

1: Marxist Dreams and Soviet Realities

The Soviet Union enforced the collectivization (Russian: «Коллективизация») of its agricultural sector between and (in West - between and) during the ascendancy of Joseph Stalin.

In Soviet terminology the transformation of agriculture from private-capitalist to collective-socialist production. The idea of collectivization has long been familiar in socialist co-operative movements, and Marxists have inserted it into their program. Engels, the process of collectivization must be completely voluntary and gradual. The Communists in Russia adopted a program of collectivization only after the October Revolution of 1917. In the USSR the long-term aim of collectivization was to set up large, state-owned, mechanized farms managed by experts and utilizing the newest inventions of science and technology. The short-term aim was to establish a form of collective farming that would provide the state with the maximum production of agricultural goods at a minimum level of peasant consumption. Before the collectivization drive at the end of the 1920s the prevailing view was that this transformation was to take place voluntarily. Basically, three types of collective farms were set up: These types of associations were voluntary, that is, the admission of members was based on a civil-law contract that provided for voluntary withdrawal. The peasants preferred the first form of collective farming because it guaranteed that the means of production would remain privately owned. The first collective farms, which were communes consisting mostly of workers, appeared in the Ukrainian SSR as early as 1925. In February the first congress of farm collectives took place in Odesa. The decree of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee of 9 August encouraged voluntary collectivization by various incentives. Ukrainian agrarian co-operative organizers such as I. Odynets, and Oleksa Trylisky contributed to the theory of voluntary collectivization, mainly in the form of the Association for the Joint Cultivation of Land rather than of the *artel*. There were voluntary collective farms in 1925 and 1926, embracing 2. The final version of the plan, which was approved in April 1929, projected 25 percent of the land to be collectivized. In November 1929, however, all these plans were set aside, and forced collectivization was begun. Additional capital could be secured only by increasing exports of farm products, and so large quantities of them had to be purchased at low prices. However, the peasants did not want to surrender their grain to the state at ridiculously low prices. Furthermore, the Great Depression caused the price of grain on the world market to fall. The Soviet government also wanted to deprive the peasants of their own means of production and to draw excess labor resources from the countryside into the cities. To fulfill the plan, the CP B U sent its cadres into the countryside, increasing their number from 38,000 in 1928 to 100,000 in 1929. It also sent urban industrial workers 10,000 in 1929, who were appointed chairmen of collective farms and rural soviets, and 19,000 urban workers and functionaries on temporary assignment to the villages. Peasants were forced to join collective farms under duress. Economic pressure was also used: The collective-farm members paid a monetary tax of 5 percent of their income, while all other peasants were taxed at 7 percent. The rate of collectivization was greatly accelerated. By 10 March 1930, 65 percent of farms and 70 percent of draft animals were collectivized. In many cases everything, including chickens and houseware, was socialized. In Ukraine almost half of the peasants immediately left the collective farms see the accompanying table, and by 1 February only 30 percent of peasant farms remained collectivized. When it became clear that without coercion the collective farms would disintegrate and the peasants would return to individual farming, forced collectivization was reintroduced. At first the government of the Ukrainian SSR resisted the decisions coming from Moscow about an accelerated, forced collectivization, but in November it agreed to collectivize 70 percent of the land by the spring of 1931. Thus, a second collectivization drive was begun in the winter of 1930-1. The extent of resistance among the Ukrainian peasants can be seen in the official statistics: Revolts and uprisings broke out in many villages. This resistance did not come from the kulaks, most of whom had been crushed in 1929. The level of resistance is apparent also in the mass slaughter of cattle, intended to keep them from the collective farms. Between 1929 and 1930 the number of cattle in Soviet Ukraine fell from 8 million to 6 million. In Moscow raised the quota for grain deliveries see Grain procurement in Ukraine by 50 percent above the 1929 quota. The same quota was applied to the harvest, although the collectivization reduced the yield because the collective farms were poorly run and the peasants were unable

and unwilling to work collectively. According to official data, the harvest was 11.13 million t, the government succeeded in exacting 7 million t. As a result, an average of only 100 kg of grain per person was left to the Ukrainian peasants to consume, and in the spring of 1933 famine broke out in Ukraine see *Famine-Genocide of 1933*. In spite of the famine and the poor harvest in 1933 it managed to exact only about 5 million t. At the same time there was almost no famine in Russia, for the delivery quotas there were considerably lower than in Ukraine. The figures prove that Ukraine was intentionally exploited: At the same time political departments were set up at machine-tractor stations MTS and were given full administrative authority in the villages. These departments were staffed mostly by Chekists see *Cheka* and used terror to complete the collectivization drive. The collective farms improved somewhat only when farming began to be rapidly mechanized, beginning in 1935. As late as 1935, because of collectivization, after the state could buy at bargain prices or seize over 50 percent of the collective-farm production of Ukraine, which it then resold at higher prices in the cities, to the peasants themselves, and abroad. The free capital obtained in this way was used to develop heavy industry see *Agricultural procurement and Collective farm*. Because of the collectivization, capital investment in the Soviet Union in 1935 was 5. The collectivization also provided industry with a huge labor pool: In Western Ukraine collectivization began after the first Soviet occupation in the summer of 1939. By the beginning of 1940 only 3. By 1 June 1940 as many as 13 percent were. A new, postwar collectivization drive began in the fall of 1945, and the last drive took place in the spring of 1946 as is evident from the statistics: The Soviets applied the same methods here as they had used in central and eastern Ukraine to force the peasants into the collective farms. Political departments, for example, were set up at machine-tractor stations and were staffed with armed MVD agents. During the collectivization in Western Ukraine, and particularly in Subcarpathia, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army put up a stiff resistance to collectivization. Soviet agents were assassinated, farm buildings were burned down, cattle were slaughtered, and operations were sabotaged. In retaliation large numbers of peasants were deported to Siberia and Central Asia. Most of the collective farms in Western Ukraine remained poor and run-down for a long time. *Kolkhoznoe dvizhenie na Ukraine* Kharkiv Chubar, V. *Do novykh peremoh* Kharkiv Demchenko, M. Moscow Matsiievyh, K. *Dvadsatipiatitsiachniki* Moscow Chmyga, A. *Ocherki po istorii kolkhoznogo dvizheniia na Ukraine* 1933 gg. *Russian Peasants and Soviet Power: Kolkhoznoe dvizhenie na Ukraine* Moscow Davies, R. *The Harvest of Sorrow: Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv* Kyiv Graziosi, A. *The Great Soviet Peasant War: Vinnytsia Hrynevych, Liudmyla*. The bibliography has been updated. A referral to this page is found in 67 entries.

2: Marxist Dreams and Soviet Realities | Mises Institute

Robert Conquest, Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine (New York: Oxford University Press,), pp. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto, in Selected Works, p.

