

## **Communism and Political Terror: Trotskyism, Stalinism and the West in Revisionist Perspective**

Matthew Raphael Johnson  
Johnstown, PA

In Russia before World War I, there was little support for revolution. Russia since the time of Tsar Alexander III had the most progressive labor legislation in the world. Foreign capital, not Russian, dominated the small Russian bourgeoisie and was not trusted by St. Petersburg. Peasants before World War I owned almost 95% of the land, and more were emigrating to the lush parts of southern Siberia where the government offered free land and tools. Third, the peasants were taking advantage of the state peasant bank that offered free loans and training for all peasants and communes (Goulevitch, 1962)

Russian taxes were the lowest in the world (per capita), and Russia was almost totally self sufficient in everything it needed. There was no real “nobility” in 1914, since the remnants of that older class were in such debt that they could not function. It is also true that nobles were the least likely to support the crown, contrary to long standing prejudice. The nationalist Union of the Russian People (the Black Hundreds) had a membership of 600,000 despite the open condemnation of Sergei Witte and the condemnation of the state. The Union demanded free education and the expropriation of all remaining noble land.<sup>1</sup> Again, this is contrary to long standing myth. Industrial growth was averaging about 15% a year since 1861, and the wages of labor were also going up rapidly (Goulevitch, 1962)

Under Alexander III, the revolutionaries of all stripes were in despair. Revolution was not coming to Russia as laboring incomes continued to skyrocket, especially when the cost of living was taken into consideration. Russian prices remained very low while she enjoyed a huge trade surplus. On what basis could a revolution take place, let alone a Bolshevik one? Fortune favored the Bolsheviks with Russia's entry into World War I, an entry that was opposed by large portions of the Russian right (Goulevitch, 1962 and Mironov, 2010). In a statement that is both simple and correct – itself a rarity – had there been no Great War, there would have been no revolution.<sup>2</sup>

What is the point of writing yet another paper on the Red Revolution, Trotsky or Stalin? The point is to explicate several fairly radical, inter-related and revisionist ideas that my name has now become forever attached: in the broadest strokes, these theses are:

1. The Bolsheviks never cared about “labor” in the sense that “labor” refers to the working people of the empire. The Bolsheviks defined “labor” so broadly that it became meaningless. They did not believe it themselves. The Bolsheviks held “labor,” defined above, in utter contempt.
2. The purpose of the revolution was to use ideology to cover over a radical idea: that

---

1 The Union of the Russian People had an agenda far more radical than what the state desired. The “state” is amorphous, since it could mean, after 1905, the Duma, the royal administration, the bureaucracy, the State Council or the elite of Petrograd in general.

2 For a rigorous statistical analysis of the above claims, consult, Mironov, BN (1999) *New Approaches to Old Problems: The Well-Being of the Population of Russia from 1821 to 1910 as Measured by Physical Stature*. *Slavic Review*, 58(1), 1-26 and Mironov, BN (2010) *Wages and Prices in Imperial Russia, 1703-1913*. *Russian Review*, 69(1), 47-72

the Red state, backed by extreme violence and terror, papered over by slogans, was nothing more than a transmission belt delivering all productive capital into the hands of the new ruling clique. Despite their name, the Bolsheviks were a tiny, urban group of intellectuals who had no ties with the people they were soon to rape and cared little for this fact.

3. The methods by which this belt was to operate were not controversial. Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin were of one mind on all things, until the Jewish question, personified by Trotsky, became explicit. This by no means requires a belief in Stalin's "antisemitism." it remained a capital crime in the USSR under his rule. The Old Bolsheviks, almost exclusively Jewish, were the target, not Jews as such, who were a privileged group in the "new Russia."
4. Nationalism of all sorts was banned throughout Soviet history. Western "accusations" of this new-Soviet crime are absurd exaggerations. Several examples of what western academics think "nationalism" is will be shown below.
5. Given the above, the USA was never anti-Bolshevik (even to the extent that the western ruling class had any idea what "Bolshevism" was). Almost every early condemnation of the "Reds" was based on them "acting like Tsars." This was the main line of criticism. It was a rare find to discover an American that had any idea what "Leninism" was to any great extent.
6. The USA built the Soviet Union, along with the major western powers, even during their own Depression.

Striking to this author is the weak links by which authors have tried to turn Stalin into a "rightist." That Stalin was backing an egalitarian agenda sits uncomfortably with the typical leftist university professor, so the agenda was hatched some time ago. Authors such as Nicholas Timasheff, Frederick C. Barghoorn, Zvi Gitelman and Roman Szporluk have made the argument that Stalin was a "typical Russian nationalist" in various ways. The arguments are very weak. First of all, to connect any reference to "Soviet Patriotism" to Russia in any way is bizarre. It would be like connecting Napoleon III to Louis IX. One came on the corpse of the other. Secondly, there can be no Russian nationalism without the church. She sits at the center of all Russian culture and all that makes this form of nationalism what it is. Since this was not part of the agenda in the USSR, it is a parody. The worst one, almost an open mockery of history, is that of Jewish activist in the Bund, MI Lieber (Goldman), who, suspicious of Lenin's lack of solid Jewish roots, saw him as a "neo-Slavophile" (Kara-Murzha, 2011: lec XIX).<sup>3</sup>

Third, having a good thing to say about a tsar once in a while does not make the speaker a monarchist. Stalin stated:

I want to say a few words which may not seem too festive. The Russian tsars did much that was bad. They robbed and enslaved the people. They led wars and seized territory in the interests of the landowners. But they did do one good thing – they put together an enormous state stretching out to Kamchatka. We inherited this state. We Bolsheviks were the first to put together and strengthen this state not in the interests of the landowners and capitalists, but for the toilers and for all the great peoples who make up this state (quoted from David Brandenberger, 22).

---

3 Cited from Kara-Murza, "Crisis Civics" Volume I, Lecture 19 on the Russian Civil War (pt I), 384-410. Cited in the Bibliography as С.Г. Кара-Мурза (2011). Кризисное обществоведение. Часть первая. Москва: Научный эксперт (all Russian translations mine). He also shares this author's distaste of the "left-revisionist" views on Stalin and cites the same list of authors above that this paper does.

