

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

1: Talk:Soviet Union/Archive 3 - Wikipedia

The ideology of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was Marxism-Leninism, an ideology of a centralised, planned economy and a vanguardist one-party state, which was the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It was presented as an absolute truth for understanding social life. Marxism-Leninism was the cornerstone of Soviet ideology. Leninism In Marxist philosophy , Leninism is the body of political theory for the democratic organisation of a revolutionary vanguard party , and the achievement of a dictatorship of the proletariat , as political prelude to the establishment of the socialist mode of production , developed by Lenin. The highest development of the State power for the withering away of State power -this is the Marxian formula. Yes, it is "contradictory. De-Stalinization After Stalin died and once the ensuing power struggle subsided, a period of de-Stalinization developed, as Soviets debated what Marxism-Leninism would be in the absence of its de facto enforced equivalence with Stalinism. During the Khrushchev Thaw , the answer that emerged was that it would continue to involve central planning to the exclusion of market mechanisms , the totalitarian version of collectivism, and xenophobia, but that it would no longer involve the extreme degree of state terror seen during the Great Purge era. This ideological viewpoint maintained the apotheosis of Lenin, treating the terror aspect of Stalinism as a perversion that had been belatedly corrected, rather than admitting that Lenin himself had built a legacy of state terror. This storyline persisted into the Gorbachev era and even mostly survived glasnost , being definitively debunked only after the dissolution of the union and still not rejected even today by a sizeable fraction of the Russian public. Dictatorship of the proletariat "Either the dictatorship of the landowners and capitalists, or the dictatorship of the proletariat There is no middle course There is no middle course anywhere in the world, nor can there be. It can be exercised only by a vanguard that has absorbed the revolutionary energy of the class. Imperialism "Imperialism is capitalism at stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts as begun; in which divisions of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed. Through the Soviet ideological viewpoint, pro-Soviet factions in each country were the only legitimate voice of "the people" regardless of whether they were minority factions. All other factions were simply class enemies of "the people", inherently illegitimate rulers regardless of whether they were majority factions. Thus, in this view, any country that became Soviet or a Soviet ally naturally did so via a legitimate voluntary desire, even if the requesters needed Soviet help to accomplish it. The principal examples were the Soviet invasion of Finland yielding the annexation of Finnish parts of Karelia , the Soviet invasion of Poland , the Soviet occupation of the Baltic states , and the postwar de facto dominance over the satellite states of the Eastern Bloc under a pretense of total independence. In the post-Soviet era even many Ukrainians, Georgians, and Armenians feel that their countries were forcibly annexed by the Bolsheviks, but this has been a problematic view because the pro-Soviet factions in these societies were once sizable as well. Each faction felt that the other did not represent the true national interest. This civil war -like paradox has been seen in the annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation , as pro-Russian Crimeans have been viewed as illegitimate by pro-Ukrainian Crimeans, and vice versa. Peaceful coexistence Main article: Peaceful coexistence "The loss by imperialism of its dominating role in world affairs and the utmost expansion of the sphere in which the laws of socialist foreign policy operate are a distinctive feature of the present stage of social development. The main direction of this development is toward even greater changes in the correlation of forces in the world arena in favour of socialism.

2: Ideology of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union - Wikipedia

v This library is a Congressionally designated depository for U.S. Government documents. Public access to the Government documents is guaranteed by public law.

Mikka Evil Empire The following piece removed as misplaced in a general-purpose article In , attempting to draw a clear moral divide in the Cold War, former President Ronald Reagan called the Soviet Union an " evil empire ," a statement that drew the ire of some but was championed by his conservative supporters in the U. You may wish to reinsert it into specialized articles dealing with politics or history of the Soviet Union. I lost the fight with my fingers Any help on finding good resources would be greatly appreciated. The resources I currently have are as follows: Bobby Fischer biography by Frank Brady 3. Chess is My Life Korchnoi 5. Chess is My Life Karpov 6. The Life and Games of Mikhail Tal 7. Bobby Fischer Goes to War Thanks. I am amazed that this article stands without criticism. It whitewashes a very sinister regime. I am not saying it should do anything but present the facts but even minor changes have been rejected. How does this work? Libertas This article is linked to scores of articles that accomplish this, and characterize myriad other facets of the Soviet regime, as it is supposed to. The function of this page, based on encyclopedic hierarchy, is to give very brief overviews on the Soviet polity, economy, and demography, as it is for articles on every other existing or defunct nation. Incidentally, we still have to complete a number of important articles, such as Politics of the Soviet Union and Foreign relations of the Soviet Union ; notice that their links appear in red in this article, meaning that they have not been even started. In this article, constructive additions to the general overviews will mention specifics that link to other Soviet-related topics, such as collectivisation in the USSR , and Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But adding emotive, POV terms like "murder," "totalitarian," or "dictatorship" though I personally agree with your sentiment does not help make this article a better guide to the other articles on Soviet topics in Wikipedia. On that note, helpful sources for picking up the kind of language appropriate for this article can be found in the U. Adding POV language is not the proper way of making sure that information on the crimes of the Soviet regime are more readily acceptable to Wikipedia readers. Notice that this is not even the approach of U. Please, by all means, add important key words linked to specific articles where you can find them. Soviet history was also very complex and should not be oversimplified. And the USSR was not totalitarian for most of its history. And Soviet people were much happier before their country collapsed than they are now, according to almost any reasonable metric, from economic output, to food consumption, to life expectancy, to number of hospital beds, to average income, to subjective happiness, to the damn number of smiles in the streets. Still, before you spit out your misconceptions about this great country that you were told by propaganda in your American school, please have a modicum of respect to people who attempted to build the first ever society based on the principles of Communism. I was one of the fortunate ones. And yes we came to America and built a better life. Russian achievements in science, education and culture long preceded his murderous reign of terror. Shall I annoy you by citing a hundred composers, authors, etc? It is indeed a job for encyclopedia articles to state facts and not whitewash them: As to the crap about smiling Soviet cherubs compared with today, Russia is on the verge if Putin can restrain himself a little of a natural resources led boom. Russia has more natural resources than any other nation and its best days are coming, under freedom. It is a joke and an insult to Russians to say they better off under any measure under that evil system of state fascism: Freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect, but we have never had to put a wall up to keep our people in. Kennedy Ask me to have to respect for the wall-builders and gulag-operators and politburo special lane drivers and I spit in your eye figuratively at least! If possible, his defense of Stalin lowers his credibility further. Libertas I am not just of Russian descent, I live in Russia now. I am very well off personally, I also happen to have an excellent general education and a very good business education. But what you say about Putin and "natural resources led boom" is idiocy, which is partly explained by the fact that you live outside of Russia. There is no "boom", except the possible "boom" of crashing even lower than Russia currently is. Soviet Union was not a totalitarian state for most of its history. Check out the definition of "totalitarian". The legacy of the Russian