Gorbachev at 75 By Sean — 13 years ago Gorbachev turns 75 today. This world historical figure needs no introduction. He is celebrated in the West and reviled in Russia. Yet, he continues to speak out against censorship in Russia as well as sending warnings about the re-emergence of authoritarianism. He spoke on similar themes in an interview with Radio Free Europe. Whatever one may think of his views, he remains one of the most important figures of the 20th century. Gorbachev recently gave an interview to Rossiiskaya gazeta. Here are some of his more interesting comments. All translations, for better or for worse are mine. In your opinion, what must the leaders of Islam do to reduce the dangerous characteristics of the rising opposition? I would like to put the question differently: What must all the participants in the process of globalization do? The Islamic world—it demands understanding and respect. It has huge human, historical and cultural potential. In the span of a century and a half it has given much to the world, enriching its science and culture. An equal and mutually respectful dialogue with it is not completely impossible. This is the only correct path. Gorbachev remains optimistic for the victory of moderation. The text can be read here. I then said that there is only one court possible—the court of history. The crimes of the regime must not be combined with the lives of several generations. People lived, selflessly labored, to elevate the country. All that was achieved in this period that was achieved by the people. By a mighty people. This needs to be remembered. This resolution condemns communism as a political practice. Even communist ideology is not subjected to judgment. That said, what remains of your relation to its past? I was and remain a supporter of the socialist idea. But I lead in the process of debunking the socialist model which renounced democracy and made a bet on dictatorship. Once a speech was given on this. In February the country will mark a historical date—50 years since the 20th Party Congress. You were a young man then. I remember how I came to these events. I arrived in Stavropol, and after seven day duty in the Procuracy they sent me to lead a department of propaganda in a Komsomol kraikom. This was August The 20th Party Congress was in February. That said, I was prepared to take some sort of role in it. Twelve people—eleven were war veterans and me. They probably took me as proletarian. Then they were beginning to reorganize the department in the Procuracy which controlled the passage of penal law in the State security organs. Up to that time the [Security organs] carried out investigations, judged and carried out executions without legal oversight. Then in the spring of this already became clear to me. After all, I joined the Party in school in the tenth grade. I believed in communism; I believed in Stalin. For me the speech on the cult of personality was a shock. Then came the red little books which had the speech printed in them. They sent us to the villages with these books to conduct expository work. I arrived in Novoaleksandrovskii district with my friend, Nikolai Vorotnikov a Party secretary of a district committee, as a relatively young man. We addressed and told them and it was quiet as a coffin. So today we see them walking with portraits of Stalin. Because under [Stalin] the prices were lower not like it is now. Ten years ago we had a conference in our foundation on the 20th Party Congress. There, voices also cried out that the 20th Congress was a betrayal. And that perestroika was a continuation of this betrayal. You understand that the problem is not in Stalin, that this was from a personality with a certain character, but in Stalinism which was the ideological foundation of a totalitarian regime. In recent years so many movies came out on this period, the best artists played the role of Stalin. And all the rest of it remains so primitive. But I repeat the problem is not in Stalin, but in Stalinism. We still have not thoroughly debunked Stalinism. I find this absolutely fascinating. Gorby said many more interesting things, but the labor of translation got the better of me. I encourage all who read Russian to check it out. Related By Sean — 3 years ago Guest: Julie Hemment , Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Massachusetts where she specializes in Russia, post-socialism, gender and transition, non-governmental organizations NGOs and global civil society. Producing Patriots and Entrepreneurs.

3: Collectivization in the Soviet Union - Wikipedia

The sum total of deaths due to Soviet policy "in the Stalin period alone" deaths from the collectivization and the terror-famine, the executions and the Gulag, is probably on the order of.

Like the United States, the Soviet Union is a nation founded on a distinct ideology. In the case of America, the ideology was fundamentally Lockean liberalism; its best expressions are the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights of the U. The Ninth Amendment, in particular, breathes the spirit of the worldview of late-century America. Translated into law, this framework defines the social space within which men voluntarily interact; it allows for the spontaneous coordination and ongoing mutual adjustment of the various plans that the members of society form to guide and fill their lives. The Soviet Union was founded on a very different ideology, Marxism, as understood and interpreted by V. Marxism, with its roots in Hegelian philosophy, was a quite conscious revolt against the individual rights doctrine of the previous century. The leaders of the Bolshevik party which changed its name to Communist in were virtually all revolutionary intellectuals, in accordance with the strategy set forth by Lenin in his work *What Is to Be Done?* The Bolshevik leaders viewed themselves as the executors of the Marxist program, as those whom History had called upon to realize the apocalyptic transition to Communist society foretold by the founders of their faith. The aim they inherited from Marx and Engels was nothing less than the final realization of human freedom and the end of the "prehistory" of the human race. Theirs was the Promethean dream of the rehabilitation of Man and his conquest of his rightful place as master of the world and lord of creation. It lies in the abolition of alienation, i. For Marx and Engels, the market represents not merely the arena of capitalist exploitation but, more fundamentally, a systematic insult to the dignity of Man. As Marx wrote of the stage of Communist society before the total disappearance of scarcity, freedom in this field can consist only in socialized man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with Nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of Nature. With the seizure of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and with it the dominion of the product over the producers. Anarchy of social production is replaced by conscious organization according to plan. The whole sphere of the conditions of life which surround men, which ruled men up until now comes under the dominion and conscious control of men, who become for the first time the real, conscious lords of nature, because and in that they become master of their own social organization. The laws of their own social activity, which confronted them until this point as alien laws of nature, controlling them, then are applied by men with full understanding, and so mastered by them. Only from then on will men make their history themselves in full consciousness; only from then on will the social causes they set in motion have in the main and in constantly increasing proportion, also the results intended by them. It is the leap of mankind from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. Man would determine his own fate. It would lead, Bakunin warned, to the creation of "a new class," which would establish "the most aristocratic, despotic, arrogant, and contemptuous of all regimes"[7] and entrench its control over the producing classes of society. In the course of the vast, senseless carnage that was the First World War, the Tsarist Empire collapsed and the immense Imperial Russian Army was fragmented into atoms. A small group of Marxist intellectuals seized power. What could be more natural than that, once in power, they should try to bring into being the vision that was their whole purpose and aim? The problem was that the audacity of their dream was matched only by the depth of their economic ignorance. The accounting and control necessary for this have been simplified by capitalism to the utmost, till they have become the extraordinarily simple operations of watching, recording and issuing receipts, within the reach of anybody who can read and write and knows the first four rules of arithmetic. As for distribution, according to these eminent Bolshevik economists, all products will be delivered to communal warehouses, and the members of society will draw them out in accordance with their self-defined needs. Proletarian coercion, in all its forms, from executions to forced labor, is, paradoxical as it may sound, the method of molding communist humanity out of the human material of the capitalist period. At the end of his *Literature and Revolution*, written in , Leon Trotsky placed the famous, and justly ridiculed, last lines: Under Communism, he wrote,