This is supposed to be one of the proof texts that Stalin was resurrecting the “tsarist past.” It is clearly no such thing, and re-emphasizes the Party's hatred of the royal office. Peter I was a self-described revolutionary that bulldozed the church wherever he can. Making positive reference to him proves only the point being made here. Fourth, proof of “Russocentrism” is supposed to be discovered in mentions of pre-revolutionary writers like Pushkin, references to Peter I and other such nonsense. Even titling an official school text “A History of the People's of Russia” is sufficient to convince the alienated dons of Stalin's nationalism (Zalampas, 1993).<sup>4</sup>

Lenin's statement to the *New York Herald* in 1922 that

those who intend to offer humiliating terms to the Russian delegation at Genoa are deeply mistaken. Russia will not allow herself to be treated as a vanquished country. If the bourgeois governments try to adopt such a tone towards Russia they will be committing the greatest folly (Lenin, 1922).

This sounds terribly nationalist and yet, no one uses this to show that Lenin was resurrecting the cult of Ivan IV. He is a “Soviet Patriot” now that he has power and as such, he will use the appropriate language. The motive, however, is clear: awful men of history must have been on the “right of the spectrum” to use a contemporary distorting label. It also shows how readily the left, even its academics, believes and utilizes poor arguments when their ideological interests are at stake.

#### Stalinism and Industrialization

Marx's students, Lenin and Stalin, however, used terror and violence for two purposes, a) for the sake of gaining and maintaining power in a time of chaos, and b) to manifest the communist concept of power by destroying enemies and creating structures such as central planning, re-education camps and total party dominance over politics and all life. The tsarist “Okhrana” the very small police service used against the occasional revolutionary, had about 1,000 people in exile in 1900, most escaped. Only a handful were at hard labor. Seems quite weak given the tens of thousands killed by leftist terrorists at that time. By the end of the Civil War, the Cheka had 250,000 already behind bars (Prefobrzhensky, 1977).

Stalin is not just the fulfillment of Marx and Lenin, but of modernity more generally. Joseph Stalin is the world's most violent dictator. He ruled the USSR through the traumatic 1930s and the reconstruction project of the late 1940s. Dying in 1953, his influence will be discussed for the rest of Russia's earthly existence. No paper can deal with the literature on Stalin, regardless of the length or obsessive qualities of the researcher. No research on such a person could ever be totally objective.

It is often said that his industrialization of the USSR was a triumph. The industrialization of the tsars was not. However, it is questionable whether industrialization is ever a triumph. The sacrifice of men, labor and international conquest needs to be taken into account and found to be worth the later conveniences of such a project. Labor was better off in 1900 than they ever were under the commissars by almost every imaginable measure.

An area of interest little discussed is the US investment in the Soviet system. US credit, loans and technical expertise was at the root of every facet of Stalin's industrialization project. What began as a tiny group of cranks became a global empire due to American and western European assistance. The very concept of the “Cold War” needs to be reconsidered (Clark and Bahry, 1983)<sup>5</sup>

---

4 Zalampas' work is very useful since it shows in striking relief the grounds upon which the US ruling class opposed the USSR. It was almost exclusively as “Russia” and all the Mongol-like associations it conjured.

5 For the western creation of the “workers paradise,” see Sutton, 1968, 1971, 1973. The present author has a

The simple fact was that the Bolshevik Party was always struggling to maintain unity. Stalin's own “organic” view of the party was that unanimity was the most important quality of socialist leadership. Eric van Ree writes in a little known article on Stalin's political theory:

In his speeches and articles in 1923 and 1924, Stalin consistently argued that the party should be considered as a living organism. In what amounted to a rudimentary theory, Stalin believed that the party had an inner division of labor, the most important of which being the differentiation between rulers and ruled, the apparatus and the members. Despite this stratification the party should act as a united 'whole.' Its 'weldedness' and 'closedness' were achieved by 'self-activity,' the participation of all members in party work and discussions on policy. Only thus could the ranks truly be tied to the common purpose. Thus the party lives. But discussion must contribute to 'unity' only; hostility toward the apparatus was unacceptable. Discussion, moreover, had to result in unambiguity—in one common will among all members—for the party was an organism that had only one will (Ree, 1993: 54).

Nothing here is different from Lenin. In fact, it sounds a bit like Miss Rosenberg's criticism of Lenin's “hyper-centralism.” Lenin writes:

The force of habit in millions and tens of millions is a most formidable force. Without a party of iron that has been tempered in the struggle, a party enjoying the confidence of all honest people in the class in question, a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, such a struggle cannot be waged successfully (Lenin, 1999: 49).

Again, Lenin is not referring to the working class. He's referring to his political allies. In his definition, Jacob Schiff, millionaire financier of the Bolshevik movement, was “working class.” For both Lenin and Trotsky, “workers” did not refer to the real men in the factories. Most of the time, they loathed and feared them and labor responded accordingly. Rather, it was a mystical justification of the “party” that was to mold cadres that were to support the centralization of production and the destruction of religion. Then would they become “workers.”

Trotsky states, pulling no punches,

One method consists of taking over the thinking for the proletariat, i.e., political substitution for the proletariat; the other consists of political education of the proletariat, its political mobilization, to exercise concerted pressure on the will of all political groups and parties (quoted from Seymour, 1978).

The only problem is that they are both identical. Education is identical, especially in the context of the times, of creating an artificial “unity” through terror. Lenin says in “One Step Forward” that “The Party, as the vanguard of the working class, must not be confused, after all, with the entire class.” This is the nature of Rosenberg's criticism. Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin again, did not disagree.

Trotsky says in his *Terrorism and Communism* on the party:

---

lengthy paper detailing the massive level of capitalist investment in the USSR, the full understanding of which should radically alter how the 20<sup>th</sup> century is seen. Sutton (1973a) also details the transfer of sensitive military equipment to the USSR during the odd “Cold War.” Also

The exclusive role of the Communist Party under the conditions of a victorious proletarian revolution is quite comprehensible. The question is of the dictatorship of a class. In the composition of that class there enter various elements, heterogeneous moods, different levels of development. Yet the dictatorship presupposes unity of will, unity of direction, unity of action. By what other path then can it be attained? The revolutionary supremacy of the proletariat presupposes within the proletariat itself the political supremacy of a party, with a clear program of action and a faultless internal discipline (Trotsky, 1920, ch 7).

