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How Far Have The Bolsheviks Followed Karl Marx's Theories?

General Introduction.

Causes of the Bolshevik Movement.

"Comrades, the workers' and peasants' revolution, the need of which the Bolsheviks have emphasized many times, has come to pass." Thus spake Lenin on November 7, 1917.

The revolution was an accomplished fact. It had swept across the lives of a hundred and forty million souls in Russia; it had pulled the great tree of autocracy up by the roots and hurled it onto the rubbish heap to wilt and die. In its place, a vigorous, young sapling stood, eager to grow and spread its branches, Communism. This revolution did not materialize over night; it had been a long time brewing and many had been the warnings that disaster was impending. Furthermore it was not the result of some trivial incident as a bread riot; it was closely related to a very vital life problem of the masses of the people.

The Russian revolution, briefly, had its roots in the agrarian question. Far back in the thirteenth century, the invading and conquering Tartars had sown the seed of autocracy and oppression. Two hundred years of Tartar rule had proved excellent soil for this seed; the peasants grew more and more dependent on the nobles; the roots of serfdom dug in deeper and deeper, binding themselves on the Russian peasants until in 1671, Stenko Razin,

a Cossack bandit led a great peasant uprising. Autocracy, firmly entrenched and confident of its strength, disdained to remedy conditions; it was so much easier to stamp the revolters under foot and execute the leader. Little did they know or care that this seed of revolt had found good soil in the oppressed, land hungry peasantry; the seed lived, rooted in deeper, quietly grew, waiting another favorable opportunity to rear its head above ground.

Slowly and imperceptibly a great change stole over Russia under Peter the Great (1682-1725) and Catherine II (1762-1796); contacts were made with Western Europe, and the theater and press began disseminating new ideas and standards of high moral purpose. Radishchev, a Russian critic of liberal tendencies, stirred by the evils of serfdom, denounced the landlords and advocated freedom for the serfs and ownership of the land. His voice was like that of one crying in the wilderness; autocracy refused to listen to such radicalism and for his boldness, he was exiled to Siberia, the first martyr to liberalism.

Thus autocracy continued, conservative, unsympathetic, inflexible "giving social life a certain outward stability and determining its outward shape and appearance. While underneath the crust, the social life of the people... was constantly changing, growing, developing, adapting itself to new conditions and surroundings." The great achievement of the eighteenth century appeared to be the complete enslavement

2. Korff, S.A., Autocracy and Revolution in Russia, p. 4.
of the masses; the gap between them and autocracy steadily widened. A wise ruler would have foreseen impending disaster; all signs pointed to it, but the day of reckoning was delayed by the strong bureaucratic and centralized system of the government.

During the early part of the nineteenth century, serfdom as a social institution gradually lost ground. Education, contact with Western ideas, economic industrialism and increasing idealism in the field of literature and poetry, encouraged the best minds among the Russian people to fight this curse. Furthermore, the changing economic conditions of trade, commerce and industry steadily lessened the enormous advantages of keeping serf labor. Then, the defeat of Russia in the Crimean War did much to convince the Russians that serfdom's day was over and a change was necessary. Even the Tsar Alexander II, (1855-1881) believed that the time was ripe for the emancipation of the serfs but the landowning nobility, with an eye to their own interests, opposed the reform. The land was not given outright to the peasants and the Act of Liberation, March 3, 1861, made them freed men but economic slaves, tremendously discontented and bitter toward their traditional enemies, the nobility, whom they blamed for this injustice. The government failed to understand the peasant; the land was more valuable to the latter than his personal liberty; like a tree, the peasant felt he was an organic growth of the soil. He loved the bit of land where-in his roots congenially resided. The government was so blind and stupid
that it did not realize that the solving of this very fundamental agrarian question would doubtless have prevented or at least mitigated the later revolutions of 1905 and 1917.

The discontent and agitation among the peasantry encouraged the revolutionary societies which had sprung up in the early nineteenth century; they increased their activities and in the 1870's, they flooded the country with propaganda. This was followed by terrible reaction and oppression on the part of the government in the 1880's and revolutionary work was driven underground for a time.

After the defeat of the Crimean War, the government realized that it could never meet European attack successfully unless it built railroads and industrialized the country. So, from the point of view of self-defense, it must stimulate industry. The Emancipation edict had resulted in an enormous surplus of cheap labor; these found their way to the large cities and became a part of the army of workers in the large factories. Foreign capital invested in Russian industry and developed a large class of wealthy citizens, capitalists. These concentrated their workers into single large factories, formed syndicates, fixed prices and regulated the output. This class of wealthy men, with interests of their own, soon wanted political power to protect these interests.

Along with this industrialization went the rise of a proletariat, which was later to form the foundation and chief
support of the revolutionary movement. Freedom to form trade unions, right of labor to strike and social protective legislation were entirely missing or very inadequate. As a general rule, the wages were low, the hours were long and the living conditions of the workers were bad. The government's reply to a strike was a severe raid by the Cossacks and every attack generated greater hatred. The gap widened between the masses and the Tsar; the workers lost confidence in the government. Thus the proletariat became fertile ground for the socialists, since it was easier for the revolutionary agitators to reach the workers in their large factories than it was the peasants in their remote and isolated villages.

Furthermore the industrialization of Russia had an important effect on the ideology of the revolutionary movement. Herzen, in the early days of socialism in Russia, believed that the peasant was by nature a socialist, because of his association with the old organization, the mir. Russia would not need to go through the capitalist stage on its way to socialism; it would become an agrarian socialist state immediately socialism was introduced. It proved to be a phantastic idea, but it had great influence because it started a current of thinking along social and reform lines which resulted in the formation of an influential intelligensia.

With the growth of the factory system and an industrial class, Karl Marx's ideas were substituted for Herzen's and the Social Democrats became influential. In the 1880's, Plekanov, the real founder of Marxian doctrine in Russia, criticized Herzen's
ideas; denounced them as absurd, scoffed at this peculiar bent for socialism of the Russian peasant and declared that Russia would have to pass through the capitalist stage on its way to socialism. In 1903, the Social Democrats held a conference at London, an important event, for from it emerged the so-called Bolshevik and Menshevik wings of the party and the appearance of Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin as the leader of the Bolsheviks. The split in the party had arisen over a dispute as to how a revolutionary party should be organized in Russia at that time. Lenin insisted on a centralized, strongly disciplined party, its strength to lie in quality rather than in quantity. Furthermore he favored the violent overthrow of the capitalist state order and the dictatorship of the proletariat. At last, out of all the revolutionary societies, one had emerged which had a distinct policy and aim, namely the establishment in Russia of a socialistic state. They had the plan, all they needed was the opportunity to carry it out.
II. Principles of Marxism

A. Interpretation of History.

Since "modern communism which is sometimes called Bolshevism, is identified with Marxism," let us examine the theories of Karl Marx and then attempt to find out whether or not the Bolsheviks have followed out his principles.

From his study of communism, Marx built up a theory of history quite different from the older views. Marx received from his teacher, Hegel, a conception of social evolution in which he attempted to explain the development of ideas and institutions in economic terms. The accepted view of history up to his day had been that the ultimate causes of historical changes could be traced back to the changing ideas of human beings; that is, certain outstanding personalities had been the chief molding influences in history. Marx minimized this influence of the individual; he believed society should be looked upon as a unit, institutions were the historical products and the result of the energies of the whole community. "In the social production of the means of life, human beings enter into definite and necessary relations which are independent of their will; production relations which correspond to a definite stage of the development of their productive forces. The totality of these production relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which a legal and political superstructure arises and to which definite forms of social con-

The mode of production of the material means of life determines, in general, the social, political, and intellectual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of human beings that determines their existence, but, conversely, it is their social existence that determines their consciousness."

Thus Marx attempted to explain the development of ideas and institutions in economic terms. The first economic order was characterized by communal property; land was held in common, tilled in common and the fruits thereof were divided among the producers. Here was co-operative production, common ownership of the land and the total absence of private property. The black cloud that cast its shadow over those days of peace and contentment was private property. Then came the evil days, the inheritance of wealth, the exchange and transformation of products into commodities, with the result that the community of interests was broken up, classes began to develop. This was followed by the era of slaves, "whose forced labor formed the basis on which the whole superstructure of society was reared." These masses of slaves produced a surplus; this in turn, stimulated trade, commerce, navigation and eventually a new actor appeared on the stage, the merchant. He proceeded to exploit the direct producers; he amassed wealth, gained power and then attempted to displace the old nobility with a new weapon, money. Thus the bourgeoisie, the modern era of commercialism, capitalism and wage slavery were

ushered in. So Marx's theories, in part, formed a theory of value. He believed that the capitalist system was a logical and necessary stage in the evolution of society; its institutions were the results of economic conditions. It was a great and splendid epoch which had developed out of the economic conditions and institutions generated in feudal society. The objective of capitalist production was surplus value and the State was the economic organization of the dominant class, created to protect the latter in the process of extracting surplus value from the workers.