"The average human type will rise to the heights of an Aristotle, a Goethe, or a Marx. And above this ridge new peaks will rise. Under Communism, Man will "reconstruct society and himself in accord with his own plan. I suggest that what we have here, in the sheer willfulness of Trotsky and the other Bolsheviks, in their urge to replace God, nature, and spontaneous social order with total, conscious planning by themselves, is something that transcends politics in any ordinary sense of the term. It may well be that to understand what is at issue we must ascend to another level, and that more useful in understanding it than the works of the classical liberal economists and political theorists is the superb novel of the great Christian apologist C. Lewis, *That Hideous Strength*. Now, the fundamental changes in human nature that the Communist leaders undertook to make require, in the nature of the case, absolute political power in a few directing hands. During the French Revolution, Robespierre and the other Jacobin leaders set out to transform human nature in accordance with the theories of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. This was not the only cause but it was surely one of the causes of the Reign of Terror. The Communists soon discovered what the Jacobins had learned: In his celebrated November speech, Gorbachev confined the Communist Reign of Terror to the Stalin years and stated: Many thousands of people inside and outside the party were subjected to wholesale repressive measures. Such, comrades, is the bitter truth. The various mandates under which the Cheka operated may be illustrated by an order signed by Lenin on February 21, The best estimate of the human cost of those episodes is around 6., persons. Gorbachev asserted that "the Stalin personality cult was certainly not inevitable. Scorning what Marx and Engels had derided as mere "bourgeois" freedom and "bourgeois" jurisprudence,[25] Lenin destroyed freedom of the press, abolished all protections against the police power, and rejected any hint of division of powers and checks and balances in government. They laid out, often in painstaking detail, the political arrangements that are required, the social forces that must be nurtured, in order to avert tyranny. But to Marx and his Bolshevik followers, this was nothing more than "bourgeois ideology," obsolete and of no relevance to the future socialist society. Any trace of decentralization or division of power, the slightest suggestion of a countervailing force to the central authority of the "associated producers," ran directly contrary to the vision of the unitary planning of the whole of social life. They died in hell, They called it Passchendaele. But what word to use, then, for what the Communists made of the Ukraine? Vladimir Grossman, a Russian novelist who experienced the famine of , wrote about it in his novel *Forever Flowing*, published in the West. An eyewitness to the famine in the Ukraine stated, Then I came to understand the main thing for the Soviet power is the Plan. Fathers and mothers tried to save their children, to save a little bread, and they were told: You hate our socialist country, you want to ruin the Plan, you are parasites, kulaks, fiends, reptiles. When they took the grain, they told the kolkhoz [collective farm] members they would be fed out of the reserve fund. They would not give grain to the hungry. Alexander Solzhenitsyn compared them to an archipelago spread across the great sea of the Soviet Union. The camps grew and grew. Who were sent there? Any with lingering Tsarist sentiments and recalcitrant members of the middle classes, liberals, Mensheviks, anarchists, priests and laity of the Orthodox Church, Baptists and other religious dissidents, "wreckers," suspects of every description, then, "kulaks" and peasants by the hundreds of thousands. During the Great Purge of the middle s, the Communist bureaucrats and intellectuals themselves were victims, and at that point there was a certain sort of thinker in the West who now began to notice the camps, and the executions, for the first time. There the death rate may have been as high as 50 per cent per year[32] and the number of deaths was probably on the order of 3., It goes on and on. During the Purges there were probably about 7., arrests, and one out of every ten arrested was executed. No one will ever know. What is certain is that the Soviet Union has been the worst reeking charnel house of the whole awful 20th century, worse even than the one the Nazis created but then they had less time. I am referring to the shameful chapter in 20th-century intellectual history involving the fellow travelers of Soviet Communism and their apologias for Stalinism. Americans, especially American college students, have been made familiar with the wrongs of McCarthyism in our own history. This is as it should be. The harassment and public humiliation of innocent private persons is iniquitous, and the U. Any report of famine in Russia is today an exaggeration or malignant propaganda. He wrote a glowing report on the camp and on its chief warden, Commandant Nikishov, for the *National Geographic*. Andrei Sakharov has called for the full disclosure of "the entire, terrible truth of Stalin and his era. Could the Communist leaders admit, for

instance, that during World War II, "the losses inflicted by the Soviet state upon its own people rivaled any the Germans could inflict on the battlefield"? That "the Nazi concentration camps were modified versions of Soviet originals," whose evolution the German leadership had followed with some care. That, in short, "the Soviet Union is not only the original killer state, but the model one"? But the fact that the victims of Soviet Communism can never be fully acknowledged in their homelands is all the more reason that, as a matter of historical justice, we in the West must endeavor to keep their memory alive. He is a specialist on the history of liberty, the liberal tradition in Europe, and the relationship between war and the rise of the state. You can study the history of civilization under his guidance here: This essay was originally published in , by the Cato Institute, Washington, D. It is collected in *Great Wars and Great Leaders* , chapter 4: Permission to reprint in whole or in part is hereby granted, provided full credit is given. Notes [1] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. Vintage, , p. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?* Hoover Institution Press, *A Critique of Political Economy*, vol. International Publishers, , p. Progress Publishers, , p. Krimerman and Lewis Perry, eds. Oxford University Press, vol. University of Michigan Press, , pp. Editions du Seuil, *Lenin, State and Revolution* New York: International Publishers, , pp. University of Michigan Press, McGraw-Hill, , p. As for the result, Kolakowski states:

4: Collectivization

Collectivization did not fail in the Soviet Union, but achieved its intended effect, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was relatively unconcerned with humanitarian side-effects in the countryside.

Like the United States, the Soviet Union is a nation founded on a distinct ideology. In the case of America, the ideology was fundamentally Lockean liberalism; its best expressions are the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights of the U. The Ninth Amendment, in particular, breathes the spirit of the worldview of late-century America. Translated into law, this framework defines the social space within which men voluntarily interact; it allows for the spontaneous coordination and ongoing mutual adjustment of the various plans that the members of society form to guide and fill their lives. The Soviet Union was founded on a very different ideology, Marxism, as understood and interpreted by V. Marxism, with its roots in Hegelian philosophy, was a quite conscious revolt against the individual rights doctrine of the previous century. The leaders of the Bolshevik party which changed its name to Communist in were virtually all revolutionary intellectuals, in accordance with the strategy set forth by Lenin in his work *What Is to Be Done?* The Bolshevik leaders viewed themselves as the executors of the Marxist program, as those whom History had called upon to realize the apocalyptic transition to Communist society foretold by the founders of their faith. The aim they inherited from Marx and Engels was nothing less than the final realization of human freedom and the end of the "prehistory" of the human race. Theirs was the Promethean dream of the rehabilitation of Man and his conquest of his rightful place as master of the world and lord of creation. Building on the work of Michael Polanyi and Ludwig von Mises, Paul Craig Roberts has demonstrated "in books that deserve to be much better known than they are, since they provide an important key to the history of the 20th century [4] " the meaning of freedom in Marxism. It lies in the abolition of alienation, i. For Marx and Engels, the market represents not merely the arena of capitalist exploitation but, more fundamentally, a systematic insult to the dignity of Man. As Marx wrote of the stage of Communist society before the total disappearance of scarcity, freedom in this field can consist only in socialized man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with Nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of Nature. With the seizure of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and with it the dominion of the product over the producers. Anarchy of social production is replaced by conscious organization according to plan. The whole sphere of the conditions of life which surround men, which ruled men up until now comes under the dominion and conscious control of men, who become for the first time the real, conscious lords of nature, because and in that they become master of their own social organization. The laws of their own social activity, which confronted them until this point as alien laws of nature, controlling them, then are applied by men with full understanding, and so mastered by them. Only from then on will men make their history themselves in full consciousness; only from then on will the social causes they set in motion have in the main and in constantly increasing proportion, also the results intended by them. It is the leap of mankind from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. Man would determine his own fate. Left unexplained was how millions upon millions of separate individuals could be expected to act with one mind and one will " could suddenly become "Man" " especially since it was alleged that the state, the indispensable engine of coercion, would wither away. It would lead, Bakunin warned, to the creation of "a new class," which would establish "the most aristocratic, despotic, arrogant, and contemptuous of all regimes" [7] and entrench its control over the producing classes of society. In the course of the vast, senseless carnage that was the First World War, the Tsarist Empire collapsed and the immense Imperial Russian Army was fragmented into atoms. A small group of Marxist intellectuals seized power. What could be more natural than that, once in power, they should try to bring into being the vision that was their whole purpose and aim? The problem was that the audacity of their dream was matched only by the depth of their economic ignorance. The accounting and control necessary for this have been simplified by capitalism to the utmost, till they have become the extraordinarily simple operations of watching, recording and issuing receipts, within the reach of anybody who can read and write and knows the first four rules of arithmetic. As