This is as harsh and centralizing as anything Stalin ever said. Endless citations to this effect can be brought out. The attempt to distinguish the three founders of the USSR must have another source and origin, since facts, theory or policy cannot account for them.

Lenin purged the party quite often, though not as spectacularly as Stalin. He states this clearly in his (1922) "Dual Subordination and Legality." He writes in 1922:

I come to the categorical conclusion that precisely at this moment we must give battle to the Black Hundred clergy in the most decisive and merciless manner and crush its resistance with such brutality that it will not forget it for decades to come. The greater the number of representatives of the reactionary clergy and reactionary bourgeoisie we succeed in executing for this reason, the better (from Pipes, 1996: 152-154).

Quoting Lenin from 1905 is useless. Only when he has political power can his understanding of the party or terrorism be understood. Lenin's constant complaining that he lacks the men to accomplish his will shows that he was working with a state that was only barely forming.

Stalin is not known as a theoretician, but as a ruthless politician. The same can be said for Trotsky and Lenin. Lenin was just better educated. Theory for Stalin was a means of justifying policies long in place. Lenin and Trotsky were no different. His "organic" theory of the party is of particular interest not because Stalin was converting to political Romanticism, but because this sort of "natural" and "organic" trope was the outward justification for his ruthless politics both within and without party circles. Stalin's concept of a unified party was the same as his view of his personal dominion. In other words, Stalin wanted a party that was totally subservient to his personal views on industrialization and relations with the west. Again, no communist who mattered disagreed.

As much as his policies involved excessive use of power, such as execution of perceived enemies, most of his policies led to the mechanization of the Soviet economic system. The real revolution was that the Soviet system, in cooperation with western capitalism, transformed Russia from an agrarian to an industrial economy. Socialism adopted the capitalist myth of linear progress based on this same development (Alexandrov is important here for manifesting the myth skillfully). However, Lenin, not Stalin, built the first concentration camp on the White Sea as early as 1918.

For every step in the direction of industrialization, the human sacrifice was great. This of course, is not unique to the USSR, though it is in terms of scale. The very fact that one can say Stalin "improved" the condition of the Soviet union is itself a problem, since there is no clear argument that moving away from the "backward" agricultural life does anything but increase the misery and regimentation of the population as a whole. The additional fact that much of the money and expertise in the development of heavy industry was American and European, also challenges the myth. The fact that Hitler did the same in Germany after the

hated Versailles treaty hurled him to power should be taken more seriously. Hitler and Stalin were similar in this respect: they both equated national success and prestige with a) a centralized state and b) an obsession with transferring labor from the farm to the factory (cf. Meek, entire). Even more significantly, both ideologies were based on the Darwinian notion that economic entities remain in contention, and that which system or firm can adapt the more rationally and quickly is justified in destroying the competition.

This industrialization did not lead to greater incomes. In fact, the USSR never achieved the rates of growth registered in the late imperial era, nor its pre-war advanced labor legislation. Using 1920 as a baseline (ie 100%), real economic growth in the USSR is greatly uneven. In 1937, the Soviet GDP was 86% of 1920. Due to the war, it had fell to about 50% in 1946, but the war is not the only cause. In 1940, it was 78% of the 1920 economy. Only in 1954 is there anything above 1920, that year registering at 119%, almost all of this American (Sutton, 1973).

Industrialization permitted the Soviet elite to accumulate more power than ever before. Totalitarianism, in its strict definition, is only possible under modern industrialism. Heavy industry was significant since it led to the Soviet Union being named as the world's second largest economy not long after the Second World War. This empowered the USSR to eventually manipulate hapless and cynical western politicians into permitting his absorption of eastern Europe. The US, ultimately, entered World War II to make the world safe for Soviet totalitarianism.

In early 1927, there was a critical shortage of grains in the Soviet Union. Stalin's endless abuse of the Russian and Ukrainian peasant destroyed Russia's agriculture. In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, tsarist Russia was feeding the world, and had become not only one of the world's most significant economic powers, but also showed the possibility of total autarky. Famine was caused, in the final analysis, by the deliberate funneling of all resources into industry. The peasantry were sacrificed for this New Atlantis. Stalin used "natural" disasters to destroy what he considered to be his main problem: Ukrainian nationalism, especially since its mentality was peasant-based. Yet again, western capitalism came to the rescue and granted both free and purchased grain to the "enemy."

It is a mistake to say that "Americans feared Bolshevism" or some other such meaningless nonsense. Very few Americans, including in history departments, had any idea what "Bolshevism" was. There were almost no Russian language programs in the US until the 1950s and later. Russia was and is a black spot on the knowledge of western intellectuals. Little has changed.

### The Psychology of Power: Stalin and Communist Ideology in Tucker, Trotsky and Coombs

Normally, Stalin accomplished his justification of terror through a pathological deformation of historical fact, especially when it comes to his supposed closeness to Lenin. In general, Trotsky argues that Stalin was a neurotic personality that saw power as a good in itself. That Marxism was an expedient vehicle for this is mere coincidence; any ideology would do. Therefore, Trotsky argues, it is Stalin's mind, not his policy, that deserves extended treatment.<sup>6</sup>

Tucker (1992) contends that to understand Stalin, his manifest mental illnesses should be the first step. Given the sheer size of Tucker's book, only a few areas can be summarized. Primarily, Stalin was a man obsessed. Power does not satisfy. The greater the power, the more enemies; the more enemies, the more power one requires. His obsessions were many, and

---

6 This paper will not succumb to the temptation of linking Trotsky to the exclusively Jewish "psychoanalytic" movement in Central Europe. It remains highly significant that he uses this movement to justify his otherwise anti-Freudian mentality. The "Frankfurt School" was Trotskyite, not post-War.

include the desire to be considered Lenin's moral compeer the desire to be seen as an intellectual, and the desire for the world to see the USSR as messianic (Tucker, 89-90; 170 and 560ff). The messianic idea revolves around Stalin being viewed as the "hero." The dictator portrayed himself heeding the popular cries of Russia, a woman in distress, and rescuing her through the sheer force of his will and the immense depth of his mind.

Tucker's real conclusion is that Stalin's mental state could be best described as a pathological self loathing that required constant flattery to maintain even a precarious balance (Tucker, 620ff). However, when reading Tucker, narcissism seems to be the proper diagnosis. Stalin had an inflated sense of importance, but one that was easily injured. Stalin's overarching obsession was that no one realize he had no right to power. Hence, masochism alternated with self-idealization.