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

empire was further developed by the Soviet Union. The achievements during that time were much greater than already great deeds done before the The majority thinks that current system is bad for the country. By any reasonable quantitative measure life in USSR was better than today. I challenge you, take any metric and chances are it was better 20 years ago. The excellent Soviet systems of education, science, medicine, culture, defence were either already completely destroyed or are being destroyed as we speak. No freedom, not of speech, not of thought, the Soviet Union respected neither the will of the majority nor the rights of the minority. Meanwhile, Stalin fought racial war upon Tartars and Ukrainians and class war upon the Khulaks claiming at least 4 million, most historians say 8 million. Meanwhile 1 million Russians were purged for thoughtcrime. Lets not forget the tens of millions forced to live under Communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe. A South or a North Korean? A mainland Chinese or a Taiwanese? The Soviet Union was the fruits of a complete and total betrayal of the revolution. A traditional ad hominem argument was identified by Aristotle in his On Sophistical Refutations and has the basic form: A makes claim B; there is something objectionable about A, therefore claim B is false. Meanwhile the Soviet times are remembered positively. Another facet of facts is that I repeat it again by any reasonable measure, life in the Soviet Union was better than life is today in Russia, which, in turn, is many times better than life in other "independent states". I measure whether people are willing to die to leave Russia, this no longer happens. The evil empire no longer needs walls to imprison its people. Libertas, It is always healthy to be skeptical of polling data. However, when it comes to Russian opinion polling, you are painting a picture with an excessively large brush. Libertas I wrote that entry for the most part Do some searches online. You will find respected Western academics and media outlets using their data. And God willing, the thieves and bullies in the Kremlin and oligarchy will invest in Russia and not hide the profits offshore. That investment will give all the capital Russia needs to achieve great prosperity, not just for avaricious insiders like you but for all the people. A true democracy needs equality of opportunity, and Russia is lacking that. I believe it will come. On that note, the Democratic Republic of Congo is one of the richest countries in the world, right? Commodity wealth does not inevitably yield liquid wealth. Russia has its problems but Congo has bigger ones, which it too might overcome, I certainly hope Africa improves using its own resources not relying on handouts which never seem to solve anything. Every Russian I know celebrates its collapse without necessarily being overjoyed about everything that replaced it of course and to pretend otherwise with fake opinion polls is an insult to my intelligence although a credit to your Soviet style intelligence service. On that note, please take note of Wikipedia: Calling someone a "freak" is not going to win you support on Wikipedia. The same goes for Paranoid and myself. Paranoid should avoid using terms like "brainwashed. Let me just say that I consider Libertas to "hold strong ideas that I consider to be implausible and that seem resistant to evidence, common sense, experience and logic". Furthermore, I believe that he developed these ideas under external influence. I find it quite obvious that he is very poorly informed about the real situation in Russia, which is quite normal for an emigrant, but must be taken into account. I could just restate my points, but that would be useless. Libertas, if you want to argue, please respond in a rational and calm manner to my posts first. It adds value-neutral factual information. I did not express any views much less misogynist , I just mentioned several facts, which are supported by evidence. I fail to see what "common sense, experience and logic" have to do with it. So would you please stop your personal attacks that contradict facts and have nothing to do with this article. If you want to discuss my views, do it at User talk: Thank you in advance. As opposed to what, rich peasants, who benefited immediately? Everything was forced in a sense. Electrification was forced, five year plans were forced. The NEP was an economic regime, just as 5-year plans and collective farming were an economic regime. Forced collectivisation was a form of achieving such regime and is not relevant in that particular sentence. Additionally, enough is probably written in the linked article. This addition by Libertas was correct and also improved the style by connecting two sentences. I thought it was particularly important to note that there Russia followed a global trend.

3: Project MUSE - Peasants into Pilots: Soviet Air-Mindedness as an Ideology of Dominance

SOVIET IDEOLOGY AND SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY. \$ / 30,00 â,- / Â£ Get Access to Full Text. Citation Information. *The New Face of Soviet Totalitarianism.*