for distribution, according to these eminent Bolshevik economists, all products will be delivered to communal warehouses, and the members of society will draw them out in accordance with their self-defined needs. Proletarian coercion, in all its forms, from executions to forced labor, is, paradoxical as it may sound, the method of molding communist humanity out of the human material of the capitalist period. At the end of his *Literature and Revolution*, written in , Leon Trotsky placed the famous, and justly ridiculed, last lines: Under Communism, he wrote, "The average human type will rise to the heights of an Aristotle, a Goethe, or a Marx. And above this ridge new peaks will rise. Under Communism, Man will "reconstruct society and himself in accord with his own plan. I suggest that what we have here, in the sheer willfulness of Trotsky and the other Bolsheviks, in their urge to replace God, nature, and spontaneous social order with total, conscious planning by themselves, is something that transcends politics in any ordinary sense of the term. It may well be that to understand what is at issue we must ascend to another level, and that more useful in understanding it than the works of the classical liberal economists and political theorists is the superb novel of the great Christian apologist C. Lewis, *That Hideous Strength*. Now, the fundamental changes in human nature that the Communist leaders undertook to make require, in the nature of the case, absolute political power in a few directing hands. During the French Revolution, Robespierre and the other Jacobin leaders set out to transform human nature in accordance with the theories of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. This was not the only cause but it was surely one of the causes of the Reign of Terror. The Communists soon discovered what the Jacobins had learned: In his celebrated November speech, Gorbachev confined the Communist Reign of Terror to the Stalin years and stated: Many thousands of people inside and outside the party were subjected to wholesale repressive measures. Such, comrades, is the bitter truth. The various mandates under which the Cheka operated may be illustrated by an order signed by Lenin on February 21, In the Leninist period " that is, up to " fall also the war against the peasantry that was part of "war communism" and the famine conditions, culminating in the famine of , that resulted from the attempt to realize the Marxist dream. The best estimate of the human cost of those episodes is around 6,, persons. Gorbachev asserted that "the Stalin personality cult was certainly not inevitable. Scorning what Marx and Engels had derided as mere "bourgeois" freedom and "bourgeois" jurisprudence, 25 Lenin destroyed freedom of the press, abolished all protections against the police power, and rejected any hint of division of powers and checks and balances in government. It would have saved the peoples of Russia an immense amount of suffering if Lenin " and Marx and Engels before him " had not quite so brusquely dismissed the work of men like Montesquieu and Jefferson, Benjamin Constant and Alexis de Tocqueville. They laid out, often in painstaking detail, the political arrangements that are required, the social forces that must be nurtured, in order to avert tyranny. But to Marx and his Bolshevik followers, this was nothing more than "bourgeois ideology," obsolete and of no relevance to the future socialist society. Any trace of decentralization or division of power, the slightest suggestion of a countervailing force to the central authority of the "associated producers," ran directly contrary to the vision of the unitary planning of the whole of social life. We shall never know the full truth of this demonic crime, but it seems likely that perhaps ten or 12,, persons lost their lives as a result of these Communist policies " as many or more than the total of all the dead in all the armies in the First World War. Who could have conceived that within a few years what the Communists were to do in the Ukraine would rival the appalling butcheries of World War I " Verdun, the Somme, Passchendaele? They died in hell, They called it Passchendaele. But what word to use, then, for what the Communists made of the Ukraine? Vladimir Grossman, a Russian novelist who experienced the famine of , wrote about it in his novel *Forever Flowing*, published in the West. An eyewitness to the famine in the Ukraine stated, Then I came to understand the main thing for the Soviet power is the Plan. You hate our socialist country, you want to ruin the Plan, you are parasites, kulaks, fiends, reptiles. When they took the grain, they told the kolkhoz [collective farm] members they would be fed out of the reserve fund. They would not give grain to the hungry. Alexander Solzhenitsyn compared them to an archipelago spread across the great sea of the Soviet Union. The camps grew and grew. Who were sent there? Any with lingering Tsarist sentiments and recalcitrant members of the middle classes, liberals, Mensheviks, anarchists, priests and laity of the Orthodox Church, Baptists and other religious dissidents, "wreckers," suspects of every description, then, "kulaks" and peasants by the hundreds of thousands. During the Great

Purge of the middle s, the Communist bureaucrats and intellectuals themselves were victims, and at that point there was a certain sort of thinker in the West who now began to notice the camps, and the executions, for the first time. There the death rate may have been as high as 50 per cent per year 32 and the number of deaths was probably on the order of 3,, It goes on and on. In there was Katyn and the murder of the Polish officers; in , the leaders of Yiddish culture in the Soviet Union were liquidated en masse 33 " both drops in the bucket for Stalin. During the Purges there were probably about 7,, arrests, and one out of every ten arrested was executed. No one will ever know. What is certain is that the Soviet Union has been the worst reeking charnel house of the whole awful 20th century, worse even than the one the Nazis created but then they had less time. I am referring to the shameful chapter in 20th-century intellectual history involving the fellow travelers of Soviet Communism and their apologias for Stalinism. Americans, especially American college students, have been made familiar with the wrongs of McCarthyism in our own history. This is as it should be. The harassment and public humiliation of innocent private persons is iniquitous, and the U. But surely we should also remember and inform young Americans of the accomplices in a far different order of wrongs " those progressive intellectuals who "worshiped at the temple of [Soviet] planning" 37 and lied and evaded the truth to protect the homeland of socialism, while millions were martyred. Any report of famine in Russia is today an exaggeration or malignant propaganda. The food shortage which has affected almost the whole population in the last year and particularly in the grain-producing provinces " the Ukraine, North Caucasus, the lower Volga region " has, however, caused heavy loss of life. He wrote a glowing report on the camp and on its chief warden, Commandant Nikishov, for the National Geographic. Andrei Sakharov has called for the full disclosure of "the entire, terrible truth of Stalin and his era. What would it mean to reveal the entire truth? Could the Communist leaders admit, for instance, that during World War II, "the losses inflicted by the Soviet state upon its own people rivaled any the Germans could inflict on the battlefield"? That "the Nazi concentration camps were modified versions of Soviet originals," whose evolution the German leadership had followed with some care. That, in short, "the Soviet Union is not only the original killer state, but the model one"? But the fact that the victims of Soviet Communism can never be fully acknowledged in their homelands is all the more reason that, as a matter of historical justice, we in the West must endeavor to keep their memory alive. This essay was originally published in , by the Cato Institute, Washington, D. It is collected in *Great Wars and Great Leaders* , chapter 4: Permission to reprint in whole or in part is hereby granted, provided full credit is given. Notes [1] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. Vintage, , p. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?* Hoover Institution Press, *A Critique of Political Economy*, vol. International Publishers, , p. Progress Publishers, , p. Krimerman and Lewis Perry, eds. Oxford University Press, vol.

5: Collectivization and Stalinist Perpetrators – Sean's Russia Blog

Compulsory ujamaa villages in Tanzania, collectivization in Russia, Le Corbusier's urban planning theory realized in Brasilia, the Great Leap Forward in China, agricultural "modernization" in the Tropics--the twentieth century has been racked by grand utopian schemes that have inadvertently brought death and disruption to millions.