The capitalist, in order to secure this surplus value with which to accumulate capital, had to find in the market a commodity, whose use-value had the peculiar quality of being a source of value. He found this commodity in human labor-power. Its use was labor and the latter created value. The capitalist bought this labor-power at its value, which was determined like the value of all other commodities, by the socially necessary labor time required for its production, that is, the cost of maintaining the worker and his family. Having bought this labor-power, the capitalist used it to further his interests. Suppose the capitalist hired a man for an eight hour day's work. In the course of four hours (the necessary labor time), the worker produced enough to pay back the cost of his own maintenance; then, in the next four hours (the surplus labor time), he produced a surplus value over and above the price for his labor-power. This constant effort on the part of the capitalist to
exploit the worker and extract surplus value from him was the very life of capitalist society. Marx writes, "Capital perishes if it does not exploit labor, and in order to exploit, it must buy it. The faster the capital devoted to production—the productive capital increases, and the more successfully the industry is carried on, the richer do the bourgeoisie become, the better does business go, the more laborers does the capitalist require, and the dearer does the laborer sell himself."

Thus the worker produces a "surplus" product for which the capitalist does not pay him; surplus product or surplus value. So we have to distinguish between two parts in capital, from the point of view of the process of production. First, there is constant capital, which is expended for the means of production (machinery, tools, raw materials, etc.), the value of this being transferred, unchanged to the finished product; secondly, variable capital, expended for labor-power. The value of this latter capital is not constant, but grows in the labor process, creating surplus value.

Now the accumulation of capital results in competition between the members of the capitalist class for pre-eminence. The deeper and more bitter the struggle becomes between the owners of the means of production and the producers over questions of wages and hours, the faster the system develops. The struggle acts as a motivating force, it forces improvement of technique in production and as a result great masses of capital.

pile up. "One capitalist lays a number of his fellow capitalists low. Hand in hand with this centralization, concomitantly with the expropriation of many capitalists by a few, the co-operative form of the labor process develops to an ever-increasing degree; therewith we find a growing tendency towards the purposive application of science to the improvement of technique; the land is more methodically cultivated; the instruments of labor tend to assume forms which are only utilisable by combined effort; the means of production are economised through being turned to account only by joint, by social labor; all the peoples of the world are enmeshed in the net of the world market, and therefore the capitalist regime tends more and more to assume an international character. While there is thus a progressive diminution in the number of the capitalist magnates (who usurp and monopolise all the advantages of this transformative process), there occurs a corresponding increase in the mass of poverty, oppression, enslavement, degeneration, and exploitation; but at the same time there is a steady intensification of the wrath of the working class—a class which grows ever more numerous, and is disciplined, unified, and organized by the very mechanism of the capitalist method of production. Capitalist monopoly becomes a fetter upon the method of production which has flourished with it and under it. The centralisation of the means of production and the socialisation of labor reach a point where they prove incompatible with their capitalist husk. This bursts asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

Thus capitalism was destined to arrive at a stage where its organization of industry would prove more and more inadequate and a fetter on life. Just as the feudal society arrived at a place where it became a fetter upon life which had to be broken to make way for the new order of capitalism, so the latter, having fulfilled its historic role, resplendent with great achievements, would have to give place to the new class developing under its own rule.

However the industrialists in the cities were not the only monopolists. There were the landlords to be considered, too. Marx analyzed the history of ground-rent and showed how rent paid in labor service, that is, when the peasant created a surplus product by laboring on the lord's land, was transformed into rent paid in produce or rent in kind (i.e., the peasant created a surplus product on his own land and handed this over to the lord of the soil under stress of "non-economic constraint"). Later this was transformed into a money rent and finally became capitalist rent. A new class of propertyless day laborers appeared gradually who hired themselves out for wages. The landowners, like the industrialist exploited them and accumulated wealth. The exploitation of the peasant "differs from the exploitation of the industrial proletariat only in point of form. The exploiter is the same: capital. The individual capitalists exploit the individual peasants through mortgages and usury and the capitalist class
exploits the peasant class through state taxation. "In agriculture as in industry, capitalism improves the production process only at the price of the martyrdom of the workers. Moreover, Marx continues, "the dispersion of the rural workers over larger areas breaks down their powers of resistance at the very time when concentration is increasing the powers of the urban operatives in this respect. In modern agriculture, as in urban industry, the increased productivity and the greater mobility of labor are purchased at the cost of devastating labor power and making it a prey to disease. Every advance in capitalist agriculture is an advance in the art, not only of robbing the worker, but also of robbing the land. Capitalist production, therefore, is only able to develop the technique and the combination of the social process of production by simultaneously undermining the foundations of all wealth; the land and the workers."

Yet, in spite of all the criticism of capitalism, Marx felt that the historic role played by the latter was very important. "The bourgeois, during its rule of scarce one hundred years has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground; what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces were possible?" 1 Marx, Class Struggles in France, N.Y., 1924, pp. 164-165.

I. The forces slumbered in the lap of social labor?"

B. Class Struggle.

Marx writes that the "history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles", that is, all written history. With the dissolution of the primitive communistic society, the latter began to be differentiated into separate and finally antagonistic classes.

"In the earlier epochs of history we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the middle ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature; it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other; Bourgeoisie and Proletarist."

The capitalist system not only produced conditions which would cause its overthrow, but it also produced the agency, interest and social class by which this would be accomplished. As already stated, capitalism depends on wage-labor and the latter

2. Ibid. p. 31.
depends upon competition among the laborers. The law of wages needs competition for its operation. When competition belonged to production on a small scale, the workers were separated into small groups, but as production increased and developed, large bodies of workers were massed together; this inevitably tended to produce a solidarity of interest, a mutual interdependence among the workers which sooner or later would lead to combinations or trade-unions for defense against the oppression of the owners of the means of production.

Furthermore the capitalist system had turned this organization of workers into a political force, a party. The workers had taken advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie to further their own interests. At times, the bourgeoisie, in attempting to secure their own interests, had appealed to the proletariat, thus they were drawn into the political field. Here they secured political education and training and experience, weapons which they would later use to good advantage in fighting the bourgeoisie.

When the time should arrive that the "modern laborer instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his class, when he becomes a pauper . . . . and . . . it becomes evident that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society . . . ." then the day for the social revolution has arrived.

C. The Revolution.

Now the proletariat play their role, they are the ones, the particular class, which, by the economic conditions of their existence, are prepared to carry the action of the drama to its grand climax. The capitalist class has broken up and dispersed the peasantry and all the petty bourgeoisie, but has welded together, united and organized the town proletariat. It is the task of the latter, then, to set free the elements of the new society concealed within the womb of the old, capitalism. To accomplish this task, the proletariat need state power, the centralized organization of force, the organization of violence, both for the purpose of crushing the resistance of the capitalists and for guiding the great mass of the population, the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie, and the semi-proletarians in the work of establishing a socialist economy.

Once the bourgeoisie are overthrown, the proletariat will be transformed into the ruling class; this will enable them to crush the inevitable and desperate resistance of the bourgeoisie and to organize all the toiling and exploited masses for the new economic order. This class struggle will lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat. A period of consolidation must follow, one of iron dictatorship, in which the victorious class must safeguard itself against counter-revolution. All opponents must be terrorized into acquiescence; they must be disarmed, the rebellious executed, imprisoned or exiled. The revolution means war; it is no time for compassion or remorse. The proletariat must use the terrorism of capitalism to destroy capitalism. The latter made human life the cheapest of commodities; now they, the bourgeoisie must be sacrificed and any means justifies the end. "The proletariat will use
its political supremacy to wrest by degrees all capital from
the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production
in the hands of the state, that is, of the proletariat organized
as the ruling class; and to increase the total of the productive
forces as rapidly as possible."

In the capitalist society, under the conditions most
favorable to its development, there was more or less complete
democracy in the democratic republic. Since this democracy was
always surrounded by the narrow framework of capitalist exploita-
tion, it was consequently a democracy for the minority, the possess-
ing class. The dictatorship of the proletariat will for the first
time produce democracy for the people, the majority. To accomplish
this, suppression is still necessary. The state is still neces-
sary, but it is now a transitional state, for the suppression of
the minority of exploiters, by the majority of the exploited of
yesterday. Communism alone will give a really complete democracy
and the more complete it is the more quickly will it become un-
necessary and fade away. People will gradually become accustomed
to the observance of the elementary rules of social life, they
will become used to observing them without force, without com-
pulsion, without subordination, without the state.