Trotsky's biography, on the other hand, is an attempt to debunk the invented history Stalin was imposing on the country. Stalin claimed a far greater role in the events of 1917-1921 than history allows. Stalin, in Trotsky's mind, was a minor figure in the revolution and therefore, had no claim to be Lenin's successor. Trotsky states:

In what did Stalin's own theoretical work express itself? In nothing. All he did was to exploit his fellow-traveler theorists, in the interests of the new ruling caste. He will enter into the annals of the history of "thought" only as the organizer of the greatest school of falsification. . . Official "theory" is today transformed into a blank sheet of paper on which the unfortunate theoreticians reverently trace the contours of the Stalinist boot (Trotsky, 1937: int)

Tucker's analysis of Stalin's rise to power makes an essential distinction, one that should be used more in political biography: the difference between intelligence and cunning; the difference between rationality and deviousness. Stalin showed no intelligence, defined as the ability for sustained conceptual analysis. His writings were either plagiarized from Lenin or worthless. The same could be said for Trotsky as well.

Cunning and deviousness is a matter of animal instincts. Animals seem highly intelligent in the ways they hunt, but they are operating from instinct, not conceptual distinctions. In a telling statement that almost sums up the entire book: "Stalin's mental world was sharply split into trustworthy friends and villainous enemies—the former being those who affirmed his idealized self-concept, the latter, those who negated it. People around him were in greater peril than many realized of slipping from one category to another if they spoke or acted. . . in a manner that triggered his hostility (Tucker, 164).

In terms of more practical history, Tucker spills a huge amount of ink on the 17th Communist Party Congress of 1934. Lenin died in 1925, but Stalin had still not totally consolidated power. While most party members performed the proper homage, the voting for party secretary was not unanimous. About 120 votes were against him from of a plenum of 1,966. Kirov, a longtime Stalin ally, had electrified the party and seemed a possible competitor. Tucker holds that at this moment, something snapped. Stalin was never the same. Of the total plenum at this Congress, well over 1,000 were eventually sent to the forced-labor camps, as Khrushchev later announced (Tucker, 248). Stalin's reaction was to refuse to give a speech, since, coming after Kirov, this would have been more embarrassing.<sup>7</sup> Stalin demanded not just homage, but total unanimity which alone could satisfy his narcissism.<sup>8</sup>

Soon after, the purges began. He hired L. Beria, Yezhov and Nikita Khrushchev to run

---

7 Tucker adds that these numbers are open to dispute, since Stalin himself disposed of the "negative" votes. This might also explain the Kirov murder later on. Other than this meeting, Kirov was a lifelong ally of Stalin. Therefore, the argument that Stalin orchestrated his murder is based exclusively on this Congress.

8 Tucker is wrong. Stalin was remarkably consistent. Yet, his thesis remains worthwhile.

his security apparatus.<sup>9</sup> This meant that he rewarded devious rather than intelligent behavior. Party members were uneasy at such choices, and even uneasier at the developing cult of personality, where massive photos of Stalin, often depicted with Lenin, turned up everywhere (Tucker 262). In 1935, Stalin delivered a speech that was to kick off the entire purge movement. In it, he stated that “. . . it is impossible to build anything enduring with such human materials, composed of skeptics and critics. . .” (Tucker 266). He, of course, is referring to opposition within the party (Tucker, 253).

The heart of the book is in the process of Stalin's rise to absolute power. Stalin was already head of the party by 1929, but this was not sufficient. He needed a) a total purge of anyone suspected of disloyalty, b) to be sycophantically venerated and c) to remake the security system so as to root out anti-Stalin elements at all levels. The result was that the narcissistic personality that showed itself in the mid-20s turned into an all consuming colossus. Since the opposition was very rapidly decimated, all who were left realized that survival meant the most humiliating abasement in front of the Great Architect.<sup>10</sup>

Tucker interprets historical events as manifestations of different elements of narcissism, self-doubt, self-hatred and low self-esteem. The problem is that social forces and objective political requirements are not seen as autonomous, but functions of Stalin's illness. Stalin was not paranoid. His actions were deliberate and well considered. He did not believe in conspiracies against himself (Tucker, 59ff) He knew that his enemies were not “Nazis,” “Hitlerites,” “kulaks,” or “CIA stooges.” He did want to conceal his actions from the party, lest the scam be exposed. In Stalin's mind, it did not take long for excuses to turn into truths.

Little by way of political results are mentioned. The issues of Russia's industrialization, the destruction of the peasantry and the endless rebellions and famines are discussed, but not as autonomous events. While Tucker seeks to give a complete picture of Stalin in power, he gives policy as a set of images distorted by Stalin's preoccupations. Tucker's interesting analysis fails because there is no reason to see a difference between Stalin the violent revolutionary and Stalin the violent dictator. One might use psychological categories here with no problem, but not to justify any alleged “change” in his mentality.

In Richard Coombs' (2008) book on the USSR, he writes on Stalin:

This self-generated, doctrinally based “mega-imperative” to mobilize, intertwined with the ruthlessness and paranoia of Stalin’s personality, was the prime motivational force behind Stalin’s remarkable attempt to construct a totalitarian system in which essentially all resources, human and material, were marshaled to accomplish his goals. This grandiose conception of governance—Volkogonov has termed it “sacrificial socialism”—served as justification for perpetuation of a single, all-powerful political party, a centrally controlled “command” economy, forced collectivization of agriculture and resulting mass starvation, regimented industrialization, an extensive system of prison camps and forced labor, strict controls over mass media and information from abroad, and a pervasive system of regime informants and secret police (Coombs, 148)

Coombs is correct, and yet, he fails to see how this derives directly from the mechanistic view of the universe so important to the early Enlightenment and modern industry. To say that labor is “forced,” from the Soviet point of view, is nonsense since free

---

9 Beria and Yezhov were both Jews. The anti-Semitism charge against Stalin is largely mythic. His circle was usually top-heavy with those of Jewish background. Trotsky's real name was Bronstein. Usually, Stalin used his real name in speeches.