Within an historically short period of twelve to fifteen years, an economically backward agrarian country achieved rapid economic growth, created a more modern industrial sector, and acquired new technologies that changed it from an agrarian to an industrial economy. At the turn of the century Imperial Russia was lagging behind its neighbors to the west in practically all aspects of economic development. Weakened by World War I and the civil war that followed, Russia was in ruins in 1917. The Communist Party that seized power after the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 initially proclaimed a world revolution as its goal. The first socialist revolution occurred in Russia, the weakest link among the world capitalist states. However, later failures to propagate communist rule in Germany, Hungary, and Poland demonstrated that the export of revolution required not an ideological dogma, but a powerful economy and military might. Both required powerful industry. Soviet industrialization was organized according to five-year plans. The first five-year plan was launched by the Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin in 1928. It was designed to industrialize the USSR in the shortest possible time. The plan, put into action ruthlessly, aimed to make the USSR self-sufficient and emphasized heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods. The first plan covered the period from 1928 to 1932 but was officially considered completed in 1932, although its achievements were greatly exaggerated. One objective of the plan was achieved, however: The communist regime thought that the resources for industrialization could only be squeezed out of agriculture. Moreover, they believed that collectivization would improve agricultural productivity and produce sufficient grain reserves to feed the growing urban labor force caused by the influx of peasants seeking industrial work. Forced collectivization also enabled the party to extend its political dominance over the peasantry, eliminating the possibility of resurrection of market relations in agriculture. The traditional Russian village was destroyed and replaced by collective farms kolkhoz and state farms sovkhoz, which proved to be highly inefficient. Although the first five-year plan called for the collectivization of only 20 percent of peasant households, by 1932 97 percent of all peasant households had been collectivized, and private ownership of property was virtually eliminated in trade. Forced collectivization helped Stalin achieve his goal of rapid industrialization, but the human costs were huge. Stalin focused particular hostility on the wealthier peasants or kulaks. Beginning in 1929 about one million kulak households some five million people were deported and never heard from again. Forced collectivization of most of the remaining peasants resulted in a disastrous disruption of agricultural production and a catastrophic famine in 1932 and in Ukraine, one of the richest agricultural regions in the world, which exacted a toll of millions of lives. The rationale for collectivization in the Soviet Union, with all of its negative consequences, was its historic necessity in communist terms: Russia had to engage in rapid industrialization in order to create a massive heavy industry and subsequently powerful modern armed forces. The second five-year plan continued and expanded the first, albeit with more moderate industrial goals. The third plan was interrupted by World War II. The institution of the five-year plan was reinforced in 1946, and five-year plans continued to be published until the end of the Soviet Union. From the very beginning of industrialization, the Communist Party placed the main emphasis on the development of heavy industry, or, as it was called in the Soviet literature, "production of means of production. Similarly, production plants for aluminum and nonferrous metals were constructed at a rapid pace. Electric energy supply was ensured through the construction of dozens of hydroelectric and fuel-operated power stations; one of them, a Dnieper plant, was canonized as a symbol of Soviet industrialization. Railroads and waterways were modernized and built to ensure uninterrupted flow of resources. Automobile and aviation industries were built from scratch. Whole plants were purchased in the West, mostly from the United States, and put in operation in the Soviet Union. Many American engineers were lured by promises of high wages to work at those plants and contributed to a rapid technology transfer to Russia. New weapon systems were developed and put into production at the expense of consumer goods. Similar ratios applied for artillery, aircraft, navy vessels, and small arms.

Substantial resources were materialized and frozen in the stockpiles of weapons. During the first period of war a substantial portion of the European territory was lost to Germany. During the second half of and the beginning of , industrial facilities were relocated to the east beyond the Volga river and the Urals from European Russia, Central and Eastern Ukraine including major industrial centers of Kharkov, Dniepropetrovsk, Krivoy Rog, Mariupol and Nikopol, Donbass , and the industrial areas of Moscow and Leningrad; this relocation ranks among the most difficult organizational and human achievements of the Soviet Union during World War II. The industrial foundation laid between and proved sufficient for victory over Fascist Germany in World War II. Russian and Soviet Economic Performance and Structure. Gregory Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography.

In the s, much Soviet propaganda for the outside world was aimed at capitalist countries as plutocracies, and claiming that they intended to destroy the Soviet Union as the workers' paradise. Capitalism, being responsible for the ills of the world, therefore was fundamentally immoral.

The effect of this restructuring was to reintroduce a kind of serfdom into the countryside. Although the program was designed to affect all peasants, Stalin in particular sought to eliminate the wealthiest peasants, known as kulaks. Generally, kulaks were only marginally better off than other peasants, but the party claimed that the kulaks had ensnared the rest of the peasantry in capitalistic relationships. Colin Harris In November , Joseph Stalin launched his "revolution from above" by setting two extraordinary goals for Soviet domestic policy: His aims were to erase all traces of the capitalism that had entered under the New Economic Policy and to transform the Soviet Union as quickly as possible, without regard to cost, into an industrialized and completely socialist state. It set goals that were unrealistic-- a percent increase in overall industrial development and a percent expansion in heavy industry alone. All industry and services were nationalized, managers were given predetermined output quotas by central planners, and trade unions were converted into mechanisms for increasing worker productivity. Many new industrial centers were developed, particularly in the Ural Mountains, and thousands of new plants were built throughout the country. But because Stalin insisted on unrealistic production targets, serious problems soon arose. With the greatest share of investment put into heavy industry, widespread shortages of consumer goods occurred. The First Five-Year Plan also called for transforming Soviet agriculture from predominantly individual farms into a system of large state collective farms. The Communist regime believed that collectivization would improve agricultural productivity and would produce grain reserves sufficiently large to feed the growing urban labor force. The anticipated surplus was to pay for industrialization. Collectivization was further expected to free many peasants for industrial work in the cities and to enable the party to extend its political dominance over the remaining peasantry. Stalin focused particular hostility on the wealthier peasants, or kulaks. About one million kulak households some five million people were deported and never heard from again. Forced collectivization of the remaining peasants, which was often fiercely resisted, resulted in a disastrous disruption of agricultural productivity and a catastrophic famine in . Although the First Five-Year Plan called for the collectivization of only twenty percent of peasant households, by approximately ninety-seven percent of all peasant households had been collectivized and private ownership of property almost entirely eliminated. Library of Congress Added by: Colin Harris Joseph Stalin was furious that the peasants were putting their own welfare before that of the Soviet Union. Local communist officials were given instructions to confiscate kulaks property. This land would then be used to form new collective farms. The kulaks themselves were not allowed to undermine the success of the scheme. Thousands were executed and an estimated five million were deported to Siberia or Central Asia. Of these, approximately twenty-five per cent perished by the time they reached their destination.

7: Propaganda in the Soviet Union - Wikipedia

The Soviet Union was founded on a very different ideology, Marxism, as understood and interpreted by V. I. Lenin. Marxism, with its roots in Hegelian philosophy, was a quite conscious revolt against the individual rights doctrine of the previous century.