Mastery of language exists only as mastery of its worst and most inadequate possibilities. Martin Walser The crucial issue of the survival of ideology in our postmodern era brings into focus the concept of relativity. The defining feature of postmodernist thought is the absence of any particular centralist patterns which claim objective truth or absolute value. The generic quality of ideology, on the other hand, is considered to be an absolute commitment to some system of ideas which is strictly opposed to all other idea systems. Is it possible that ideological thinking will survive the postmodernist kingdom of playful relativity, preserving all necessary ideological definitions of mandatory and absolutist modes of thinking? Posed in this way, the problem appeared singularly intriguing, for ideology was the unique exception to the modernist rule; no other discipline or mode of discourse made such strident truth claims or clung to its certainties in so uncompromising and non-modernist a fashion. It seems more appropriate to identify "relativist skepticism" with postmodernism than with modernism because the latter is known exactly for its "strident truth claims," as in the philosophy of Marx and Nietzsche or in the art of futurism and surrealism. Unfortunately, the answer given by Mr. Susser is not persuasive. An ideology that was nonchalant or equivocal about the activities it enjoyed or prohibited would be no ideology at all. Ideology and modernism were to each other as an immovable object to an irresistible force. My answer, if only preliminary and partial, is quite different. Far from being antithetical to post-modernism, ideology supplies a unique forum for the post-modernist interplay of all conceivable ideas. Paradoxically, Soviet Marxism, the philosophy least expected to be involved in postmodernist debate, can provide an explanation. The ideology of Soviet Marxism has always enjoyed the reputation of being one of the most conservative and anti-modern system of beliefs of the twentieth century. Totalitarianism was assumed to exclude the sort of relativism that flourished in Western culture and laid the basis for the transition to the postmodernist condition. Totalitarianism itself may thus be viewed as a specific postmodern model which came to replace the modernist ideological stance elaborated in earlier Marxism. The difference between classic Marxism, which is recognized as a breakthrough in philosophical modernism, and Soviet Marxism in its Stalinist and especially Brezhnevian versions, can be described precisely in terms of the modernist-postmodernist relationship. The following discussion will attempt to answer a series of interrelated questions: What are the principal patterns of ideological thinking in general and of Soviet Marxism in particular? Is the allegedly "scholastic" system of Soviet ideology alien to the mainstream of Occidental thinking, or does it reproduce or perhaps precede some of the most striking intellectual developments of the West? How are relativist patterns introduced into the structure of totalitarian ideology, transforming it into a variant of postmodernist thinking? Ideology is perhaps more strongly connected with language than any other kind of social activity. Language is the main vehicle of communication, and the mission of ideology is to rule the process of communication and organize people into communities governed by specific ideas. Karl Marx himself noted that "ideas do not exist in separation from language. Language is the most honest witness of ideological contradictions, which in Soviet Marxism were painstakingly concealed from the consciousness of the population in order to mold more successfully its collective subconscious. Until now, only individual aspects of Soviet Marxist ideolanguage have come under consideration: But the essential overall patterns of ideological language have thus far been neglected, and the analytical framework reduced to one historical epoch, one social stratum, or one functional style see Bibliographical Supplement, p. In fact, the "language of the revolution" is only one stage in the development of Soviet Marxist ideolanguage, "proletarian dialect" only one of its sources, and publitsistika only one of its thematic realms. Ideolanguage goes beyond these particular aspects, it is something constant and universal, with its own logic, imagery and archetypes rooted in human consciousness. The author proposes the term "ideolinguistics" for this field of analysis, a field as important for understanding the nature of language and the development of society today as were sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics in the s and s. Instead, these policies made more explicit the rhetorical devices of Soviet

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

Marxism which the previous two or three generations of ideologists had concealed. With perestroika, the ideological relativism inherent in the totalitarian mode of thinking oversteps the boundaries of totalitarianism--an outwardly coherent and intolerant system of political thought--and displays a host of controversial meanings which were previously hidden inside the self-contradictory doctrines of Stalinism and Brezhnevism. A unique opportunity exists for linguistic and epistemological analysis of the patterns of the most long-standing totalitarian ideology of modern times. Two theoretical approaches dominate this field: It seems neither theory expresses the entire truth. In contrast to the assumptions of both homogeneity and heterogeneity, the author will argue that ideology and language are two phenomena which can neither be equated to, nor torn apart from one another. This section will attempt to demonstrate that the dialectic interaction of ideology and language defines the specific subject of ideolinguistics, laying the groundwork for the analysis of Soviet Marxist ideolanguage which follows. Let us now examine the heterogeneous and homogeneous approaches. Hayakawa, and other representatives of the so-called "general semantics" school. This philosophical school was founded by Alfred Korzybski, who developed a comprehensive critique of the ideological abuse of language. Meanings of words are improperly broadened and abstracted from concrete references. These empty abstracts, which do not correspond to reality, are then easily manipulated in order to provoke love and hate with respect to purely fictitious objects. Semantic analysis claims to show that ideological terms such as "democracy," "communism," "fascism," and "capitalism" are devoid of any specific meaning. Each speaker supplies such words with his own meaning, resulting in ideological battles which, in real life, often progress to the point of military clashes. Semanticists recommend certain logical procedures to heal language from this ill-intentioned substitution of concepts and deterioration of meaning. One procedure would require that each pronouncement include an indication of its own incompleteness and non-identity with its object. Such words as "Germany" or "Russians," for example, are abstractions; expressions like "Germany chokes freedom" or "the Russian people are virtual slaves" are vague and ambiguous. It is necessary to identify a more specific subset before such expressions can become meaningful: For example, "war1 is not war2," would prevent confusion over different meanings of this word in such expressions as "Germany is eager to engage in war" and "the war between cinema and TV is the main cultural collision of the recent decades. On the whole, general semantics proceeds from the assumption that language can be improved rationally. This liberal optimism goes back to the philosophy of John Locke who, in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*; Book 3, chapters , focused on the criteria for the verification of speech. In this perspective, ideology is alien to the essence of language, an irrational distortion of its rational structures. An opposing approach was developed in the works of Russian and French thinkers. His theory holds that any system of signs is completely ideological: They may be equated A word accompanies and comments on every ideological act All this makes a word a fundamental object of the theory of ideologies. His approach to language as an "ideological substance" is based on the assumption that "in living pronouncements each element not only signifies but also evaluates The objective predmetnoe meaning is formed by evaluation Evaluation has the creative role in changes of meanings. Structuralism views ideology not as imposed on language from the outside, but as the immanent property of language itself. Language is considered to undergo the process of ideologization every time it is transformed into speech. Ideology is thus not an anomaly, but a norm of every pronouncement which somehow relates to the world of values. Courtes make a clear distinction between paradigmatic and syntagmatic articulation of a world of values, known as "axiology" and "ideology," respectively. In their view, ideology can neither be avoided nor banished from language because language is constantly assimilating some values while expelling others. These authors imply that axiology is a stable system of values while "ideology is a permanent quest for values In *Elements of Semiology*, Barthes discusses ideology within the framework of so-called "connotative linguistics. According to Barthes, ideology is a secondary system of connotations which is built over a system of denotations. For example, the word "Motherland" denotes "the country in which one was born and of which one is a citizen". The connotation of the word may be defined as "patriotic pride," or "faithfulness to the land of the ancestors," or "love for compatriots. Here, the word "Motherland" is the sign, "country" is the first signified denotation , and "pride" is the second signified connotation. Barthes concludes, "We might say that ideology is the form For Stuart