Thus Marx explains that "what we are dealing with....
is not a communist society which has developed on its own
foundations, but, on the contrary, one which is just emerging
from capitalist society and which therefore in all respects-

economic, moral, and intellectual—still bears the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it sprung." This society which has just emerged out of capitalism, Marx calls the first or lower phase of communist society. In this phase, the means of production no longer belong to a few private individuals, but to the whole of society. Every member of this society, after doing a certain part of socially necessary work, will receive a certificate from society to the effect that he has done such and such a piece of work. According to this certificate, he will receive from the public warehouses, where the articles of consumption will be stored, a corresponding quantity of products. Subtracting that proportion of labor which goes to the public fund, every worker will receive from society as much as he has given it. Equality seems to reign, but in this first phase of communism, differences and unjust differences, in wealth will still exist, but the exploitation of man by man will have become impossible, because it will be impossible to seize as private property, the means of production, the factories, machines, land, etc.

Marx takes into account the inevitable inequality of men; he also takes into consideration the fact that turning the means of production into common property of the whole of society does not remove the defects of distribution. "These defects are unavoidable in the first phase of Communist society, when, after long travail, it first emerges from capitalist society. Justice can never rise superior to the economic conditions of society.................

1. Lenin, V, State and Revolution, p. 76.
and the cultural development conditioned by them."

Marx does not tell us how long the revolution is to last. He warned the working classes, "not to expect their immediate emancipation from the political victory. In order to work out their own emancipation and with it that higher form of life which present-day society inevitably opposes, the protracted struggle must pass through a whole series of historical processes, in the course of which men and circumstances alike will be changed." Marx doubtless felt the new productive system of communism was sure to involve new institutions which he could not foresee.

However, "in the higher phase of Communist society, when the enslaving subordination of individuals in the division of labor has disappeared and with it also the antagonism between mental and physical labor; when labor has become not only a means of living, but itself the first necessity of life; when, along with the all-round development of individuals, the productive forces, too, have grown and all the springs of social wealth are flowing more freely - it is only at that stage that it will be possible to pass completely beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois rights, and for society to inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs."

The state will then wither away completely when people have become accustomed to observe the fundamental rules of social life, and their labor is so productive, that they voluntarily work

1. I.Lenin, V., State and Revolution, quoted, p. 77.
2. Ibid. p. 79.
according to their ability. Until this higher phase of Communism arrives, the communists demand the strictest control by society and by the state, of the quantity of labor and the quantity of consumption.

What are some of the measures that the proletariat propose to apply during this period of transition? In the Communist Manifesto, ten are given which would be generally applicable in the most advanced countries. They are as follows:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.

Thus Marx deduces from the economic law of the movement of contemporary society the inevitability of the transformation of capitalist society into Socialist society. The chief material foundation of the inevitable coming of Socialism is the socialisation of labor in its myriad forms. The intellectual and moral driving force of this transformation is the proletariat, trained by capitalism itself. The socialisation of production will lead to the transfer of the means of production into the hands of society. An immense increase in the productivity of labor; a reduction in working hours; replacement of the ruins of petty, individual production by collective and perfected labor—these will be the direct results of this transformation.

III. Application of Marxism in Soviet Russia.

A. Bolshevist Revolution.

Was the stage set for a proletarian revolution in Russia in 1917? Let us examine conditions in Russia at that time. In 1917, Russia was predominantly an agricultural country, for about eighty-five percent of the people lived in the country, so the industrial proletariat, in the cities, formed a relatively small group. The aristocracy formed a still smaller group, about seven percent of the entire population. So there were three distinct classes; the multitude of the peasants, the proletariat, and the aristocracy. In order to stage a revolution, there must be antagonism between these classes, developed to such a degree, that the poorer, exploited groups are ready to revolt.

There were the few rich landlords and the multitude of landless peasants, toiling in bitter poverty. In the cities, the means of production and consumption were in the hands of a relatively few capitalists and the proletariat were oppressed by long working hours, low wages, bad living conditions and scarcity of food. The government was involved in a World War. At this time, nearly every individual in Russia had been directly or indirectly touched in some way. The people knew the government was utterly incompetent; it had failed to regulate the rationing of food; transportation had broken down, suffering was general. Scandals concerning the royal family and the high officials were common talk; all of Russia, except the bureaucracy and the Tsar were convinced that
the incompetence and rottenness of the government was the source of all the people's troubles. Even the soldiers at the front showed signs of discontent. They had no ammunition and few rifles, again the fault of the government. Now the fact that the army was dissatisfied showed that the social dissatisfaction of the country had reached a point where a revolutionary outburst might be expected, for all autocratic governments are careful to keep the army satisfied, in good condition, and particularly under severe discipline. Thus two movements existed in Russia in 1917—the development of the revolutionary movement and the gradual degeneration of autocracy; but so long as the government could control the army, no end was in sight.

As the war progressed, and defeat followed defeat, the tide of social dissatisfaction increased, the morale of the army began to waver and the military discipline slackened. The stage was set, the curtain rolling up, the chief actor was on the stage and the world looked on, wondering how the play would develop.

Lenin saw his chance to convert this war of imperialism into a civil war. The Paris Commune, a revolutionary movement in 1871, a clearly defined attempt of the Parisian proletariat to free itself from the hostile domination of rural France, had demonstrated for Lenin several fundamental theorems for conducting a proletarian revolution. One was that the army must become the instrument of the proletariat. So Lenin's first line of attack was to win over the support of the soldiers. They were weary of fighting a war that they did not understand and fought without knowing why. The city people needed food and the peasants wanted land for their agricultural needs.
Lenin appealed to the masses through four short and expressive slogans—Peace, Food, Land, and Liberty. He urged the soldiers to cease fighting, promising them a speedy peace if the Bolsheviks should come into power. The peasant wanted land, Lenin invited them to take it and the peasants all over Russia made a rush for it. This was a clever move on the part of Lenin, for he secured the support of the peasants, a tremendous and strong social force. The factories were given over to the workers to run. It was not surprising that Lenin should gain control of the state with such a program, appealing to the greatest needs of the day in Russia. Lenin represented a small group, but the latter had a distinct policy, they knew what they were standing for and what they wanted, namely, the establishment in Russia of a socialist state and the trying out of a communist experiment. Thus Lenin was carrying out Marx’s strategy, for the Communists ... are ... the most advanced and resolute section which pushes forward all others; ... they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

Now, according to Marx, the proletariat are the class who are to overthrow the old order, but since the former were such a relatively small group in Russia, it was necessary to win over the peasantry as allies. So, the revolution in November 1917, was intended, first of all, to strike a blow at the capitalists, landlords and aristocracy, all of the bourgeois class. In order to carry it out, Lenin had to count not only on the peasantry and proletariat, but on the petty bourgeois also. Thus in the first stage of the revolution, he had the support of far larger groups than he would have had if he had attempted to apply the whole program at once.

Lee, A., Essentials of Marx, Communist Manifesto, p. 44.
Many who followed him in the first stage tried to withstand him in the second and found it was too late.

Lenin writes concerning this first stage, "The victorious Bolshevik revolution meant the end of all hesitations and the complete destruction of the monarchy and landlordism (which had still been in existence until the November revolution). The bourgeois revolution was carried out by us to the end, the peasantry as a whole was supporting us, since its antagonism to the Socialist proletariat could not break out at once. The Soviets included at the time the peasantry as a whole, the class divisions among the latter being still latent."

So, according to Lenin, only the cities passed through the proletarian revolution in November, 1917. A huge task still confronted the Bolsheviks; the first blow had been directed at the capitalists and landlords, now the rest of the bourgeois must go; the rest of the country must pass through the proletarian revolution. About this second part of the revolution, Lenin says, "All acquainted with the conditions who have been to the villages, declare that it was not until the summer and autumn of 1918, that our countryside passed through its November (that is, proletarian revolution). .... One year after the proletarian revolution in the countryside finally consolidated the power of the Soviet and Bolshevism, and finally proved that the latter had no longer to fear any hostile power in the interior. Thus, after completing the bourgeois, democratic revolution in alliance with the entire peasantry as a

whole, the Russian proletariat has passed definitely to the socialist revolution, having succeeded in splitting up the village, in rallying to its side the village proletariat and semi-proletariat and in uniting them against the exploiters and the bourgeois, including the peasant one."

So if we judge the revolution from the point of view of the class of people who participated in it, it was a proletariat revolution.

However the revolution must be judged from two other angles. Marx claimed that the overthrow of the bourgeois was only the first step in the revolution; not only must the latter be overthrown, but the bourgeois machinery of state must be seized, destroyed and new forms reconstructed. Since only about ten percent of the population in 1917 constituted the real proletariat there could not be a dictatorship of the latter except in theory, as long as eighty-five percent of the population remained individualist peasants. The peasants supported the Bolshevik government exclusively for practical purposes, for acquiring more land; but Bolshevism is Communism, and communism denies private property in any form whatsoever. When the peasants realized that they would not be able to keep the land, that they had no legal right of property, no positive assurance of ownership, they were naturally frightfully disappointed and they stopped backing the Bolshevik government.