Background[edit] After the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, peasants gained control of about half of the land they had previously cultivated, and began to ask for the redistribution of all land. The Russian Provisional Government accomplished little during the difficult World War I months, though Russian leaders continued to promise redistribution. Peasants began to turn against the Provisional Government and organized themselves into land committees, which together with the traditional peasant communes became a powerful force of opposition. When Vladimir Lenin returned to Russia on April 16, 1917, he promised the people "Peace, Land and Bread," the latter two appearing as a promise to the peasants for the redistribution of confiscated land and a fair share of food for every worker respectively. During the period of war communism, however, the policy of Prodravvyorstka meant that the peasantry was obligated to surrender the surpluses of almost any kind of agricultural produce for a fixed price. The pre-existing communes, which periodically redistributed land, did little to encourage improvement in technique, and formed a source of power beyond the control of the Soviet government. Although the income gap between wealthy and poor farmers did grow under the NEP, it remained quite small, but the Bolsheviks began to take aim at the wealthy kulaks. Published Projector May The small shares of most of the peasants resulted in food shortages in the cities. Although grain had nearly returned to pre-war production levels, the large estates which had produced it for urban markets had been divided up. As a result, city dwellers only saw half the grain that had been available before the war. Lenin claimed "Small-scale production gives birth to capitalism and the bourgeoisie constantly, daily, hourly, with elemental force, and in vast proportions. Crisis of [edit] Main article: Soviet grain procurement crisis of 1927 This demand for more grain resulted in the reintroduction of requisitioning which was resisted in rural areas. In 1928 there was a 2-million-ton shortfall in grains purchased by the Soviet Union from neighbouring markets. Stalin claimed the grain had been produced but was being hoarded by "kulaks. The seizures of grain discouraged the peasants and less grain was produced during 1929, and again the government resorted to requisitions, much of the grain being requisitioned from middle peasants as sufficient quantities were not in the hands of the " kulaks. Also, massive hoarding and illegal transfers of grain took place. Also, various cooperatives for processing of agricultural products were installed. In November 1929, the Central Committee decided to implement accelerated collectivization in the form of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This marked the end of the New Economic Policy NEP, which had allowed peasants to sell their surpluses on the open market. Stalin had many so-called " kulaks " transported to collective farms in distant places to work in agricultural labor camps. In response to this, many peasants began to resist, often arming themselves against the activists sent from the towns. As a form of protest, many peasants preferred to slaughter their animals for food rather than give them over to collective farms, which produced a major reduction in livestock. Collectivization had been encouraged since the revolution, but in 1929, only about one percent of farm land was collectivized, and despite efforts to encourage and coerce collectivization, the rather optimistic first five-year plan only forecast 15 percent of farms to be run collectively. Between September and December 1929, collectivization increased from 7. To assist collectivization, the Party decided to send 25, "socially conscious" industry workers to the countryside. Shock brigades were used to force reluctant peasants into joining the collective farms and remove those who were declared kulaks and their "agents". Collectivization sought to modernize Soviet agriculture, consolidating the land into parcels that could be farmed by modern equipment using the latest scientific methods of agriculture. It was often claimed that an American Fordson tractor called "Fordson" in Russian was the best propaganda in favor of collectivization. The means of production land, equipment, livestock were to be totally "socialized", i. Not even private household garden plots were allowed. Agricultural work was envisioned on a mass scale. Huge glamorous columns of machines were to work the fields, in total contrast to peasant small-scale work. The peasants traditionally mostly held their land in the form of large numbers of

strips scattered throughout the fields of the village community. By an order of 7 January, "all boundary lines separating the land allotments of the members of the artel are to be eliminated and all fields are to be combined in a single land mass. Kolkhozy of tens, or even hundreds, of thousands of hectares were envisioned in schemes which were later to become known as gigantomania. In the prevailing socio-economic conditions, little could become of such utopian schemes. The giant kolkhozy were always exceptional, existing mainly on paper, and in any case they were mostly soon to disappear. The peasants chose to remain in their traditional, primitive, villages. It is a fact that by February 20 of this year 50 percent of the peasant farms throughout the U. That means that by February 20, , we had overfulfilled the five-year plan of collectivization by more than per cent After the publication of the article, the pressure for collectivization temporarily abated and peasants started leaving collective farms. Peasant resistance[edit] Theoretically, landless peasants were to be the biggest beneficiaries from collectivization, because it promised them an opportunity to take an equal share in labor and its rewards[clarification needed]. In fact, however, rural areas did not have many landless peasants, given the wholesale redistribution of land following the Revolution. Alternatively, for those with property, collectivization meant forfeiting land up to the collective farms and selling most of the harvest to the state at minimal prices set by the state itself. This, in turn, engendered opposition to the idea. Furthermore, collectivization involved significant changes in the traditional village life of Russian peasants within a very short time frame, despite the long Russian rural tradition of collectivism in the village obshchina or mir. The changes were even more dramatic in other places, such as in Ukraine, with its tradition of individual farming, in the Soviet republics of Central Asia , and in the trans-Volga steppes , where for a family to have a herd of livestock was not only a matter of sustenance, but of pride as well. YCLers seizing grain from " kulaks " which was hidden in the graveyard, Ukraine Peasants viewed collectivization as the end of the world. The drive to collectivize came without peasant support. Collectivization would increase the total crop and food supply but the locals knew that they were not likely to benefit from it. When their strategies failed, villagers turned to violence: According to Party sources, there were also some cases of destruction of property, and attacks on officials and members of the collectives. In his words, "[w]hole tracts were left unsown, Collectivization as a "second serfdom"[edit] Rumours circulated in the villages warning the rural residents that collectivization would bring disorder, hunger, famine, and the destruction of crops and livestock. Farmers did not have the right to leave the collective without permission. The level of state procurements and prices on crops also enforced the serfdom analogy. The government would take a majority of the crops and pay extremely low prices. The serfs during the s were paid nothing but collectivization still reminded the peasants of serfdom. To the peasants, the revolution was about giving more freedom and land to the peasants, but instead they had to give up their land and livestock to the collective farm which to some extent promoted communist policies. For example, when it was announced that a collective farm in Crimea would become a commune and that the children would be socialized, women killed their soon-to-be socialized livestock, which spared the children. Stories that the Communists believed short hair gave women a more urban and industrial look insulted peasant women. The common blanket meant that all men and women would sleep on a seven-hundred meter long bed under a seven-hundred-meter long blanket. They "physically blocked the entrances to huts of peasants scheduled to be exiled as kulaks , forcibly took back socialized seed and livestock, and led assaults on officials. When women came to trial, they were given less harsh punishments as the men because women, to officials, were seen as illiterate and the most backward part of the peasantry. One particular case of this was a riot in a Russian village of Belovka where protestors were beating members of the local soviet and setting fire to their homes. The men were held exclusively responsible as the main culprits. Women were given sentences to serve as a warning, not as a punishment. Because of how they were perceived, women were able to play an essential role in the resistance to collectivization. Riots exploded after the closing of churches as early as Rumors about religious persecution spread mostly by word of mouth, but also through leaflets and proclamations. Peasants feared that if they joined the collective farm they would be marked with the stamp of the Antichrist. Choosing between salvation and damnation, peasants had no choice but to resist policies of the state. The attacks on religion and the Church affected women the most because they were upholders of religion within the villages.

8: Industrialization, Soviet | www.enganchecubano.com

Stalin - Collectivization. In November , Joseph Stalin launched his "revolution from above" by setting two extraordinary goals for Soviet domestic policy: rapid industrialization and.