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

Chase, ideology is a "tyranny of words" from which one can and must liberate oneself. For Roland Barthes, ideology is "a linguistics of connotation," in which every speaker inevitably inscribes his own meanings. But ideology should be neither opposed to nor equated with language because these extremes abolish the main question raised by ideolinguistics: If every evaluative component of speech is classified as ideological, then the distinction between different modes of evaluation is lost. Clearly, expressions such as "Oh, what bad weather! Does this mean that all of these expressions are ideological pronouncements? If the answer is yes, then the concept of ideology covers such a broad range of phenomena that it loses all specificity and theoretical usefulness. It would be frivolous to detect the same ideological character in Soviet Marxist expressions and momentary, emotional proclamations of an individual. If, however, we agree that ideology does not include evaluations based on personal emotions or whims, and only one of the above-mentioned expressions is genuinely ideological the latter one, then the specific relationship between ideology and language can be explored. On the other hand, if ideology is a perverse use of language which can and must be abandoned, then the proper theory of ideological language loses its focus. From this point of view, ideology is just an obstacle to communication and understanding and has nothing to do with the inner essence of language. In the 1950s, the methods and problems of syntactical research, in particular generative and transformative grammar, prevailed in linguistics. In the seventies "semantics," the analysis of semantic primitives, universals, and primary lexical functions, dominated. Only in the late seventies and early eighties did the accelerated development of pragmatics become evident and lead to the formation of a specific discipline-- "pragmalinguistics. This theory attempts to show how signs express the attitude of the speaker or of the listener towards the signified. In contrast, general semantics and structuralism are oriented towards semantic and syntactic aspects of the sign, respectively. Charles Morris, one of the founders of pragmatics, indicated that in addition to signs-designators, whose aim is purely descriptive, other types of signs also exist. Among these signs are appraisors, which make evaluations; prescriptors, which aim at evoking some type of reaction; and formators, which aim at the systematization and organization of the entire behavior of the recipient. This classification of signs allows for analytical distinctions between different types of discourse, including political and propagandistic discourse. The most productive contribution of pragmatics, however, turned out to be not its classification of signs, but its concept that signs possess a flexible pragmatic function which can be actualized in any meaningful pronouncement, depending on the conditions of communication. The pragmatic relationship between language and its users includes social, psychological, and ideological aspects. This would create the subfield of ideolinguistics, filling the gap in the existing system of linguistic disciplines. Ideolinguistics would explore a middle ground between language and ideology in the way in which sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics have examined interdisciplinary problems on the border between language and society and language and psychology. Although sociolinguistics studies language in terms of its social functions, ideology has its own peculiarities which cannot be reduced to sociological issues. Ideology is a sort of bridge between human mentality and social life and offers its own broad realm of investigation. Moreover, ideological factors sometimes have more importance for the development of language than do sociological or psychological factors.

4: Ideological Differences - Background Material: The Cold War - Cold War Radar

EUROPE 1918 SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY foment revolution in those countries with which the USSR had regular diplomatic relations was seen as normal. The relationship with Germany was not untroubled.

Strike, Battleship Potemkin and October Like novels and other categories of art, movies also provide inestimable source of information in the context of its geography, society, era and ideology in which they are created. Soviet movies are one of the best examples with regard to go into the ins and outs of its geography, society, era and especially its ideology. In this paper, Sergei Eisenstein as one of the most famous and influential Soviet directors, will be my focus with his silent films, Strike! Objective reality, ontological reality or Kantian reality is the objective world faced by all people and institutions. On the other hand, subjective reality or individual reality is the reflection or representation of objective reality held in the psyches and documents of those same people and institutions. As we mentioned before, every piece of art, every movie provides a blend of hard and soft facts. Thus, as we see in other works of art, Strike, Battleship Potemkin and October reflect not only reality but also ideological orientation and background of Eisenstein as well as his knowledge and perspective of the world. Stalin was a unique leader who was extremely absorbed with movies and moviemaking industry; he managed to create a reality on the screen that had very little in common with real life. It is a trend which aimed to idealize the individual, and easel painting of the Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia, which demanded accessible content and comprehensible form. Eisenstein was ready to romanticize and idealize the Soviet people, leaders, revolutionary action and Soviet Union. Ideological Conflict and Social Reality, p. The oppressor massacre innocents containing mothers, infants, children, old men and women, etc. Organizations means unity of action, unity of practical operations. One of the most touching and dramatized incident is a worker hangs himself after being falsely accused of stealing and responded harshly by the management, and this leads to a strike. Relation to this dramatization, workers as idealizing characters and typology are the features which we can find in the movie in a manner of heroic realism. To give another example of romanticization of the characters, we can remember the oppressive management, capitalist forces or briefly enemies are reflected as animals that control the proletariat. When capitalists and strikebreakers were all portrayed as anomalous figures, the working mass was glorified. Except the suicide man, we cannot find individualized characters or characters with depths. The Silent Films,, p. The Silent Films, p. Workers at most could achieve short-run success through spontaneous uprisings as we see in Strike, Battleship Potemkin and October but they would never be able to organize themselves sufficient to take power. For that, workers have to subject themselves to the leadership of the Communist Party. However, we do not see a specific leader or main character in Battleship Potemkin. As in Strike, revolution is made collectively. It inevitably recalls being equal, being the all of them and also being the one. In the movie, we see that all for one and one for all. Heroic realism appears in the sense of romanticization and idealization of 7 Bordwell D. The class enemy ceased to be abstract imperialist monster; instead, he or she was a concrete person not necessarily a capitalist. Those attractions stimulate an emotional energy to people who watch Battleship Potemkin. October is about the history of the October Revolution, the events comes after and the Bolsheviks seizure of power. As we mentioned in Strike and Battleship Potemkin, again the mass scenes with thousands and extras are one of the important part of the movie. In terms of idealized characters as an integral element of heroic realism; Bolsheviks are the brave and powerful masses with purposeful and collectivist activity. When it comes to Mensheviks and provisional government ministers, they are particularly ugly or bizarre looking actors. After, Strike and Battleship Potemkin, we clearly see a hero, the hero, Lenin. Even if the movie does not distort the whole reality, we can say that the events are it selected and exaggerated in many ways. Eisenstein never details the behind-the-scenes wrangling within the Bolshevik ranks, nor does he articulate the positions of the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries. We see the hard fact that movies are built by many factors including the political situation in the country, public opinion in general, the directors individual beliefs regarding specific ideological issues and directors own life experiences.