So Lenin writes, "during this period of reconstruction, the transition from Capitalism to Communism, suppression is still necessary... A special instrument, a special machine for suppress-

sion,-that is, the State, is necessary but this is now a transitional State, no longer a State in the usual sense. "In other words, once the proletariat have put through the revolution, they must consolidate their gains by establishing a Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

B. Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Marx writes, "between capitalism and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the former into the latter. To this also corresponds a political transition period, in which the state can be no other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." The portion of the latter which is best fitted to carry out this part of the program, is the Communist Party, which contains the best, most class-conscious, most active and most loyal members of the proletariat class. The party, "basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism and representing the general and lasting interests of the whole of the working class, the party personifies the unity of proletarian revolutionary action." Furthermore it is a revolutionary organization which has become hardened, disciplined and centralized in its struggle to overthrow the bourgeois state; therefore, the Communist Party must steer this transitional state, emerging from the capitalist society and still bearing many birth marks of the old regime, safely through its transformation into the full-fledged communist society.

Lenin learned many lessons from the Paris Commune failure. It was not enough merely to seize the existing machinery of the

1. Lenin, State and Revolution, p. 74.
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of the state, it must be shattered and replaced by more suitable forms. The old official class must disappear, the civil service must be replaced by party men. The mere capture of authority was not the end of the revolution, the capitalist class must be suppressed; dictatorship was necessary.

Thus, as dictators, the Party must suppress the bourgeoisie and break up the old state machinery. So, Lenin replaced the old Tsarist army with the Red army, composed of proletarians loyal to the new state. In place of the old official bureaucracy, a soviet organization of workers and peasants councils was established. In addition to these, the Party created a special institution, the State Political Department, the G.P.U., whose duty it was to suppress and punish all offences against the state, especially anything that savored of counter-revolution. As dictators, the Party controlled the mechanism of soviets, congresses, committees and councils. No other party was to be allowed to live, anyone who dared to oppose the party would be considered counter-revolutionary and disloyal.

Lenin writes, "the dictatorship of the proletariat is a resolute, persistent struggle, sanguinary and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative, against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit of the millions and tens of millions is a formidable force. Without an iron party hardened in fight, without a party possessing the confidence of all that is honest in the given class, without a party capable of observing the disposition of the masses and influencing them, the conduct of such a struggle
is impossible."

"All the work of the Party is done through the Soviets, which units the laboring masses irrespective of the difference of their trade or profession. Through the District Congress of Soviets....whose proceedings are followed by the Party with very careful attention as well as through the constant delegation of class-conscious workmen who occupy its various positions in the country, the city performs its functions of leading the peasantry. Thus is carried out the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the systematic struggle against the rich, exploiting and speculating peasantry."

In order to accomplish its goal, the Party must have the support of the proletariat in the cities and in addition, it must secure for itself the whole-hearted support of that stratum of the rural population that stands closest to the proletariat, the agricultural laborers and the rural poor.

So the Proletarian Revolution still goes on, the Party by its policy is endeavoring to exterminate bourgeois ideas and traditions and replace them with the new ideas of collectivism, new ethics and a new mentality.

Thus far we have considered two factors; first, that the people who staged the revolution were proletarian and second, that the class of people who have controlled the state power since the revolution are also proletarian. Still another factor must be considered. What was the form of government set up?

The Soviet form of Government set up by the Bolsheviks

2. Ibid. pp 30-31.
consists of a pyramid of councils of workers' and peasants' representatives, elective and revocable with the village and city soviets at the bottom of the pyramid and the All-Union Congress at the top. The city soviet sends delegates directly to the All-Russian Congress; the rural soviets are indirectly represented by delegates from the provincial and regional congresses. The ratio of representation is heavily in favor of the urban industrial population, for the reason that these bodies are considered the real proletarians; they are more loyal in their allegiance to the new order. The basis of representation is vocational; people of different employments vote separately; miners in one group, iron-workers in another, soldiers in a third and so on. Each group chooses representatives from its own class. A miner in the All-Russian Congress does not represent a city but a class of people, irrespective of their residence. The soviet system represents real groups with a common purpose. Theoretically the Russian people control their government, but they are required to exercise this control through such a complicated mechanism that actually it is an oligarchic government posing as a democratic one. The Communist Party controls the whole mechanism of soviets, congresses, committees, and councils.

Who may vote? All Russian citizens eighteen years of age or over without distinction of sex, nationality, religion or any residential qualification, provided they earn their living by productive labor and do not employ others for personal gain. This includes soldiers and sailors. Again, we notice the emphasis placed on the worker.
The Russian constitution of 1918 declares that it recognizes the equal rights of all citizens but goes on to say, in the very next paragraph, that no citizen may claim privilege which might be used to the detriment of the socialist revolution. The Russian citizen has no rights as against the state. The socialist state is the end; the individual citizen is only a means.

The Soviet government has evolved a new and improved method of dealing with the minorities living within its borders. The old regime tried to kill out their culture and language and Russify them. The Communists feel that these minorities (sixty-five million of them) ought to have self-determination as far as possible; if it is not practicable, then within the country where they live, they should be assured rights by statutes or by treaties. In other words, these people should be treated like guests and not as victims. So, there is a Soviet of Nationalities which consists of representatives from the minorities in proportion to their numerical strength and is organized to deal with problems concerning these people. It has a praesidium of its own and has set up an Institute of Nationalities for the study of the economic, cultural and legal affairs which affect the minorities. The aim of this latter organization is to foster and encourage the culture, language and folkways of these peoples and in so doing enrich the civilization of Russia.

This soviet form of state is modelled on the Paris Commune, which Marx believed was "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of labor." It favors the worker and discredits the bourgeois elements; it puts the

means of production and consumption in the hands of the state and thus ends exploitation of man by man and establishes the dictatorship of a class, the proletariat. Without doubt it measures up to the Marxian standard.

Lenin gives six reasons why the soviet power is superior to the bourgeois democracy. "The Soviets are the new State machinery. In the first place, they give expression to the armed force of the workers and peasants; in such a way, however, that this force is not divorced from the people, as was the force of the old standing army, but is bound up with them as closely as possible. In the military sense this force is incomparably greater than the former; in relation to the machinery it is second to none. Secondly, the link of this machinery with the masses, with the majority of the people, is so intimate, so indissoluble, so readily verified and renewable, that nothing like it is even approached in the former state. Thirdly, this machinery, because it is elective and its constitution is revocable in accordance with the will of the people, without any bureaucratic formalities, is far more democratic than that of the old government. Fourthly, it yields a firm connection with the various industries and professions, thus facilitating all sorts of the most radical reforms without any bureaucracy. Fifthly, it gives form to the organization of the vanguard, that is to the most conscious, most energetic, most progressive section of the oppressed classes of the workers and peasants and is thus an apparatus whereby the vanguard of the oppressed classes can uplift, educate
and lead in its train the whole gigantic mass of these classes which have until stood quite outside all political life, outside history. Sixth, it makes it possible to unite the advantages of immediate and direct democracy, that is, to unite in the persons of elected representatives of the people both legislative and executive functions. In comparison with bourgeois parliamentarism it is a step forward in the development of democracy which has a historical world significance."

Not only is the Communist Party interested in the welfare of the Russian proletariat, they also represent the interests of the movement in every country. "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win."

Marxism, them, in theory and practice, is international. Theoretically "the working men have no country," so united action of the proletariat is necessary if it hopes to be free. Just as capitalism has become an international affair, so the problem of class struggle has assumed an international aspect and cannot be solved within the boundaries of a single country. Hence the working classes must consolidate their strength in their common struggle against the ruling classes and their governments. The emancipation of labor is not confined to a single locality, nor to a particular country; it is a social problem, including all countries in which modern society exists. Therefore the Communists

2. Marx, Communist Manifesto, p. 65. (Essentials of Marx)
aid revolutionary movements against the existing social and political order of things anywhere in the world.

The Third Internationale is the pivot of the Communist movement, with the separate national movements built up around it as a center. The communists are accused with desiring to abolish countries and nationalities. Marx writes "We can not take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is, so far, itself national though not in the bourgeois sense of the word. National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, the supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading civilized countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat."

The chief function of the Internationale is to act as a bureau of propaganda for the Communist Party. The members of the latter are also members of the Third Internationale, they both work for the same chief. Its aim is "the organization of common action between the workers of various countries who are striving towards the overthrow of capitalism, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Internationale Republic, the complete abolition of classes and the realization of socialism as the first step to communist society."