In cold fact, the new Russian government was not quite as new as many of its admirers and enemies believed. Tyranny—the oppressive government of brute force—was as old as civilization itself. Because private ownership of goods would corrupt their owners by encouraging selfishness, Plato argued, the guardians must live as a large family that shares common ownership not only of material goods but also of spouses and children. Other early visions of communism drew their inspiration from religion. The first Christians practiced a simple kind of communism—as described in Acts 4: Similar motives later inspired the formation of monastic orders in which monks took vows of poverty and promised to share their few worldly goods with each other and with the poor. The English humanist Sir Thomas More extended this monastic communism in Utopia , which describes an imaginary society in which money is abolished and people share meals, houses, and other goods in common. Other fictional communistic utopias followed, notably City of the Sun , by the Italian philosopher Tommaso Campanella , as did attempts to put communist ideas into practice. The vision was not shared by the Protectorate led by Oliver Cromwell , which harshly suppressed the Diggers in . It was neither a religious upheaval nor a civil war but a technological and economic revolution —the Industrial Revolution of the late 18th and early 19th centuries—that provided the impetus and inspiration for modern communism. This revolution, which achieved great gains in economic productivity at the expense of an increasingly miserable working class, encouraged Marx to think that the class struggles that dominated history were leading inevitably to a society in which prosperity would be shared by all through common ownership of the means of production. Marxian communism Karl Marx was born in the German Rhineland to middle-class parents of Jewish descent who had abandoned their religion in an attempt to assimilate into an anti-Semitic society. The young Marx studied philosophy at the University of Berlin and received a doctorate from the University of Jena in , but he was unable, because of his Jewish ancestry and his liberal political views, to secure a teaching position. He then turned to journalism, where his investigations disclosed what he perceived as systematic injustice and corruption at all levels of German society. Convinced that German and, more broadly, European society could not be reformed from within but instead had to be remade from the ground up, Marx became a political radical. His views soon brought him to the attention of the police, and, fearing arrest and imprisonment, he left for Paris. There he renewed an acquaintance with his countryman Friedrich Engels , who became his friend and coauthor in a collaboration that was to last nearly 40 years. Like Marx, Engels was deeply disturbed by what he regarded as the injustices of a society divided by class. Appalled by the poverty and squalor in which ordinary workers lived and worked, he described their misery in grisly detail in *The Condition of the English Working Class* . Marx and Engels maintained that the poverty, disease, and early death that afflicted the proletariat the industrial working class were endemic to capitalism: Under this alternative system, the major means of industrial production—such as mines, mills, factories, and railroads—would be publicly owned and operated for the benefit of all. Marx and Engels presented this critique of capitalism and a brief sketch of a possible future communist society in *Manifesto of the Communist Party* , which they wrote at the commission of a small group of radicals called the Communist League. Marx, meanwhile, had begun to lay the theoretical and he believed scientific foundations of communism, first in *The German Ideology* written —46, published and later in *Das Kapital ; Capital* . His theory has three main aspects: Marx derived his views in part from the philosophy of G. According to Marx, material production requires two things: In primitive societies the material forces were few and simple—for example, grains and the stone tools used to grind them into flour. For example, iron miners once worked with pickaxes and shovels, which they owned, but the invention of the steam shovel changed the way they extracted iron ore. Since no miner could afford to buy a steam shovel, he had to work for someone who could. Marx held that human history had progressed through a series of stages, from ancient slave society through feudalism to capitalism. In each stage a dominant class uses its control of the means of production to exploit the labour of a

larger class of workers. Thus, the bourgeoisie overthrew the aristocracy and replaced feudalism with capitalism; so too, Marx predicted, will the proletariat overthrow the bourgeoisie and replace capitalism with communism. The problem, Marx believed, was that this wealth—and the political power and economic opportunities that went with it—was unfairly distributed. The capitalists reap the profits while paying the workers a pittance for long hours of hard labour. Under capitalism, Marx claimed, workers are not paid fully or fairly for their labour because the capitalists siphon off surplus value, which they call profit. Thus, the bourgeois owners of the means of production amass enormous wealth, while the proletariat falls further into poverty. This wealth also enables the bourgeoisie to control the government or state, which does the bidding of the wealthy and the powerful to the detriment of the poor and the powerless. The exploitation of one class by another remains hidden, however, by a set of ideas that Marx called ideology. In slave societies, for example, slavery was depicted as normal, natural, and just. In capitalist societies the free market is portrayed as operating efficiently, fairly, and for the benefit of all, while alternative economic arrangements such as socialism are derided or dismissed as false or fanciful. These ideas serve to justify or legitimize the unequal distribution of economic and political power. Revolution and communism Marx believed that capitalism is a volatile economic system that will suffer a series of ever-worsening crises—recessions and depressions—that will produce greater unemployment, lower wages, and increasing misery among the industrial proletariat. These crises will convince the proletariat that its interests as a class are implacably opposed to those of the ruling bourgeoisie. Once this threat disappears, however, the need for the state will also disappear. Thus, the interim state will wither away and be replaced by a classless communist society see classless society. Some features that he did describe, such as free education for all and a graduated income tax, are now commonplace. Among them was his friend and coauthor, Friedrich Engels. This emendation of Marxist theory provided the basis for the subsequent development of dialectical materialism in the Soviet Union. Friedrich Engels, detail of a portrait by H. The foremost revisionist was Eduard Bernstein, a leader of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, who fled his homeland in to avoid arrest and imprisonment under the antisocialist laws of Chancellor Otto von Bismarck. Bernstein spent most of his exile in Britain, where he befriended Engels and later served as executor of his will. Bernstein revised Marxian theory in four interrelated respects. This trend he traced not to the kindness of capitalists but to the growing power of unions and working-class political parties. Orthodox Marxists branded Bernstein a bourgeois and a counterrevolutionary traitor to the cause. Chief among his communist critics was Lenin, who had devoted his life to the revolutionary transformation of Russia. Its economy was primarily agricultural; its factories were few and inefficient; and its industrial proletariat was small. Most Russians were peasants who farmed land owned by wealthy nobles. Russia, in short, was nearer feudalism than capitalism. Lenin was the chief architect of this plan. The first, set out in *What Is to Be Done?* Secretive, tightly organized, and highly disciplined, the communist party would educate, guide, and direct the masses. This was necessary, Lenin claimed, because the masses, suffering from false consciousness and unable to discern their true interests, could not be trusted to govern themselves. Democracy was to be practiced only within the party, and even then it was to be constrained by the policy of democratic centralism. In short, the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat had to be a dictatorship of the communist party in the name of the proletariat. This, he argued, was because the most direct and brutal exploitation of workers had shifted to the colonies of imperialist nations such as Britain. Its immediate impetus was World War I, which was taking a heavy toll on Russian soldiers at the front and on peasants at home. Riots broke out in several Russian cities. When Tsar Nicholas II ordered soldiers to put them down, they refused. Nicholas abdicated, and his government was replaced by one led by Aleksandr Kerensky. Lenin returned to Russia from exile in Switzerland barely in time to lead the Bolsheviks in seizing state power in October November, New Style The Soviet government moved quickly to withdraw from the war in Europe and to nationalize private industry and agriculture. In the name of the people and under the banner of War Communism, it seized mines, mills, factories, and the estates of wealthy landowners, which it redistributed to peasants. The Russian Civil War ended in with the victory of the Reds, but the war in Europe and the war at home left the Soviet Union in shambles, its economic productivity meagre and its people hungry and discontented. Desperate for room to maneuver, Lenin in announced the New Economic Policy

NEP , whereby the state retained control of large industries but encouraged individual initiative , private enterprise , and the profit motive among farmers and owners of small businesses. The warning proved prophetic. In the late s, Stalin began to consolidate his power by intimidating and discrediting his rivals. In the mids, claiming to see spies and saboteurs everywhere, he purged the party and the general populace, exiling dissidents to Siberia or summarily executing them after staged show trials. Bukharin was convicted on trumped-up charges and was executed in . As a variant of Marxism-Leninism, Stalinism had three key features. The first was its reliance on dialectical materialism as a way of justifying almost any course of action that Stalin wished to pursue. For example, in a report to the 16th Congress of the Communist Party in June , Stalin justified the rapid growth of centralized state power as follows: We stand for the withering away of the state. At the same time we stand for the strengthening of the strongest state power that has ever existed. Yes, it is contradictory. But Stalin omitted mentioning that Marx believed that contradictions were to be exposed and overcome, not accepted and embraced. A second feature of Stalinism was its cult of personality. Whereas Lenin had claimed that the workers suffered from false consciousness and therefore needed a vanguard party to guide them, Stalin maintained that the Communist Party itself suffered from false consciousness and from spies and traitors within its ranks and therefore needed an all-wise leader—Stalin himself—to guide it. This effectively ended intraparty democracy and democratic centralism. The resulting cult of personality portrayed Stalin as a universal genius in every subject, from linguistics to genetics. To this end, Stalin rescinded the NEP, began the collectivization of Soviet agriculture, and embarked on a national program of rapid, forced industrialization. Specifically, he insisted that the Soviet Union had to be quickly, and, if need be, brutally, transformed from a primarily agricultural nation to an advanced industrial power. During the collectivization, millions of kulaks , or prosperous peasants, were deprived of their farms and forced to labour on large collective farms; if they resisted or were even thought likely to do so , they were shot or sent to forced labour camps in Siberia to starve or freeze to death. In the food shortages that resulted, several million people the precise number remains unknown starved, and many more suffered from malnutrition and disease. In foreign policy , socialism in one country meant putting the interests of the Soviet Union ahead of the interests of the international communist movement. He also subordinated the interests and aspirations of communist parties there and elsewhere to the interests of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union CPSU. A few dissident leaders, notably Josip Broz Tito in Yugoslavia, were rather reluctant allies; but most were pliant, perhaps out of fear of Soviet military might. Khrushchev himself was deposed in , after which a succession of Soviet leaders stifled reform and attempted to impose a modified version of Stalinism. Yet the ghost of Stalin was not exorcized completely until the collapse of the Soviet Union and the effective demise of the CPSU in . Mao envisioned the proletarian countries encircling the capitalist countries and waging wars of national liberation to cut off foreign sources of cheap labour and raw materials, thereby depriving the capitalist countries of the ever-expanding revenues that are the lifeblood of their economies.