5: SOVIET IDEOLOGY AND SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY : The New Face of Soviet Totalitarianism

Talk:Soviet Union/Archive 3 41, 27 Dec (UTC) Another important factor in the USSR's collapse was the tremendous brainwashing of the.

An MP3 audio file of this article, read by Jeff Rigenbach, is available for download. But how realistic, how well grounded, is this assumption? First, there is no doubt that the Soviets, along with all other Marxist-Leninists, would like to replace all existing social systems by Communist regimes. But such a sentiment, of course, scarcely implies any sort of realistic threat of attack – just as an ill wish in private life can hardly be grounds for realistic expectation of imminent aggression. On the contrary, Marxism-Leninism itself believes that victory of Communism is inevitable – not on the wings of outside force, but rather from accumulating tensions and "contradictions" within each society. So that Marxism-Leninism considers internal revolution or, in the current "Eurocommunist" version, democratic change for installing Communism to be inevitable. At the same time, it holds any coercive external imposition of Communism to be at best suspect, and at worst disruptive and counterproductive of genuine organic social change. Any idea of "exporting" Communism to other countries on the back of the Soviet military is totally contradictory to Marxist-Leninist theory. We are not saying, of course, that Soviet leaders will never do anything contrary to Marxist-Leninist theory. But to the extent that they act as ordinary rulers of a strong Russian nation-state, the case for an imminent Soviet threat to the United States is gravely weakened. If the Soviet rulers were simply to act as Russian dictators consulting only their own nation-state interests, then the entire basis for treating the Soviets as a uniquely diabolic source of imminent military assault crumbles to the ground. When the Bolsheviks took power in Russia in 1917, they had given little thought to a future Soviet foreign policy, for they were convinced that Communist revolution would soon follow in the advanced industrial countries of Western Europe. When such hopes were dashed after the end of World War I, Lenin and his fellow Bolsheviks adopted the theory of "peaceful coexistence" as the basic foreign policy for a Communist state. The idea was this: As the first successful Communist movement, Soviet Russia would serve as a beacon light and supporter of other Communist parties throughout the world. But the Soviet state qua state would devote itself to peaceful relations with all other countries, and would not attempt to export Communism through interstate warfare. The idea here was not just to follow Marxist-Leninist theory, but also the highly practical course of holding the survival of the existing Communist state as the foremost goal of foreign policy: Other countries would be expected to become Communist by their own internal processes. Thus, fortuitously, from a mixture of theoretical and practical grounds of their own, the Soviets arrived early at what libertarians consider to be the only proper and principled foreign policy. This increasing conservatism under Stalin and his successors strengthened and reinforced the nonaggressive, "peaceful-coexistence" policy. The Bolsheviks, indeed, began their success story by being literally the only political party in Russia to clamor, from the beginning of World War I, for an immediate Russian pullout from the war. Indeed, they went further and courted enormous unpopularity by calling for the defeat of "their own" government "revolutionary defeatism". When Russia began to suffer enormous losses, accompanied by massive military desertions from the front, the Bolsheviks, guided by Lenin, continued to be the only party to call for an immediate end to the war, the other parties still vowing to fight the Germans to the end. When the Bolsheviks came to power, Lenin, over the hysterical opposition of even the majority of the Bolshevik central committee itself, insisted on concluding the "appeasement" peace of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918. Here Lenin succeeded in taking Russia out of the war, even at the price of granting to the victorious German army all the parts of the Russian Empire it then occupied including White Russia and the Ukraine. Thus, Lenin and the Bolsheviks began their reign by being not simply a peace party, but virtually a "peace-at-any-price" party. Taking advantage of the turmoil and civil war within Russia at the end of the world war, various other national groups – Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania – decided to break away from the pre-World War I Russian Empire and declare national independence. While Leninism pays lip service to national self-determination, it was clear to Soviet rulers from the very beginning that the boundaries of the old Russian state were supposed to remain intact. The Red

Army reconquered the Ukraine, not only from the Whites, but also from the Ukrainian nationalists and from the indigenously Ukrainian anarchist army of Nestor Makhno. It should be noted that every political party or tendency in Russia and Germany, whether ruling the state or in opposition, agreed with this aim of full restoration of national territory. But, it should be emphasized, while Germany under Hitler took strong measures to recapture the lost lands, the cautious and conservative Soviet rulers did absolutely nothing. Only after the Stalin-Hitler pact and the German conquest of Poland did the Soviets, now facing no danger in doing so, recapture their lost territories. And they were able to do so without a fight. But Finland was prepared to fight. Here, the Russians demanded, not the reincorporation of Finland as a whole, but only of parts of the Karelian Isthmus that were ethnically Russian. When the Finns refused this demand, the "Winter War" between Russia and Finland ensued, which ended with the Finns victorious and conceding nothing. On June 22, 1941, Germany, triumphant over everyone but England in the west, launched a sudden massive and unprovoked assault on Soviet Russia, an act of aggression aided and abetted by the other pro-German states in Eastern Europe—Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Slovakia, and Finland. This German and allied invasion of Russia soon became one of the pivotal facts in the history of Europe since that date. So unprepared was Stalin for the assault, so trusting was he in the rationality of the German-Russian accord for peace in Eastern Europe, that he had allowed the Russian army to fall into disrepair. So unwarlike was Stalin, in fact, that Germany was almost able to conquer Russia in the face of enormous odds. Since Germany otherwise would have been able to retain control of Europe indefinitely, it was Hitler who was led by the siren call of anti-Communist ideology to throw away a rational and prudent course and launch what was to be the beginning of his ultimate defeat. It was during and immediately after the war, they assert, that Russia became expansionist and drove its way into Eastern Europe. What this charge overlooks is the central fact of the German and associated assault upon Russia in June 1941. There is no doubt about the fact that Germany and her allies launched this war. Hence, in order to defeat the invaders, it was obviously necessary for the Russians to roll back the invading armies and conquer Germany and the other warring countries of Eastern Europe. It is easier to make out a case for the United States being expansionist for conquering and occupying Italy and part of Germany than it is for Russia doing so—after all, the United States was never directly attacked by the Germans. During World War II, the United States, Britain, and Russia—the three major Allies—had agreed on joint three-power military occupation of all the conquered territories. The United States was the first to break the agreement during the war by allowing Russia no role whatever in the military occupation of Italy. Despite this serious breach of agreement, Stalin displayed his consistent preference for the conservative interests of the Russian nation-state over cleaving to revolutionary ideology—by repeatedly betraying indigenous Communist movements. In order to preserve peaceful relations between Russia and the West, Stalin consistently tried to hold back the success of various Communist movements. He was successful in France and Italy, where Communist partisan groups might easily have seized power in the wake of the German military retreat; but Stalin ordered them not to do so, and instead persuaded them to join coalition regimes headed by anti-Communist parties. In both countries, the Communists were soon ousted from the coalition. In Greece, where the Communist partisans almost did seize power, Stalin irretrievably weakened them by abandoning them and urging them to turn over power to newly invading British troops. There is no doubt that these rejections were the beginning of the later, extraordinarily important schisms within the world Communist movement. Russia, therefore, governed Eastern Europe as military occupier after winning a war launched against her. Her goal was to gain assurances that Eastern Europe would not be the broad highway for an assault on Russia, as it had been three times in half a century—the last time in a war in which over 20 million Russians had been slaughtered. Political conditions in Eastern Europe were such that only in more modernized Finland did non-Communist politicians exist whom Russia could trust to pursue a peaceful line in foreign affairs. And in Finland, this situation was the work of one far-seeing statesman, the agrarian leader Julio Paasikivi. It was because Finland, then and since, has firmly followed the "Paasikivi line" that Russia was willing to pull its troops out of Finland and not to insist on the Communization of that country—even though it had fought two wars with Finland in the previous six years. Even in the other Eastern European countries, Russia clung to coalition governments for several years after the war, and only fully Communized them in—after three years of unrelenting American