2. Laski, Communism, p.185.
III. Application of Marxism in Soviet Russia

C. The Economic Policy

The Russian revolution in November 1917, was not only a social and political revolution but an economic one also. In order to get the support of the proletariat in carrying out the revolution, Lenin promised the factories to the workers and the land to the peasants. Thus he won their support in overturning the bourgeois state. This accomplished, Lenin decreed the nationalization of the land, the railroads, the factories and the banks; the state took over all trade, domestic and foreign. Trading for profit and speculation was strictly forbidden.

The masses thought this new era meant perfectly free rein, they were to be supreme masters of their lives. "Now, at last, they could stretch their limbs and this they did with such good will that the cracking of their joints was felt through out the whole social body." From the time of the Emancipation Edict in 1861, the peasants' chief desire had been to own the land they worked for the wealthy landlords. Lenin promised this in 1917, and in return for this they supported the Bolsheviki, though Communism itself did not appeal to them. When they found out that Bolshevism and communism were synonymous and did not in any way guarantee their new landholdings, the peasants turned their backs on the Bolshevik government. Production fell, so that Russia, which had exported about ten million tons of grain a year before the war in 1914, could hardly supply her own people's needs. Grain had to be requisitioned in order to feed the city workers. Then general 1. Karlgren, Bolshevik Russia, p. 11.
industry broke down; there were no manufactured goods to give the peasants; they gave up their corn and received nothing in exchange. It was quite natural that the peasants should turn a deaf ear to the idea of revolutionary solidarity; they fought the armed troops sent to collect the corn. Even worse, they went on a passive resistance strike; they refused to cultivate the land. They sowed only what they had a right to keep. Then the famine caused by the drought of 1921 increased the difficulties.

The Bolsheviks were unwilling to acknowledge defeat, so they filled the proletariat with propaganda. The wicked capitalist world had caused the famine by its blockade and then, the weather had been unfavorable.

However the Bolsheviks had to beat a retreat. In the tenth Communist Congress, 1921, Lenin said, "The peasants are dissatisfied with their present relation to the State, so it cannot continue. We are great realists to say; let us revise our policy touching the peasants.... the Congress has decided to abolish the requisition system and replace it by a system of taxation."

Thus the peasants, a huge, unwieldy mass clogged the wheels of the revolution by its passive, inert resistance to the Marxian doctrine. The Bolsheviks realized that this prodigious body was indispensable to the State. They could not be liquidated or replaced; they must be handled carefully.

Communism fared no better in the factories. The workers, ignorant and inefficient were unable to run the factories; conditions went from bad to worse until finally production went down.
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far below what it had been before the world war. The equipment and capital, the surviving stock of manufactured goods, the inheritance left by the bourgeoisie, was either ruined, depleted or destroyed by the ignorant, careless workers. Russia appeared to be fast going to pieces.

Something must be done. So in 1921, Lenin proclaimed a New Economic Policy to take the place of War Communism. Private trading was to be permitted. Foreign capital was to be allowed back in the country on reasonable terms. The more capable and industrious peasants were to reap the benefits of their better output. Technicians were imported and offered high wages. Wages were classified according to ability and discipline was put back in the factories. The State ran the principal industries for profit and private trading and industrial enterprise were allowed to exist along side in open competition. A complete turn about face from Communism. Why? Marx and Engels had envisaged Socialism as successful only in an industrialized society. Lenin felt that he must restore the depleted industry and agriculture to their pre-war productivity. Once these were re-established, he could return to the original policy of complete socialization and mechanization of industry and agriculture. It was only a strategic retreat and proved to be a successful one. The standard of production increased, prosperity came back to Russia. The class of traders and prosperous peasants multiplied, private fortunes began to pile up again. However as time went on, private trade gradually waned, for the government threw its whole weight on the side of the State industries; they must succeed.
In 1924, Lenin's work was done. Stalin seized the reins and with a few strokes of his pen, he made first one section of private enterprise after another go out of business. Private fortunes, savings were confiscated, the war was on again. By 1928, Stalin's reforms were complete, private industry and trade had been abolished, but many problems still faced him.

One was the possibility of war; the capitalist world did not relish a Russian competitor, who by cheap labor and centralized control might some day undersell it in the world market. Russia was in no position to fight; she lacked the heavy industries that produced and transported equipment and munitions of war. Furthermore she could not buy them abroad, for she would have to pay for them in raw materials and foodstuffs which were needed at home. So in order to industrialize Russia and thus protect her in case of attack, Stalin announced a new experiment, The Five Year Plan.

In five years, the Plan was intended to make over the vast territories of Russia and the lives of about one hundred and fifty million people into one great departmentalized business, in which there should be one owner, one single capitalist, the State, and everyone else would be an employee, a pensioner, or a prisoner. A program was laid out which covered every branch of national economy in industry, agriculture, transportation, building etc. It was even worked out and charted for each industry and factory so that every year the exact measure of its success or failure could be checked and the workers of these respective organizations could be inspired to work for the goal set and even to break their record. Lipphard writes, "Like a general staff in an army that makes
long future plans of military operations, so this State Planning Commission estimates what the Russian people will need in five, ten, or fifty years and plans how the needs are to be supplied. "Just as in a real war, the people of Russia, in the main, were conscripted; the government directed the individual, gave him a job, put him in a government house on government rations and then watched his work and his life in order to see if it conformed to the requirements of the Plan.

Now, since the life of the Plan depended upon the export of grain, the first point of attack was the peasant. He must be up-rooted, made to discard his mediaeval methods and become collectivized. In 1928, Russia's rural population numbered about one hundred and twenty-five million in a total of about one hundred and fifty million for the whole nation. The size and psychology of the Russian peasant had long been the bane of the Socialist theorists. Did the Bolsheviks ignore these facts? Not, they believed that the preponderance of peasants was only a temporary condition historically speaking. However they soon realized that it would take an exceedingly long time to proletarize them by means of the industries, so they decided that the peasant problem must be solved on the farm itself by collectivization.

First of all, they divided the peasants into three classes, depending on the value of their possessions. They ranged from the Kulaks, the better-off peasants, who had more land and livestock than their neighbors, lived in better houses and used hired labor, down through the Seredniaks, the middle and largest group, to the bedniaks or the poorest peasants, who either worked for the kulaks 1. Lipphard, Communing With Communism, p. 80.
or possessed very small acreages, little or no livestock or farm implements. The kulak was the most intelligent and aggressive of all and the leader of resistance against the requisitions, taxes and collectivization. Further more, in the eyes of the Communists he was a capitalist, petty, greedy, with predilections decidedly bourgeois. Thus this classification was made the basis of a class war deliberately engineered by the Communists to destroy the kulak's growing independence and progress as a group. Stalin announced that the kulak was to be eliminated and his home, land, machinery and animals were to be confiscated and turned to the collectives.

Agriculture was to be re-organized and transformed from small-scale farming, carried on in the most primitive fashion by individual peasant households, to large-scale socialized agriculture, using modern machinery and the most advanced scientific methods of cultivation. The collective farms were organized to play the dominant role in this process of transformation. There were three main types of collective farms: peasant associations, artels and communes. In the peasant association, the most primitive type and now for the most part replaced by the artel, the land was cultivated jointly, but the horses, cattle and implements remained the individual property of the members of the association. In the artel, the predominant type at present, the basic means of production (machinery, tools, horses etc.) became joint property. The individual members, however, retained their own homes and gardens and also whatever
milch cows, pigs, sheep and poultry they possessed. Only in case the collective decided to specialize in some branch of commercial livestock farming did the members contribute a portion of their livestock to the collective herd. In the commune, all means of production were socialized, only articles for personal use remaining individual property.

The chief factor in the mechanization of the collective farms has been the machine and tractor stations, which provided the collectives with tractor and machinery service in return for a share of the crop. The stations also maintained agronomical staffs, which supplied the collective farms with advice and guidance as to the best agricultural practices. The very great possibilities for increased yield inherent in the collective farms as large scale, mechanized agricultural units will not begin to be realized to anything resembling their full extent until after certain basic problems have been solved. In the first place, there is the task of establishing sufficient machine and tractor stations to serve all the collective farms. Then there is the difficult problem of working out the best system of organizing labor on the collective farms. Finally, there is the problem of assisting the collectivized peasants, accustomed for so many years to primitive methods, to master the new methods based on mechanization.

In 1931, the piece-work system was made obligatory for all the principal agricultural processes. As a basis for this system, the various types of work were classified into four main groups,
according to the degree of skill required, and each group given a different valuation in so-called "labor-days," ranging from three-quarters of a labor-day for the lowest group to one and one-half labor-days for the highest group. The management of the farm established the norm for each type of work to be done in one day, quality as well as quantity being taken into account and calculated the number of labor-days to be credited for each unit of work performed.