9: Seeing Like a State - The Mason Historiographiki

The Soviet Union lasted from to the fall of the Berlin Wall in During this time it enforced policies of collectivized agriculture that caused famine, resulting in the death of millions.

Agriculture Policy - Gorbachev Stalin - Collectivization In November , Joseph Stalin launched his "revolution from above" by setting two extraordinary goals for Soviet domestic policy: His aims were to erase all traces of the capitalism that had entered under the New Economic Policy and to transform the Soviet Union as quickly as possible, without regard to cost, into an industrialized and completely socialist state. The very essence of the kolkhoz collective farm system lay in the ease with which it facilitated extraction of heavy tribute from the land in the form of extremely cheap supplies of foodstuffs and industrial crops. The ever-tightening hold of the regime over the industrial working class made possible implementation of these policies without the development of consumer goods facilities; and therefore the regime could permit a drop in the levels of consumption without jeopardizing its plan. The new agricultural program - designed primarily to redistribute agricultural produce rather than to increase it - was consistent with this aspect of the plan. Moreover, the political hold collectivization afforded over the peasants assured State control of the rural labor supply and enabled the State to channel manpower into non-agricultural occupation as it deemed necessary. This was the general rationale behind collectivization. The immediate cause for the first collectivization drive lay, however, in the mounting economic tensions of the late s. As early as the regime had sought to reimpose many of the agrarian controls lifted in , at the time of the inauguration of NEP. To implement this policy, agricultural prices were once again restricted and production itself subjected to heavy taxes. Retaliating in kind, the peasants drove production downward, hoarded again, and consumed what they could not hide or sell. As a consequence State grain collections in dropped more than one-third below the level of two years before. Tension in the countryside mounted. The means by which the new monolithic party chose to meet this situation was of a magnitude equal to the challenge. It set goals that were unrealistic -- a percent increase in overall industrial development and a percent expansion in heavy industry alone. All industry and services were nationalized, managers were given predetermined output quotas by central planners, and trade unions were converted into mechanisms for increasing worker productivity. Many new industrial centers were developed, particularly in the Ural Mountains, and thousands of new plants were built throughout the country. But because Stalin insisted on unrealistic production targets, serious problems soon arose. With the greatest share of investment put into heavy industry, widespread shortages of consumer goods occurred. The First Five-Year Plan also called for transforming Soviet agriculture from predominantly individual farms into a system of large state collective farms. The Communist regime believed that collectivization would improve agricultural productivity and would produce grain reserves sufficiently large to feed the growing urban labor force. The anticipated surplus was to pay for industrialization. Collectivization was further expected to free many peasants for industrial work in the cities and to enable the party to extend its political dominance over the remaining peasantry. The great offensive against the peasantry was launched late in , but it was not until one year later, when Stalin called for "liquidation of the kulaks as a class," that its full weight was felt. Stalin focused particular hostility on the wealthier peasants, or kulaks. Since the actual number of kulaks in post-Revolutionary Russia was not very great, this slogan made it abundantly clear that the frankly military offensive was directed against the peasantry as a whole. About one million kulak households some five million people were deported and never heard from again. Between and the Soviet Communist Party struck a double blow at the Russian peasantry: The story is well known: Forced collectivization of the remaining peasants, which was often fiercely resisted, resulted in a disastrous disruption of agricultural productivity. This was followed in by a "terror-famine," inflicted by the State on the collectivized peasants of the Ukraine and certain other areas by setting impossibly high grain quotas, removing every other source of food, and preventing help from outside--even from other areas of the Soviet Union--from reaching the starving populace. Although the First Five-Year Plan called for the collectivization of only twenty percent of peasant households, by approximately ninety-seven percent of all peasant households had been collectivized and private ownership

of property almost entirely eliminated. Robert Conquest concluded that as many as But whatever the failure of collectivization to achieve productive efficiency, and other ostensible goals widely advertised in the propaganda of the time, the Soviet State remained completely loyal to the system, bolstering it by police action and developing its distinctive features over the years. Evidently, the regime considered that for its investment, it was receiving an adequate return. The explanation for this unswerving loyalty to the system, in the face of the massive difficulties encountered, is to be found in the striking change in the pattern of grain collection after collectivization. In the State collected no more than In evaluating the success of the drive and the system it created, it is necessary to reiterate that the primary utility of the collective farm lay in its efficiency as an economic and political control device, by which rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union could be facilitated, and not in its efficiency of production. To the extent that it made industrialization possible, it is possible to show that Soviet collectivization "succeeded. It has been estimated that Soviet grain production in did not exceed that of by much more than the increase of sown area over the 11 intervening years. Similarly, the gross production value of Soviet agriculture in exceeded by only a small fraction, though in the bumper year of the harvest may have been as much as 14 per cent higher. Throughout the s the Soviets put forth many claims of increased agricultural productivity which were, however, discounted by most Western experts. Western scepticism was vindicated by the acknowledgement of agricultural deterioration by N. Khrushchev, one of the chief architects of later Soviet agricultural policy.

Best Practices in Infection Control Daddys Not-So-Little Girl (Full House Stephanie) Northrop story, 1929-1939 Life among the Yanomami Building a Doghouse (Storey Country Wisdom Bulletin, a-269) Ion chromatography applications Dim Sum at the On-On Tea Room Poststructural-ism and the New Testament Away with waste! : reduce, reuse, recycle Treatise on the law of mortgages of real property The ancient Near East : peoples and empires Problem and solutions Last word and the word after that The great contraction, 1929-1933 Rick Steves Florence and Tuscany 2004 Pse sign language book The architecture of New York City A defence of the true and catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ Self confidence building books The tabulative campaign. Crisis and development in Germanic society, 700-800 Civil War front pages Infant potty training Aurora 3d text logo maker tutorial Student and chief Sketching basics one point perspective Parasites! Lice (Parasites!) Child welfare problems Evaluation and management of the brain-damaged patient Energy secrets with tesla patents A history of mathematics an introduction victor katz A Rape of the Soul So Profound New Shell Guide to Devon, Cornwall, and Scilly (New Shell Guides) Oxford companion to twentieth-century art Pain in children youth Novel techniques sensory profiling Beer for beginners. Cannot print word ument to 15 Grand Tiger Hunt with Maharaj-Kumar of Vizianagram, Statistical description of associative memory I. Samengo