10 The list of Stalin's titles is almost humorous, including “The Great Genius” “The New Prometheus,” and the “Leader of the New Humanity.” There are hundreds of others.

will does not exist. All is mechanism, including the human brain and human culture. There is no coercion possible because, as Lev Shestov wrote many decades ago, nature itself is totally coercive, mechanical and necessary.

It is unfortunate that Coombs' work is marred by the trendy neo-conservative desire to connect Stalin with "the tsars." He argues that Stalin re-cast the Nicholevan "Orthodoxy-Autocracy-Nationality" idea within a materialist view. He writes in a shockingly absurd passage:

Stalin radically changed the content of the natural order described by Russian Orthodoxy and perpetuated by the Romanov dynasty. The pre- and post-1917 orthodoxies were mutually exclusive in substance, yet the functional notion of individual subordination to enlightened central authority, and the absolute nature of that authority's conception of the spiritual and political universe, were common to both (Coombs, 149).

The error here is on multiple levels. First, Coombs is (understandably) confused by the fact that the Petrine regime of total secularism and materialism was very similar to the pseudo-scientific mechanical and "Enlightened absolutist" theories of modernity. Absolutism is the creation of the Enlightenment designed to use state power to destroy the remnants of "superstition," which is another word for the belief in an extra-mundane universe (i.e. Christianity). This was the explicit desire of Peter I, the German oligarchy in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century and, worst of all, Catherine II. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century the Orthodox church was purged, its property secularized and its law openly mocked by Peter, Biron, Peter III, Catherine II and Alexander I. By the time Alexander III sought to rebuild this traditional authority, it was too late, since the elite had long since looked to London rather than Moscow for education.

Another level of error is that the state in Petersburg was large, but extremely weak. Nicholas I developed his "infamous Third Section" with a grand total of 16 employees. At the height of the revolutionary terror under Nicholas II, it had about 3500 employees. Its purpose was to monitor both the bureaucracy and the upper classes who had traditionally been the promoters of all things modern, western and leftist. The tsarist state was invisible to the average townsman or peasant, and the same Enlightenment that led Stalin on his rampages informed that of the Enlightened Absolutism of the 18<sup>th</sup> century which hollowed out the Church and, in its place, brought in western Masonry and liberalism.<sup>11</sup> About the only thing that did not have coercive authority was the Russian Orthodox Church, and the only institution that had no serious propaganda arm was the crown.

Worse, Coombs states: "Tsarist political culture—in the form of attitudes toward mobilization, plus conceptions of orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality—permeated and conditioned (to use Julian Towster's term) the entire Stalinist conception" (Coombs, 153). Now, much of this has already been flayed, but a factual error has appeared. There was no "tsarist political culture." Certainly, there was a "culture" of the urban elites, the Old Believers, the Cossacks and the peasants, but "tsarism" had no culture of its own under the Petrine Leviathan. That Peter openly called himself a revolutionary should give the historian a clue on why that might be. Prior to Peter one can certainly make such a claim, but the Petrine state did not physically move to the far north for fun. He was an extreme, occult revolutionary and did not hide this.

---

11 Peter I was initiated into the Lodge in Amsterdam during his Grand Tour. Most of the upper classes in Russia by the time of Alexander I had converted to some form of Masonry, as the Decembrist movement shows. Pavel Pestel's absolutist utopia was partly drafted by the Lodge of which he was a member, the *Les Slavs Reunis*. For the dominance of Masonry under the Petrine state, cf The Handbook of Russian Literature edited by Victor Terras, pg 156 (Yale University Press, 1985).

The final level of error is that the “tsar” did not rule. Beside the fact that “rule” did not mean the same in Old Russia as it did in the west, the bureaucracy that provoked Nicholas I's Third Section ruled the country in the name of the Tsar. The alienated bureaucrat, so ably mocked by Gogol and Dostoevsky, was the last group to show loyalty to the tsar and saw the state in Petrine, utilitarian terms. However, regardless of gaffes like this, Coombs' work is useful and shows the relation between Lenin and Stalin as a matter of degree.

#### Trotsky: The Ideologist of Stalin's Terror

Leon Trotsky, of course, seeks to argue that Stalin was an anomaly while failing to distinguish his views from Stalin's in even minor matters. Trotsky's own obsession with terror and his personal belief that he alone had the right to interpret Marx makes him anything but a reliable source. Trotsky, more specifically, wants to show that he and he alone, in the early years of the USSR, had exposed Stalin for what he became. With a flair for self-dramatization, Trotsky depicts himself as bravely standing up against the tyrant with no thought for his own well-being.

The basic argument in Trotsky's work is that Stalin operates as a parasite on the labor and investment of others. He accuses Stalin of total dictatorship, making alliances with the “bourgeoisie,” and “conciliating” with party enemies (cf Trotsky, 1937, esp ch 8). Terms such as “bourgeois” and “conciliation” have no stable meaning when used by Party members. The “bourgeois elements” in theoretical Marxism are the owners of capital. For Trotsky and Stalin, they refer to any opposition, including anarchists, socialists different from Bolsheviks, peasants, other Bolsheviks, most workers, most socialists, and clergy.

“Conciliation” was a term used by Trotsky and Stalin as a synonym for treason; it was about making alliances with non-communists. It was a catch-all term justifying the later liquidation of those thought to be political competitors. Therefore, his argument is strange and complex: Stalin is both too violent and too lenient; he is both a fanatic and a compromiser; he both attacks the bourgeoisie while representing it. It seems that Trotsky's aggravated state of mind is affecting his logic. His own evidence tries to prove both sides and as a result, fails entirely. Given the nature of the USSR, it stands to reason that factions would develop. The only real issue is who gets what slice of the economic pie the Russian and Ukrainian peasant worked to create.

Trotsky argues several things simultaneously: first, that the bureaucratization of the party is a distortion of Lenin's mentality and policy. Second, that this same process of regimentation destroyed the best minds in the party. Third, that the bureaucracy, a faceless machine, was the perfect vehicle for a narcissistic tyrant who both did and did not want to be associated with such violence while, finally, those who remained were flunkies, to be charitable (Trotsky, 1937, fwd). This author, for one, refuses to accept that Trotsky believes his own accusations.