Cold-War pressure to try to oust Russia from these countries. In other areas, Russia readily pulled its troops out of Austria and out of Azerbaijan. The cold warriors find it difficult to explain Russian actions in Finland. If Russia is always hell-bent to impose Communist rule wherever it can, why the "soft line" on Finland? The only plausible explanation is that its motivation is security for the Russian nation-state against attack, with the success of world Communism playing a very minor role in its scale of priorities. Schisms and World Communism In fact, the Cold Warriors have never been able either to explain or absorb the fact of deep schisms in the world Communist movement. For if all Communists are governed by a common ideology, then every Communist everywhere should be part of one unified monolith, and one which, given the early success of the Bolsheviks, would make them subordinates or "agents" of Moscow. If Communists are mainly motivated by their bond of Marxism-Leninism, why do we have the deep China-Russia split, in which Russia, for example, keeps one million troops at the ready on the China-Russia frontier? Why is there such enmity between the Yugoslav Communist and the Albanian Communist states? How can there be an actual military conflict between the Cambodian and Vietnamese Communists? The answer, of course, is that once a revolutionary movement seizes state power, it very quickly begins to take on the attributes of a ruling class, with a class interest in retaining state power. The world revolution begins to pale, in their outlook, to insignificance. And since state elites can and do have conflicting interests in power and wealth, it is not surprising that inter-Communist conflicts have become endemic. Since their victory over German military aggression in World War II, the Soviets have continued to be conservative in their military policy. Their only use of troops has been to defend their territory in the Communist bloc, rather than to extend it further. Thus, when Hungary threatened to leave the Soviet block in , or Czechoslovakia in , the Soviets intervened with troops "reprehensibly, to be sure, but still acting in a conservative and defensive, rather than expansionist, manner. The Soviets apparently gave considerable thought to invading Yugoslavia when Tito took that country out of the Soviet bloc, but were deterred by the formidable qualities for guerrilla fighting of the Yugoslav army. In no case has Russia used troops to extend its bloc or to conquer more territories. Cohen, director of the program in Russian studies at Princeton, has delineated the nature of Soviet conservatism in foreign affairs in a recent issue of Inquiry: That a system born in revolution and still professing revolutionary ideas should have become one of the most conservative in the world may seem preposterous. But all those factors variously said to be most important in Soviet politics have contributed to this conservatism: A conservative government is, of course, capable of dangerous militaristic actions, as we saw in Czechoslovakia "but these are acts of imperial protectionism, a kind of defensive militarism, not a revolutionary or aggrandizing one. It is certainly true that for most Soviet leaders, as presumably for most American leaders, detente is not an altruistic endeavor but the pursuit of national interests. In one sense, this is sad. But it is probably also true that mutual self-interest provides a more durable basis for detente than lofty, and finally empty, altruism "Why Detente Can Work," December 19, Similarly, as impeccable an anti-Soviet source as former CIA Director William Colby finds the overwhelming concern of the Soviets in the defensive goal of avoiding another catastrophic invasion of their territory. You will find the determination that they shall never again be invaded and put through the kinds of turmoil that they have been under and many different invasions. Even the Chinese, for all their bluster, have pursued a conservative and pacific foreign policy. And China even took the unusual step of declaring a unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal of forces to its border after having triumphed easily over Indian arms in their escalated border war. For Chiang Kai-shek as well as all other Chinese have for many generations considered Tibet as part of Greater China, and China was here acting in the same conservative, nation-state manner as we have seen has guided the Soviets. Avoiding A Priori History There is still one thesis common to Americans and even to some libertarians that may prevent them from absorbing the analysis of this chapter: But there is simply no evidence for this assumption. Examples range from premodern Japan to Communist Albania to innumerable dictatorships in the Third World today. On the other hand, such an indubitable democracy as Great Britain spread its coercive imperialism across the globe during the 19th and earlier centuries. The theoretical reason why focusing on democracy or dictatorship misses the point is that states "all states" rule their population and decide whether or not to make war. And all states, whether formally a democracy or dictatorship or some other brand of rule, are run by a ruling elite.