Each collective farm member had a book in which a record was kept of the amount of labor-days to his credit and also of all advances, either in money or in kind, made to him during the year. The records contained in the books constituted the basis for the distribution of the farm's income among the members at the end of the year. The shares were allotted according to the respective number of labor-days (based on quality and quantity of work performed) to the credit of each. This final settlement took place after all costs of operation have been covered and deductions made for the single agricultural tax, insurance, seed and fodder funds, reserve and social funds (fifteen to forty-five percent of the gross income) and after five percent had been distributed among the members in proportion to the value of their property socialized by the collective.

In 1931, two new features were adopted, the brigade system and the production conference. According to the former, the work of the collective was performed by the members organized into brigades chiefly of seasonal duration. Each brigade was given a definite production program which designated the amount and
and quality of work for each crop and type of work, norms of time required, valuation of each type of work in labor-days and number of labor-days for fulfillment of the brigade's production program. The valuation of the labor-day of each collective farm member rose or fell depending upon the results of the work of the brigade or group of which he found himself a part. Overfulfillment of the program resulted in an increase in the value of the labor-day, underfulfillment, in a decrease.

At first, when seasonal brigades were the rule, one group of collective farm members might plow a plot of land, another harrow, another sow, another cultivate and another reap; no group felt any definite responsibility for the final results. Now, one permanent brigade is assigned a definite share of the farm land for the entire year, the group feels the responsibility for the final results, remuneration for labor is directly linked with the results of that labor in terms of output and productivity is greatly stimulated.

By the spring of 1931, collectivization in the most important of the grain-producing districts had been practically completed. In these districts over eighty percent of the farms were organized into collectives which embraced over nine-tenths of the sown area. In the other grain producing districts and also in the principal cotton-growing regions and the sugar-beet districts more than fifty percent of the farms were organized into collectives, which had sown fifty to sixty percent of the cultivated area. The area sown by each farm in the collectives was two or three times as large as the average sown by the individual
peasant households.

The collectivized peasantry has become the central factor in agriculture; the collective farms have become the chief producers not only of grain but also of the most important industrial crops, such as cotton, sugar beets, sunflowers and flax. The reaction of the peasant to these new schemes was a very simple one. He judged the advantages of the collective farm in terms of the amount of grain and cash which he himself received. He scarcely understood such things as insurance against crop failure and sickness or funds charged off in payment of machinery.

The leaders realized that their projected system of communism could not operate with the bulk of the population of illiterate peasants, who, far from being communally minded, were mutually distrustful. The peasant himself was hardly aware of the nature of the stumbling block which he had set up in the road to socialization. Like the proverbial horse who was led to water, the peasant could not be made to work. It was difficult for him to part with the illusion of individual possession; so he sulked, sabotaged and procrastinated on the big collective farm. Marx provided a formula for the landlord and the capitalist but he appears to have neglected to give a formula for overcoming the resistance of the peasantry.

Hence, it became the task of the local Communists to carry on an educational campaign among these illiterate peasants, constantly they had to explain the new system and urge them to cooperate with their fellow workers. These backward people, living like serfs in the Middle Ages, are the material which the Soviet Govern-
ment must use to build the new social order.

Along with the collectives, there developed the mechanized State farms, marking the entrance of the government into agricultural production. The large government farms, called Sovhozes, employed peasants, too. Being equipped with the highest-powered tractors in the world, usually of American make, their task was to train unskilled peasants to operate and repair this complicated machinery. On these farms, the peasant was subjected to an organized day for the first. The eight hour day was the general rule, with extra work paid for at the overtime rate. Each of the government farms took under its wing as many peasant villages as possible. The system was to aid the peasants by lending them the government machinery and helping them to organize their collective farms. These State farms, constituting the highest form of socialized agriculture and serving as models of scientific and mechanized methods of production, embraced only a small portion of the total sown area. The main burden of establishing the new system of agriculture rested upon the collectives, which in 1931, embraced nearly sixty percent of the total sown area.

This collectivization program was not carried out by Lenin, because the material bases did not exist for such a movement while he lived. In order to place the new collective movement on a lasting basis it became necessary to create without delay the corresponding material foundation.

What was Marx's attitude toward the peasantry? Engels in an article on "The Peasant Problem in France and Germany" has expressed Marx's views; he says "When we are in possession of
of the powers of the state, we shall not even dream of forcibly expropriating the poorer peasants, the small holders (with or without compensation), as we shall have to do in relation to the large land owners. Our task as regards the small holders will first of all consist in transforming their individual production and individual ownership into co-operative production and co-operative ownership, not forcibly, but by way of example, and by offering social aid for this purpose. We shall then have the means of showing the peasant all the advantages of this change."

Collectivization has been successful, about three-fifths of the peasantry have joined and the process still goes on. Sufficient food to supply the needs of the country is still a serious problem in Russia. "The fault is not in the system, but in the reckless way in which the Bolsheviks have managed it. They have not, of course, deliberately mishandled the movement of collectivization, but if they had, they could not have done it more harm. In urgent need of food for the towns and of commodities for export in exchange for indispensable foreign currency, they have made unreasonable demands on the peasantry." The Bolsheviks have not known how to handle the peasant diplomatically, thus their treatment has tended to make the peasant antagonistic and stubborn.

Thus the aim of the Five Year Plan was to industrialize Russia, to develop her heavy industries and lay the foundation of future development and in so doing put Russia in a position to protect herself in case of war.

In order to accomplish this gigantic task, Russia had still another battlefield on which to wage war; the field of education.

The illiteracy of the masses must be wiped out. The leaders realized that it would be almost impossible to eradicate the old bourgeois traditions and habits of the older people, but the older generation will not last. While it does, it will have to operate as it has always worked, in low gear. A new generation is coming with flying banners. So the Soviets have given a larger practical place to the youth in their scheme of things than any other nation. Perhaps the most powerful instrument of the Soviet is the school. The Soviet State is out to gain the allegiance of its youth. Alongside its technical schools, high schools and general universities, to which all elements of the population are admitted, it encourages and aids in the establishment of specific proletarian schools to which none but wage earners and peasants are admitted. Such proletarian schools are known as the Rafbac schools. The students in these receive their education free, and in addition get an allowance for support either from the government or from the trade-union which sent them. There are also separate workers' universities. In the latter, the students receive a general education in economics, sociology, history, all of course, from a Marxian point of view. Then there are the Communists party schools for party members exclusively. In these, pure communism is taught and the future administrators of communism are trained and developed.

Thus the minds of the young people are taken over by the government, softened, poured into molds to cool, then stamped and sealed, a communistic mental composition. The old gods of their fathers are being destroyed and new gods created. They are being
trained in certain attitudes about the rest of the world, a carefully developed combination of brotherhood for the proletarian workers of the world and hate for everything that savors of bourgeoisdom. To do this, the State keeps the schools, the press, and every organ of publicity, as books, theaters, radio and movies under its strict control and supervision. When the new generation arrives at its maturity, it will be thoroughly inoculated with the principles and aims of communistic life, a powerful asset in the building of a communist society. This new generation, trained up from youth in socialized co-operative habits will be expected to do right because they desire to do so. Industrial workers will gladly share with peasants and the farmers with the city workers. Together they will build a new earth in which no man will exploit his fellow men but all will share eagerly with each other.

Only one political party is permitted to exist in the Soviet Union. All must think politically as Communists. Not only is there but one set of political opinions; there is no other newspaper press but that of the Communists through which these views can be expressed. The worker may criticize the administration, union and party leaders through the Communist press in the form of letters to the editor. If it is consistent with Communist ideas, it is printed. All assemblies, demonstrations, speeches and avations are arranged by Communists. No individual or group is permitted to arrange a meeting of any kind. The right to think, to express ideas and to speak is confined to Communists.

The workers and peasants constitute the majority of the Russian nation, and it is the working classes whose interests the
the government claims to represent and serve.

As mothers and their children are the backbone of society the Soviet government gives them special care. The worker's wife, receives two months of rest from work and full pay before the birth of her child. After the child is born, she remains two weeks in the hospital, with nurses and doctors at her disposal, all at the expense of the government. Upon leaving the hospital she receives a sum for the layette and is granted two more months of rest with full pay. The next nine months she receives twenty-five per cent extra on her wages to cover the expense of child-nursing. In many of the factories there are special nurseries where children are taken care of while the mother works. Health stations have been distributed throughout the industrial sections of Russia, where the latest information on child hygiene, nutrition and training are available to mothers.

Workers are engaged either through the State Labor Exchange or directly by the factory administration. Friends and relatives of the factory administration and of Union and Communist Party leaders secure employment directly, while a worker without friends or relatives in factory official circles must wait his turn at the State Labor Exchange.

Workers securing responsible positions must answer several questionnaires, which include details regarding the applicant's family for two previous generations, his social, economic and political status, property, military services and ranks and his connection with the old regime.

Wages, hours and working conditions are regulated by the
collective agreement concluded between the factory administration and the industrial labor union. The soviet worker must abide by these conditions and cannot conclude any other arrangement with the employer. If the worker does not join the union, he is not permitted to work in a Soviet State industry.