Trotsky can make no claim to objectivity: he was a victim of Stalin who exiled him, ultimately to Mexico and eventually had him murdered. The most severe problem with Trotsky is that, as a man having no power or responsibility, criticism is easy. There is every reason to argue that Trotsky would not have done anything differently, nor Lenin. The fact is that Stalin had an operational bureaucracy ready for action, while Lenin did not. This is the primary difference between the two dictators. Trotsky's command of the Red Army during the Civil War showed him far more ruthless than Stalin, since he openly hated Russians and Ukrainians, workers or no.

Trotsky was as remorseless as Stalin. He saw “bourgeois elements” everywhere and retained a belligerent policy of liquidation of “class enemies.” Trotsky's speeches show an extremely violent approach to the creation of the USSR. All of the “Old Bolsheviks” were violent men, seeking the annihilation of their enemies. There is no reason to believe that any

of them would have proceeded differently from Stalin. This is Trotsky's fatal flaw.

Trotsky's speeches in 1917-1918, which he includes in his biography of Stalin, show a man with the exact same tendencies as his old nemesis. Trotsky shouts in a series of debates at a 1917 Congress of the Bolshevik Party:

[Our enemies] protest because they are bourgeois through and through in their psychology. They are incapable of applying any serious measures against the bourgeoisie. They are against us precisely because we are putting into effect drastic measures against the bourgeoisie. Nobody can tell now what harsh measures we may yet be compelled to apply. The sum total of what [our enemies] can contribute to our work is: vacillation. But vacillation in the struggle against our enemies will destroy our authority among the masses (Petrograd Sov, 1917).

In this paragraph, Trotsky builds his rhetoric: first it is “serious” measures, then “drastic measures” and finally “harsh measures” against his enemies. As his anger builds, so do his promises. This passage shows many things. First, that Trotsky had no problem playing the tyrant so long as “bourgeois” elements existed (which of course, is what Stalin used to justify his own measures). Second, that a bureaucracy was needed to destroy his opposition and third, that more “harsh measures” will be required in the future. This latter gives Trotsky the same “blank check” Stalin gave to himself. At this early stage, Trotsky was accusing Stalin of being too lenient with the opposition. His later accusations waiver from his being too harsh on the one hand, or using coercion against the wrong people for the wrong reason (Trotsky included), on the other.

Trotsky therefore undercuts his own argument. His biography is an ideological analysis of Stalin, arguing that his Leninism is weak. The nature of Trotsky's accusations shows a mind as unbalanced as Stalin's. His speeches are violent, with lurid representations of what is in store for “class enemies.” Later, he charges Stalin with “bureaucratization.” How did Trotsky propose to demolish the “class enemy” without a security administration?

Trotsky was equally as vicious as Stalin. He took peasant children and raised them as Red Army soldiers. He killed the families of those deserting to the Whites. His support of the worst forms of terror during the Civil War were not hidden from his readers. In a passage from his 1920 work on terrorism, he writes:

The severity of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia, let us point out here, was conditioned by no less difficult circumstances. There was one continuous front, on the north and south, in the east and west. Besides the Russian White Guard armies of Kolchak, Denikin and others, there are attacking Soviet Russia, simultaneously or in turn: Germans, Austrians, Czecho-Slovaks, Serbs, Poles, Ukrainians, Roumanians, French, British, Americans, Japanese, Finns, Esthonians, Lithuanians. . . . In a country throttled by a blockade and strangled by hunger, there are conspiracies, risings, terrorist acts, and destruction of roads and bridges (Trotsky, 1920, ch 4).

This passage alone would take books to properly refute. The “Americans” did not attack anyone during the Russian Civil War. There was no blockade, as American food aid was fairly continuous. Worse of all, the final sentence aptly describes the strategy of the left from the death of Tsar Alexander III onward. Of course, the point of it all is that endless terror will always have a justification. Trotsky calls this “revolutionary violence.” When applied to Stalin, it was “terror.” Terror was used by Lenin right up to his death. As the bureaucracy required for this grew, with Trotsky's blessing, it developed into a systematic

terror machine. Stalin created the NKVD, which just absorbed the Cheka, an institution of extreme political subjugation blessed by the old Bolsheviks to a man. The NKVD merely systematized the Cheka and gave it a more regularized structure. The OGPU (which was the party police) and Cheka were consolidated, and soon, they all were consolidated into the the KGB, an empire unto itself. Their condemnations of Stalin were mere play-acting.

Trotsky's essential idea was the exaltation of the Jewish secular elite over the goyim, or the "cattle." That his faction was almost exclusively Jewish is dismissed as a coincidence and ignored. He was so ethnically obsessed that his entire view of Marxism had the Jewish element as its foundation in the same apocalyptic fervor as Moses Hess. Whenever there was a contradiction between a communist and a Jewish idea, the latter always won.

From the first beginnings of the Red forces, Trotsky's ethnic nationalism appeared over and again. The Reds had no relation to the land, and were solely based in the cities and comprised almost exclusively the Jewish middle classes. The national communists like the Ukrainian Borotbist' movement was anti-statist and agrarian. In fact, the Communist Party under Trotsky was so urban and so cut off from the land, that their definition of "taking" or "occupying" an area just meant the surrender of its cities.

Trotsky's poorly disguised war against the peasant in Ukraine was called the "anti-Kulak movement." The "kulak" referred to any opponent of the regime without regard to income or possessions. Trotsky's typically diabolical and brilliant plan was to connect Ukrainian nationalists with the kulak movement. The question was an ethnic and not an economic one: On February 22 1920, Trotsky and Lenin stated that "nation" and "kulak" were the same. Trotsky is reputed to have said "I will decide what a Ukrainian is." If this is not genuine, it still is an apt summary of his policy.

*Terrorism and Communism* also made it clear that the peasant was not an actual person, but only potentially one. Further, in calling human rights "an imitation of Christian spiritualism" he made it clear that the slaughter of peasants was grounded on his Judaism. As in other works, Christian peasants were "lazy animals, those who fear the initiative and pressure; the peasant is sick; a herd and the absence of personhood." His Judaeo-centrism is shown by the peppering of his writings with epithets such as "Pharisees" and "Philistines" It is his Jewish nationalism alone that makes him the "good guy" of the "Russian" revolution.