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

Whether or not these elites, in any particular case, will make war upon another state is a function of a complex interweaving web of causes, including the temperament of the rulers, the strength of their enemies, the inducements for war, public opinion, etc. Intensive propaganda is necessary in any case — as we can see by the zealous opinion-molding behavior of all modern warring states. But the democratic state must work harder and faster. And also the democratic state must be more hypocritical in using rhetoric designed to appeal to the values of the masses:

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

6: Ideology of Soviet Sport | Guided History

SOVIET IDEOLOGY AND FOREIGN POLICY indulge in unrestrained Machiavellian politics. At times, tired of explaining Soviet politics by quoting from the scriptures of Marxism-Leninism.

Additionally, listed below each source is a recommended usage of the resource in regards to understanding the ideology of Soviet sport. *A History of Modern Russia: From Tsarism to the Twenty-first Century*. Service writes in a historical, professional manner and creates a strong backbone of Russian history to build off of with the other resources. However, it is a dense read for the general Soviet history enthusiast, but nonetheless an excellent resource for research. Soviet political science, industrialization, post-tsarist Russia, growth of Soviet Russia. Socializing the military into school systems and civilian life was a key technique used by the Soviet party. Robert Edelman brings a historical outlook to the political influence and reasoning behind public viewings of sports and their significance within the USSR. *Serious Fun* provides detailed background to many events that were merely mentioned in other books, in particular, the Spartakiad and early Athletic parades. Edelman writes in a professional, academic manner while still providing an easy to read and entertaining piece of Soviet history. Soviet sport history, pre-Olympics Soviet sports history, general spectator sports, context behind behaviors of Soviets and their engagement with sport. *Physical Culture and Sport in Soviet Society: Propaganda, Acculturation, and Transformation in the 1920s and 1930s*. Throughout the book, Grant connects sport, politics and power to create an easy to process relationship between the three. Grant also utilizes the idea of physical culture, a much broader ideal, as well as sport on society and how political ideals effected sports and the other way around. Most effectively, Grant focuses heavily on the history and context of the creation of Soviet physical ideology and institutions. *Sport in the Soviet Union*. *Sport in Soviet Society*. He also writes extensively about sports being used in foreign policy, social routine and industrialization in lead-up to World War Two. Riordan writes appropriately for a history professor, in a structured, historical manner. Utilizing direct quotations, Steinberg creates a strong resource for understanding the politics and international communist beliefs in sports. Additionally, the article provides a greater outlook on communist ideals regarding athletics. Communist sport ideology, Soviet sport ideology, primary sources. To work, to build and not to whine! Motivational psychologist for the USSR Olympic team, Grigori Raiport, presents an interesting look at the psychological practices used by the Soviet Union in conditioning their athletes. Most importantly, Raiport goes into detail the relationship between the physical culture, sport and Marxist-Stalinist ideology. Using direct language from his teachings, Raiport provides a detail-oriented and Soviet view of their sports programs in regards to purpose, politics, cultural ideology and history. University of Illinois, We will meet at competition with new victories in labor and sports!

Stalinism is the means of governing and related policies implemented from to by Joseph Stalin (). Stalinist policies and ideas as developed in the Soviet Union included rapid industrialization, the theory of socialism in one country, a totalitarian state, collectivization of agriculture, a cult of personality and subordination of the interests of foreign communist parties.

After a political struggle that culminated in the defeat of the Bukharinists, Stalinism was free to shape policy without opposition, ushering forth an era of harsh authoritarianism that soldiered toward rapid industrialization regardless of the cost. In his dispute with Trotsky, Stalin de-emphasized the role of workers in advanced capitalist countries for example, he considered the American working class "bourgeoisified" labour aristocracy. Whilst all other October Revolution Bolshevik leaders regarded their revolution more or less just as the beginning, they saw Russia as the leapboard on the road towards the World Wide Revolution, Stalin eventually introduced the idea of Socialism in One Country by the autumn of 1926. But by time and through circumstances, the revolution did not spread outside Russia, as Lenin had assumed it soon would. Not even within the other former territories Russian Empire such as Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia had the revolution been a success. On the contrary, all these countries had returned to capitalist bourgeois rule. Sheng Shicai collaborated with the Soviets, allowing Stalinist rule to be extended to the Xinjiang province in the 1930s. In 1937, Sheng conducted a purge similar to the Great Purge. At the Party Congress where the vote for the new Central Committee was held, Kirov received only three negative votes the fewest of any candidate while Stalin received at least over a hundred negative votes. Article 58 of the legal code, which listed prohibited anti-Soviet activities as counter-revolutionary crime, was applied in the broadest manner. The Russian word troika gained a new meaning: A total of 13,000, of them Poles were arrested and 11,000, Poles were executed. Notable people executed by NKVD were removed from the texts and photographs as though they never existed. Gradually, the history of revolution was transformed to a story about just two key characters: In light of revelations from Soviet archives, historians now estimate that nearly 20 million people, in and out of the country, were executed in the course of the terror, [38] with the great mass of victims merely "ordinary" Soviet citizens: Wheatcroft, who spent a good portion of his academic career researching the archives, contends that prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the opening of the archives for historical research, "our understanding of the scale and the nature of Soviet repression has been extremely poor" and that some specialists who wish to maintain earlier high estimates of the Stalinist death toll are "finding it difficult to adapt to the new circumstances when the archives are open and when there are plenty of irrefutable data" and instead "hang on to their old Sovietological methods with round-about calculations based on odd statements from emigres and other informants who are supposed to have superior knowledge". Who remembers the names now of the boyars Ivan the Terrible got rid of? Population transfer in the Soviet Union Shortly before, during and immediately after World War II, Stalin conducted a series of deportations on a huge scale that profoundly affected the ethnic map of the Soviet Union. It is estimated that between 1941 and 1949 nearly 3 million people spent time in German-occupied territories were not examined. After the brief Nazi occupation of the Caucasus, the entire population of five of the small highland peoples and the Crimean Tatars—more than a million people in total—were deported without notice or any opportunity to take their possessions. By some estimates, hundreds of thousands of deportees may have died en route. The deportations had a profound effect on the peoples of the Soviet Union. The memory of the deportations has played a major part in the separatist movements in the Baltic states, Tatarstan and Chechnya even today. Economic policy[edit] Starved peasants on a street in Kharkiv, 1932. At the start of the 1930s, Stalin launched a wave of radical economic policies that completely overhauled the industrial and agricultural face of the Soviet Union. The NEP had been implemented by Lenin in order to ensure the survival of the socialist state following seven years of war—World War I from 1914 to 1918 and the subsequent Civil War and had rebuilt Soviet production to its 1913 levels. However, Russia still lagged far behind the West and the NEP was felt by Stalin and the majority of the Communist Party, not only to be compromising communist ideals, but also not delivering sufficient economic performance