Every worker is insured. The industry pays approximately ten percent of the total payroll to the social insurance department, and the worker or his family receives aid in case of illness, accident, unemployment or death. Medical attendance is free, but the doctors and hospitals are under government control, and so the worker must accept whatever service is given him without being able to choose his own doctor or his own hospital.

The workers' wage lies somewhere near seventy rubles ($5) a month. According to official figures, the average monthly wages of workers covered by social insurance in 1929 was 69.7 rubles. This is a small amount in view of the high price level in Soviet Russia, but there should be added the value of the services which the worker gets free of charge. It is reckoned that from a fifth to a third of the amount of the workers' wage is given him in the form of social insurance premiums, with the result that whatever sickness or other misfortune he may meet in the course of his life is covered. The worker has little to fear from unemployment, because every man or woman in Soviet Russia who can handle a tool is reasonably sure of a job; if by chance, unemployment should come, the unemployment fund will care for him.

Under these social insurance arrangements, savings are
are not necessary and the Soviet worker usually wastes his money.

Though the Communists are still far from their goal of a free, equal, classless society, they have certainly wrought a tremendous work; they have churned Russia up from the very lowest depths and their influence has been felt in every village. The old order has gone for good, new ideas and relationships and a genuine sense for discipline and order has been created.

"Progress is being made. But the country was so very primitive and backward that almost any progress is like introducing a candle light into an absolutely dark room. The light seems very radiant against the previous darkness. But it is a long way from a candle to the tungsten light."

To-day Russia is an industrial nation; she has a heavy industry and while she did not achieve the goal set in the Plan, she has laid a good foundation upon which to build and need not fear war, blockade not international boycott any longer. Private business has been snuffed out, the State is master of all economic activity with about twenty percent of the land still in the hands of private individuals.

Collectivization has been successful, about three fifths of the peasantry have joined them and the process still goes on.

Has the economic policy of the Soviet Government followed Marx's doctrines? First, the leaders attempted to establish communism. They abolished all private business, nationalized all the means of production and established the Soviet form of government under

the dictatorship of the Communist Party, members of the proletariat and occupying the economic key positions in the new State. From the economic point of view, this proved to be disastrous, although it was an attempt to carry out Marx's theories. Lenin felt this failure was due to the fact that Russia was not sufficiently industrialized, so the New Economic Policy was introduced to restore the industries of the country. Russia was such a backward country, her people lacked the discipline and organization which a highly developed industrial society would have established. Thus this new policy was not a surrender to capitalism; it was only intended as a transition step from petty bourgeois capitalism to socialism. This idea of building up socialism in a comparatively backward proletarian state through a transitional step of State Capitalism was thought of by Marx and Engels, but neither one had put the idea into a definite plan. This was Lenin's contribution to Marxism. It is one thing to write theories in a book and quite another thing to put these theories into actual practice. So when Lenin tried to carry out Marx's theories, certain peculiar situations and practical difficulties arose, which had not been foreseen by Marx. Hence new principles had to be formulated that would still be conformable to the spirit of Marxism. Thus Lenin made most of these contributions which have made it possible to carry out the doctrines of Marx into actual practice.

Likewise, Marx had a theory concerning the introduction of State Capitalism as a part of the economic system of the new State, but, here, again, did not present such a plan in detail. Marx had not foreseen that if a proletarian revolution should succeed in a country industrially backward like Russia that a transitional step of State Capitalism might be necessary.
The concrete forms of State Capitalism were three in number. First, there were the concessions, with which the government strengthened the large production against the small, the advanced against the backward, the machine against hand production. Private trade was allowed to exist, in open competition with the State industries, but was subject to a great deal of government regulation and thus the State industries tended to increase their production while private trade steadily diminished.

Second, there were the Co-operative Societies, through which the government hoped to develop a spirit of co-operation and link up industry with agriculture. These, too, had certain rights and privileges.

The role of the co-operatives was two fold; first, as middlemen distributors; second, as organizers and technical assistants. In the first role, the co-operatives watched the collective farm market and when there was a surplus of grain, meat, or perishable vegetables, they bought the surplus supplies and stored them for sale in slack seasons. The co-operatives also signed contracts with the collective farms for the delivery of staple products, as potatoes, carrots, cabbages, etc., and acted as distributors of these goods as well as those supplied by the state.

In their role as organizers of trade, the co-operatives did not regulate the activities of the collective, but assisted them in developing trade, in locating and equipping stores and stalls, in improving methods of carrying on trade. They also co-operated with the local Soviets in the organization of cultural services for the peasants trading in the towns and in the develop-
ment of an adequate supply of consumers' goods to cover the increasing demands of the peasants and collectives.

A third form of State Capitalism was one in which the State paid merchants a definite commission for selling state products and for buying products of small industries. Or, the State might lease a factory or land to a capitalist.

All three of these forms showed that the country could not dispense with the incentive afforded by private ownership and that private enterprise was still necessary during this transition period. However, the Bolsheviks did not consider these measures as a recrudescence of private trade, but a new form of socialized trade.

Existing along with State Capitalism are some examples of Socialism. According to the Land Decree, "The right of private ownership of land is abolished forever. Land cannot be sold, bought, leased, mortgaged, or alienated in any manner whatsoever. All lands, state, appanage, cabinet, monastery, church, entail, private, communal, peasant and any other lands—pass to the nation without indemnification and are turned over for the use of those who till them." Not only land but natural resources, railroads, transportation, factories and other means of production were nationalized.

The New Economic Policy did not abandon this, but simply exempted certain small enterprises or restored them to their former owners. According to Trotsky, the actual extent of socialization at the end of 1925 was as follows; the government owned all the land, all the railroads, four percent of the means of agricultural production, over sixty percent of the capital funds,

eighty-nine percent of the means of industrial production, (supplying seventy-nine percent of the total industrial production) controlled seventy percent of the total domestic trade and co-operative societies, the total trade and the entire credit system.

A second form of socialism, the National Planning and co-ordination of production, is implied in communism since the latter requires the socialization of all means of production. Under this system, the economic needs of the country are accurately estimated and the available land, labor and capital carefully apportioned, so that just that quantity of each kind of goods that are required will be produced. Duplication of plants and the excessive production of particular goods will be avoided. This will eliminate the expense of advertising and competitive selling and will suspend the production of goods that are harmful to the consumer. Products will be better distributed, the wasteful and luxurious expenditures of the rich will be prevented and all people will receive the goods needed to maintain life and comfort. This Planning Board keeps its fingers on all the strings, watches the schedules, easing up here, stiffening programs there as experience and circumstance suggest.

The history of Russia since 1917 has not been one single progressive, constructive effort. Quite the opposite. There have been three distinct, convulsive changes in the method of living, while the body of men in control have remained practically the same.

The first phase lasted from 1917 to 1921. There was a real attempt then to bring Communism into being, to live on

terms of equality in mutual service. This failed in the face of a bad harvest, civil war and intense foreign antagonism.

In 1921, Lenin's New Economic Policy took the place of Communism; it was no longer a Communistic system; it was a collective system, state socialism. One cannot say this failed, the standard of production increased, great prosperity came back to Russia.

Suddenly in 1927, Russia gave up its policy of concessions and proclaimed the Five Year Plan, which is not all Communism like the first nor a band of collectivism and restrained individualism like the second, but an attempt to construct a vast modern state capitalism on scientific lines. To-day State Capitalism exists along side of socialism in the proletarian state of Russia; it intends to snuff out private and petty bourgeois capitalism and serve as a bridge to full socialism. Since it is only serving as a transitional stage on the road to socialism it is an extension of Marx's theory to fit actual conditions.

Thus, the "Russian revolution, in the hands of its supreme architects, Lenin and Trotsky, has been the detailed fulfillment consciously planned and executed of Marx's doctrine and Marx's strategy."

IV. Critique of Communism.

What Have the Bolsheviks Accomplished.

The revolution of 1719 "whirled across the lives of the hundred and forty million; and it affected them as individuals. To some it has brought tragedy, darkness; to others it has meant the dawn of a fairer day; but on no two individuals have the results been the same. The complete story of the results of the revolution on the Russian people will be written, but not in our time; when it is written it will not emphasize data on credits, factory production, or raw materials. The truth about changes in human lives, beliefs and aspirations does not lie at the bottom of a sea of statistics."

However there are certain economic achievements that are worth noting. The Five Year Plan has practically wiped out private trade; industry, wholesale trade, retail trade with the exception of the bazaars, are all in the hands of the State. Gigantic enterprises have been created, such as the tractor plants of Kharkov and Stalingrad, the Amo automobile factory at Moscow, the Ford plant at Nizhni Novgorod, the Dnieprostroy hydro-electric plant, the mammoth steel plants at Magnitogorsk and Kuznetski, the network of machine shops and chemical plants and other industries. Russia has become an industrial nation.