In the same work, he states:

War, like revolution, is founded upon intimidation. A victorious war, generally speaking, destroys only an insignificant part of the conquered army, intimidating the remainder and breaking their will. The revolution works in the same way: it kills individuals, and intimidates thousands. In this sense, the Red Terror is not distinguishable from the armed insurrection, the direct continuation of which it represents. The State terror of a revolutionary class can be condemned "morally" only by a man who, as a principle, rejects (in words) every form of violence whatsoever – consequently, every war and every rising. For this one has to be merely and simply a hypocritical Quaker.<sup>12</sup>

Robert Service argues that Trotsky was the architect of the terror and was the most virulent of the Soviet leaders in this regard. In 1922, Trotsky, in giving the order for the church's destruction, stated "take great care that the ethnic composition of these [famine relief] committees does not give cause for chauvinism." In other words, they must not look too Jewish.

Trotsky was not in the least interested in "workers" or the mystic "proletariat." He was paid by both Jacob Schiff and the Germans. He lived in a mansion in the Bronx while

---

12 He is mocking Karl Kautsky's views here, cf chapter 4

writing for mainstream, leftist Jewish newspapers in Brooklyn. “Production” for him just meant the constant enrichment of his faction of the party. The party simply transferred all wealth to itself. Working conditions deteriorated and never returned to their tsarist level. No concern for any reforms benefiting labor were contemplated.

Trotsky was no Marxist. Marx based his vision on the notion that humans naturally seek to work and transform their environment. It is only that historical forms of this have been for the interests of others and hence the work is alienating. Trotsky makes a blanket, non-historical analysis of human nature:

As a general rule, man strives to avoid labor. Love for work is not at all an inborn characteristic: it is created by economic pressure and social education. One may even say that man is a fairly lazy animal. It is on this quality, in reality, that is founded to a considerable extent all human progress; because if man did not strive to expend his energy economically, did not seek to receive the largest possible quantity of products in return for a small quantity of energy, there would have been no technical development or social culture. It would appear, then, from this point of view that human laziness is a progressive force (Trotsky, 1920: ch 8) .

The non-Marxist statements there are many. Speaking of these variables without reference to history shows their non-Marxist origins. The phrase “economic pressure” is pregnant, as is “social education.” That the love for work has been based on “social education” is baffling, since he is referring to pre-Marxist regimes. Further, this statement rejects that technology is about profits or exploitation, but comes from the “laziness” of “people.” Famously, Trotsky states:

While every previous form of society was an organization of labor in the interests of a minority, which organized its State apparatus for the oppression of the overwhelming majority of the workers, we are making the first attempt in world-history to organize labor in the interests of the laboring majority itself. This, however, does not exclude the element of compulsion in all its forms, both the most gentle and the extremely severe. The element of State compulsion not only does not disappear from the historical arena, but on the contrary will still play, for a considerable period, an extremely prominent part (ibid).

Trotsky speaks with a forked tongue. He is precisely arguing that compulsion is needed to force labor to “work in its own interests.” Juxtaposed with other comments, he is not referring to pretentious phrases such as “class consciousness,” but compulsion is needed because workers are lazy and indolent. Their interests are not important. Hence, his views on terror, human nature and his role all join together.

Perhaps the most damning facts about Trotsky and his Jewish comrades was their personal fortune. Trotsky and his allies took goods from the workers and sold them on international markets. Trotsky's two personal bank accounts in the USA were totaled at \$80 million, while in Switzerland, he had 90 million francs. Igor Bunich reports that Moisei Uritsky had 85 million francs, Felix Dzerzhinsky had 80 million while Ganetsky had a personal account of 60 million Swiss francs and 10 million dollars. The communist movement was not about labor. Soviet emigre historical Ivan Bunich writes,

Kuhn, Loeb and Co, who through their German branches supported Trotsky's take-over in Russia in the autumn of 1917 with 20 million dollars, were later, in a half-year period, given 102, 290, 000 dollars in return. (New

York Times, 23rd of August 1921.) That is to say, everybody involved in the conspiracy made enormous amounts of money from the sufferings of the Russian people (Bunich, 1992: 82-83).

Stalin's overriding psychological motive was to destroy anyone who could expose this fact. Same for Trotsky and the rest. While that is a simplified motive, it is essentially accurate. Power was not enough. They needed total power, especially in 1925-1927, when the bureaucratic machinery had reached a point where total control was no longer theoretical. Totalitarianism can exist only in the modern world because only there did the scientific and ideological mechanisms exist for its implementation. Stalin might not have understood how it worked, but he knew how to operate it.

There was certainly nothing anti-Leninist about Stalin and his approach. Lenin was as bloody as Stalin, but the former did not have command over a substantial bureaucracy in 1924. Neither man valued human life, especially since the Marxist idea was that man was nothing more than a bundle of nerve endings with no soul, freedom or purpose. With that sort of reductionist approach to the individual, sacrificing several million in the initial industrialization drive was not a major moral problem for either socialism or capitalism, which, by the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, accepted Spencer's view of the human being (Joravsky, 1977). To counter this unexpected phenomenon, Stalin accelerated the collectivization of agriculture, something favored by both Lenin and Trotsky. This led to the development of agriculture in the countryside and the consequent realization of increased food production in the Soviet Union (Haugen, 2006), though this would continue to be the weak point in the Soviet economy, leading the west to bail out its "Cold War enemy" numerous times.

As early as 1902, Lenin wrote:

Lenin [Lenin states rhetorically, speaking of himself] takes no account whatever of the fact that the workers, too, have a share in the formation of an ideology. Is that so? Have I not said time and again that the shortage of fully class-conscious workers, worker-leaders, and worker-revolutionaries is, in fact, the greatest deficiency in our movement? Have I not said there that the training of such worker-revolutionaries must be our immediate task? Is there no mention there of the importance of developing a trade-union movement and creating a special trade-union literature? (Quoted from Draper, 1990).

"Fully class conscious" is a euphemism. It refers to "workers" that support the Party and believe that it is identical to the "working class." This view is identical over all major theorists of the communist party in the USSR. Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin were identical because their agenda was.