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

as well as not creating the envisaged socialist society. It was therefore felt necessary to increase the pace of industrialisation in order to catch up with the West. Fredric Jameson has said that "Stalinism was [According to Conquest, the industrial successes were far less than claimed and the Soviet-style industrialisation was "an anti-innovative dead-end". And economically, collectivization failed to deliver", further claiming that it decreased harvests instead of increasing them. Some scholars dispute the intentionality of the famine. Many deliberate distortions and falsehoods were used. Photographs were altered and documents were invented. Hoffmann sums up the consensus of scholars: The Stalin cult was a central element of Stalinism, and as such it was one of the most salient features of Soviet rule Despite their initial cooperation against " revisionism ", Hoxha denounced Mao as a revisionist, along with almost every other self-identified communist organization in the world. This had the effect of isolating Albania from the rest of the world as Hoxha was hostile to both the pro-American and pro-Soviet spheres of influence as well as the Non-Aligned Movement under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito , whom Hoxha had also denounced. Some historians and writers like German Dietrich Schwanitz [71] draw parallels between Stalinism and the economic policy of Tsar Peter the Great , although Schwanitz in particular views Stalin as "a monstrous reincarnation" of him. Both men wanted Russia to leave the western European states far behind in terms of development. Stalinism has been considered by some reviewers as a " red fascism ". Benito Mussolini positively reviewed Stalinism as having transformed Soviet Bolshevism into a Slavic fascism. Misconceptions about Soviet Russia and the Threat to America, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn argues that the use of the term "Stalinism" is an excuse to hide the inevitable effects of communism as a whole on human liberties. He writes that the concept of Stalinism was developed after by Western intellectuals so as to be able to keep alive the communist ideal. However, the term "Stalinism" was in use as early as when Leon Trotsky wrote his pamphlet Stalinism and Bolshevism. This allowed the anger and resentment that came with the ravages of neoliberalism i. However, after the failure of the revolution in Germany, Stalin reasoned that industrializing and consolidating Bolshevism in Russia would best serve the proletariat in the long run. By the mid century, Shachtman and many of his associates identified as social democrats rather than Trotskyists and some ultimately abandoned socialism altogether. Maoists criticised Stalin chiefly regarding his view that bourgeois influence within the Soviet Union was primarily a result of external forces to the almost complete exclusion of internal forces and his view that class contradictions ended after the basic construction of socialism. However, they praised Stalin for leading the Soviet Union and the international proletariat, defeating fascism in Germany and his anti-revisionism. The historiography of Stalin is diverse, with many different aspects of continuity and discontinuity between the regimes of Stalin and Lenin proposed. After researching the biographies in the Soviet archives, he came to the same conclusion that Radzinsky and Kotkin had, i. He lamented that whereas Stalin had long since fallen in the estimation of many Soviet minds the many who agreed with de-Stalinization , "Lenin was the last bastion" in his mind to fall and the fall was the most painful, given the secular apotheosis of Lenin that all Soviet children grew up with. Proponents of continuity cite a variety of contributory factors as it is argued that it was Lenin, rather than Stalin, whose civil war measures introduced the Red Terror with its hostage taking and internment camps , that it was Lenin who developed the infamous Article 58 and who established the autocratic system within the Communist Party. In his biography of Trotsky, British historian Isaac Deutscher says that on being faced with the evidence "only the blind and the deaf could be unaware of the contrast between Stalinism and Leninism". The major difficulty is a lack of agreement about what should constitute Stalinism".

8: Ideology of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Soviet ideology, very commonly connected with totalitarian practices and propaganda, is represented in two award-winning children's books recently published in the United States that mirror a number of complex concerns related to the construction of self-identity.

9: Mikhail Epstein

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

Marxism-Leninism was the cornerstone of Soviet ideology. [1] It explained and legitimised the CPSU's right to rule, while explaining its role as a vanguard party. [1] For instance, the ideology explained that the CPSU's policies, even if they were unpopular, were correct because the party was enlightened. [1].

3. SOVIET IDEOLOGY 41 pdf

Report to the Forty-sixth Legislature Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District Literacy Acquisition and Social Context Diccionario de dificultades y aparentes contradicciones biblicas Plant Leaf Optical Properties in Visible and Near-Infrared Light (Graduate Studies (Texas Tech University Bad neighbors short story Estimates of the population of Louisiana parishes and metropolitan areas A bibliography and readers guide to the first editions of P. G. Wodehouse Wood Bending Handbook Printmaking at the Edge Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant nowcast manual Mastering essential math skills book finance Handbook of pharmaceutical excipients sixth edition Resistance in Cush The Higher Calculus The Functional Analysis of Culture Quality and patient safety Tibor Eckhard in his own words My Life and Work (The Autobiography of Henry Ford) Wheres My Angel? Nihilism and Emancipation: Ethics, Politics, and Law (European Perspectives: A Series in Social Thought a Report on manpower, equipment, and programme resources for population communication Fundamentals of multibody dynamics The story of Anne Ange Almost famous screenplay Frogs Eggs (Read All About It-Science) Practical Longitudinal Data Analysis (Chapman Hall Texts in Statistical Science Series) Visual Performing Arts 2003, Guide to A house of entertainment Build Your Own Army of Web Bots Within 24 Hours (Army of Web Bots Series, 1) Apostles into terrorists Transportation infrastructure and safety impacts of the North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA) 14. Pacemakers for brachycardia (Gerry C Kaye). Special Education: Research and Practice Tony robbins new book The Biology of the Honey Bee Duke undergraduate application filetype Jacob and Esau (Bible Stories) Touchstones for prayer My Secret Is Mine