Furthermore Russia has led the way to a planned economy. The plan discards the ambitions, ideals and preferences of the in-

individual, he is only a small unit of the mass. The important thing is the welfare of the people. The Plan "is the lifeblood of everything and everybody. Everything you do is part of the Plan. You dig a ditch, you plant potatoes, you heave bricks, it is all the result of the Plan. . . . The Plan has become an incentive and a triumph and supplies a stimulus that is not unlike that of profit in an individualistic society."

The people have been trained and disciplined to hard and regular labor. Everybody works and nobody is rich. The old class distinctions are gone, but new ones have emerged. Self-criticism is incessant, but the censorship of reading, writing, and speaking is rigid. The army is a huge and efficient war machine, but is made to work for its living. No one may amass wealth, yet the whole country is a thrill with the urge to produce.

"The discovery of the machine and contact with it, then, are changing Russian mentality. . . . Schools are springing up by the hundreds all over the country with the special task of training students in the use of the machine. Books, posters, pamphlets, charts in millions are pouring out of the press, to help in the process. All the Russian public schools have been polytechnicalized. . . . All this is to develop mechanical mindedness and to prepare the reserve of skilled workers that the factories so desperately need. And in the process, the Russian, too, is changing. He is becoming more disciplined, more sophisticated, but at the same time more restless. . . . So whatever the statistical results of the Plan, its moral effect is of immeasurable consequence."

2. Ibid.
Russia has made the first great experiment in co-operative agriculture. "In my judgment, collectivization, for Russia, is a good agricultural system. It eliminates a great deal of the waste inseparable from individual holdings there; waste of seed, labor and animal energy. It brings a power to mechanize, energize and improve Russian farming which the individual landholding system never possessed. Under proper management it would sweep away worn out methods and worn out conceptions. It is capable of raising the fertility of the soil to an extent unattainable under ordinary Russian conditions."... The fault is not in the system, but in the reckless way in which the Bolsheviks have managed it.

The Five Year Plan has ended, "with the cultural standard of the Russian masses higher than it has ever been before but with the standard of living lower than it has been for a decade, and, so far as food is concerned, appreciably lower than it was at the beginning of the Plan. Cruel indeed is the price that Russia has had to pay for the first Five Year Plan. It has been a time of incalculable privation and sacrifice. But she has laid the foundations for future development, and what is infinitely more important from her point of view, she has strengthened prodigiously her fighting capacity......... Her main task at present is to raise the standard of living of the masses."

The goal of the Bolsheviks is a state characterized by the basic means of production and distribution under the collective will. There will be no classes, only one society of


2. Ibid.
producers. There will be no great state power but free associations of workers. Peasants and city workers will work together hand in hand. "When labor has become not only a means of living, but itself the first necessity of life; when, along with the all-round development of individuals, the productive forces too have grown, and all the springs of social wealth are flowing more freely—it is only at that stage that it will be possible to pass completely beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois rights, and for society to inscribe on its banners; from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs."

Thus the Bolsheviks have attempted to put into practice the early theories of Marx. Their practice often has contradicted his principles; it could not be otherwise; even in physical sciences no theoretical formula can be applied with a hundred percent accuracy. New principles had to be formulated to fit practical considerations, extensions or refinements of Marx's doctrines. Since all these were championed by Lenin or worked out by him, they have been called by the term, Leninism or Marxism brought up to date.

Russia, then, has built the outlines of a new economic society. A real spiritual liberation has followed the revolution. Communism is not free from intellectual error, it is dogmatic and blind, but it is also a spiritual force, for it holds up the ideal of economic liberty and equality. Mr. Durant says that Russia's Communism will pass away because it is superior to human capacity, "even her socialism will pass away, if it means state ownership and operation of the 1. Marx, cited in Lenin, State and Revolution, p. 79."
major means of production. But so far as Russia keeps out of the 
wreckage of theory, government ownership of raw materials and 
transport, and governmental control of credit and foreign trade, 
she will have, despite poverty, despotism and suffering of every 
kind, a social order which will represent a Hegelian synthesis 
of individualism and socialism, a compromise which one nation 
after another will accept. . . . For how else can the world keep 
production going than by appealing to individual ambition? And 
how else can it check individual greed than by owning the mineral resources of the soil and laying a regulating hand upon trans-
port and finance? Mr. Durant believes that "it will turn out in 
the end that it was for this modest and reasonable Utopia that 
Russia sweated and bled."

"Truth is like a steel ingot placed in the sun. It stands 
solid, no matter what the heat of the day, while error and fallacy 
are like the cake of ice in the sun; it will surely melt. This is 
a small world and the inter-play of ideas is certain to go on. 
Indeed, we must frankly face the fact that the Russian experiment 
constitutes a challenge to our whole social order. Such unsound 
ideas as are current in Russia to-day, whether in regard to poli-
tical economy, social organization, religion, or whatever else, 
will inevitably suffer the fate of all flat (fiat) currency, and 
the solid gold of the tried and tested experience of mankind 
will sooner or later assert itself. We may learn something from 
Russia; she should learn much from us."

1. Durant, The Soul of Russia Under Socialism, Saturday Eve. Post, 
Dec. 24, 1932, p. 34.


2. Kellock, Soviet Five Year Plan, Institute of Politics, Williams-
town, Mass., Aug. 1, 2, 1930.
Thus the revolution of 1917 was not a revolution to get something; it was a revolution to get rid of something. It was a great wave of indignation and despair to be free of despotism and oppression. Lenin and his followers were convinced that the theories of Marx and Engels, originally a theory of history and economics, could be transformed into a living and powerful force which would lift the people of Russia and all mankind one step forward into history. The revolution of the past thirteen years has been a demonstration of this belief.

It was a proletarian revolution, as well as a social, political and economical upheaval. The bourgeois state was overturned by the proletariat with the help of the peasantry, and the new state was organized on the soviet plan under the dictatorship of the Communist Party, a party of the proletariat.

The purpose back of the revolution was to build a state of collectively owned and managed production and distribution in which there should be no exploitation of man by man. This was the accepted purpose of the Communist Party and it has never changed since that time.

However the history of Russia since 1917 has not been one single, progressive, constructive effort; but three distinct changes; three revolutions in method, while the body of men in control have remained practically the same.

Lenin's first policy of attempting to bring Communism into being at once, to live on terms of equality in mutual ser-
vice, proved a failure. The fact that Russia was predominantly an agricultural country, made it difficult to put Marx's economic theories into practice, for Marx had envisaged the establishment of socialism as evolving out of a highly industrialized society.

So the New Economic Policy aimed to restore the depleted industries and bring them back to the pre-war standard. This proved successful. However, there were still the great multitude of peasants to be considered. They must be won over into the army of the proletariat; otherwise a socialistic state could never be established. The Five-Year Plan was launched by Stalin in 1928; this aimed to uproot the peasant, rid him of his medieval methods and make him a worker on the collective farm. The collective movement, too, has been successful, but has brought with it many serious problems, chief of which is the finding of men with sufficient training and ability to direct these co-operative farms. Few peasants have had adequate experience.

The present stage of revolutionary development is characterized by "the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", meaning that the proletariat exercises its authority through the Communist Party. The latter directs the economic organization and does not hesitate to make decisions contrary to the immediate interests and wishes of the proletariat if it is necessary to carry out a policy which the party is convinced will translate Marxian socialism into practice.
The existing system of wage payment providing a differential for skill, responsibility, and productivity, is a grudging recognition of the necessity for the present, at least, of some selfish reward as an inducement to most workers to produce according to their ability. However the economic system of Soviet Russia as a whole to-day is predominantly socialistic and conforms more and more to the theoretical system of Marx from day to day.

It is very difficult to discover differences between original Marxism (in sense of Marxism of Marx and Engels) and modern communism. If very closely scrutinized, one finds slight deviations or extensions. The idea of proletarian dictatorship is a fundamental tenet of original Marxism, but the dominant role of a Communist Party in such a dictatorship is an extension of early Marxism, because dictatorship without a strong party in a country like Russia would be impossible in practice.

Thus the system of Marx and Engels and that of the modern communist leaders, especially Lenin, form a single system.

"For the first time in history, capitalism is enduring a period of sharp economic discomfort while a socialistic system exists alongside it. Socialism is no longer in the realm of theory, no longer only a philosophy and a hope; whether for good or evil, it is an actuality."

1Hoover, Calvin B., Socialism in Practise, Current History, July, 1931, p. 504.
The revolution or transformation of an industrial nation into a communist state still goes on in Russia. To-day Säte Capitalism exists along side of socialism. Step by step the new order continues; Russia has shaken off the old regime; whether or not she reaches her goal of complete socialism remains to be seen.
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