#### The Curious Case of Western Aid to the USSR: Stalinism until 1953

*We Communists shall be able to direct our economy if we succeed in utilising the hands of the bourgeoisie in building up this economy of ours and in the meantime learn from these bourgeoisie and guide them along the road we want them to travel – Lenin's 1922 Address to the Eleventh Congress of the Communist Party*

Stalin's infamous "socialism in one country" made little sense from the Marxian point of view. Bukharin and many others created a cottage industry out of condemning this odd conception. Bukharin, among others, held that Russia was incapable of being autarkic and could not be the world's sole socialist country. Socialism was, by definition, an international

movement, and Russia needed the help of many other sympathetic countries to assist in the building of socialism. Quoting from Zinov'ev some years earlier, William Korey writes:

Thus, Zinov'ev found it necessary to gear his polemic to proving that (i) economically, a complete socialist society could not be achieved in Russia, and (ii) even if it were feasible, inevitable military action by capitalist states against the Soviet Union would bring the unfinished structure crumbling down (1950: 257)

Certainly, there was nothing in the Marxist canon that said anything about this sort of autarky. Oddly again, the continued agricultural and technical aid to the USSR from western governments was an open secret to all who bothered to look. Leninist ideology held that the “capitalist powers” would try to destroy the USSR, not profit handsomely from her. Still, the huge American presence in Soviet industry remains a topic bizarrely verboten among specialists in the Soviet economy.

Hilariously, Lenin would believe that western politicians and military elites were somehow “aware” of what Bolshevism was. Convinced that they were “threatened” Lenin created numerous “plots” that the west was creating against the Worker's Paradise. The “Envoy's Plot” was the creation of Trotsky, having no relation to the west at all. Of course, the west wanted to profit from the building of socialism and had not the slightest ill will towards Lenin. His obsession was in part reflective of a cognitive contradiction that state-capitalists in the west supported the state-capitalists of the east. He never was able to grasp why the west was so interested in building “socialism.” Lenin, believing himself to be a “rebel” while taking a small fortune from western elites, had to invent “plots” lest he go insane. Lenin would not permit the idea that he was a pawn in a broader game to ever enter his mind. Without any opposition from the state-capitalist west, he needed to invent it.

Wladimir Naleszkiewicz, in his 1966 article, details the constant and large-scale American involvement in Stalin's industrialization. It is safe to say that, without the U.S. The Soviet Union could not have existed. In all facets of heavy industry: coal, steel, oil, transport, etc., the American capitalist class was all too ready to assist the Soviet “enemy.” The “Cold War” was an odd sort of war, since, normally, combatants do not assist one another on a daily basis. Naleszkiewicz writes:

Although some writers point out that the all-out industrialization drive during the first Soviet Five-Year Plan did not reach the scheduled targets, it does represent, nevertheless, a remarkable achievement that was mostly gained by drawing upon the experience and advanced technologies of industrialized countries, largely the United States. For the most part, this took the form of either concessions, technical assistance, or trade. It is interesting to note that much of the aid given to the Soviet economy by American businessmen was given even before the U. S. government officially recognized that country (1966: 55)

Really? What sort of a Cold War is this? Of course, both before and after Stalin's liquidation of just about every one that irritated him, the U.S., apparently not “afraid of the Soviet experiment” was contributing massively to the Soviet industrialization drive. The number of competent technicians were just not available to man such a drive and therefore, the capitalists were called in. The entire myth of the Cold War would collapse if this open secret was discussed. Capitalism and communism were not foes, but sisters that occasionally became jealous of each other.

The broader point, however, is that Stalin was able to pursue “socialism” in an environment where even the capitalist powers were willing to aid in the development of this

new “experimental” economy.<sup>13</sup> The Cold War must be revised considering the major American investments in the USSR, both pre- and post-Stalin.

To consolidate his powers, Stalin began to increase the powers and the scope of the Soviet Union’s intelligence. This move saw intelligence agencies being set up in many major countries in the world. This included France, Germany and the United States of America. Stalin knew that this was the only way he could overcome potential enemies of Communism. The intelligence gathered from these countries was going to be of importance especially when the Second World War began.

Trotsky unwittingly confirms this in his *Terrorism and Communism*:

The reasons enumerated above are more than sufficient to explain the difficult economic situation of Soviet Russia. There is no fuel, there is no metal, there is no cotton, transport is destroyed, technical equipment is in disorder, living labor-power is scattered over the face of the country, and a high percentage of it has been lost to the front – is there any need to seek supplementary reasons in the economic Utopianism of the Bolsheviks in order to explain the fall of our industry? On the contrary, each of the reasons quoted alone is sufficient to evoke the question: how is it possible at all that, under such conditions, factories and workshops should continue to function? (Trotsky, 1920: ch 8)

Tongue in cheek, he says “the Soviet government was obliged to re-create it.” Apparently out of thin air. Realizing the absurdity of his position, he retreats to the explanation that the USSR suddenly became an industrial power because of the party’s “intimate connection with the popular masses.” This, indeed, fixed the fuel and steel problem.

Just before the beginning of the World War II, the Soviet Union had tried to form an anti-German relationship with France and Britain. This proposition was however denied by the two countries and therefore Stalin led the Soviet Union to create another strategy by negotiating a non-aggression pact with the Germans. This ensured that Germany, which at the time was growing rapidly, traded with the Soviets. On first of September, 1939, Germany attacked parts of Poland thereby starting the Second World War officially. The Polish military was about four times the size of the German, and Hitler’s claim that the Poles had fired first are somewhat credible. The highly nationalist Polish military government was probably more national socialist than the German party was. The fact that Poland had a sizable Germany minority was not exactly lost on the Warsaw nationalists. The agreement between the USSR and Germany led to the acquisition of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania by the USSR and they became a part of the Soviet Union (Lee, 1986). It is rare to hear that Stalin’s simultaneous attack on Poland from the opposite direction started the war, but Stalin was an ally of the capitalists.

The “Cold War” began immediately after the death of Stalin. While there was substantial disagreement over the eventual fate of central Europe, the United States continued to trust “Uncle Joe.” Veterans returning home to the United States were absolutely convinced that they had won the “good war,” and had the uncanny ability to reject any stories about Stalin’s death camps. Soon, Stalin was to finance “anti-imperialist” movements in Korea and Indochina, and the veterans of the “good war” became even more patriotic as their own

13 cf. these three works: Carley, Michael Jabara and Richard Kent Debo (1997) Always in Need of Credit: The USSR and Franco-German Economic Cooperation, 1926-1929. *French Historical Studies*, 20(3), 315-356; Lonsdale, Richard E., John H. Thompson (1960) A Map of the USSR’s Manufacturing. *Economic Geography*, 36(1), 36-52; Erickson, Rodney A. and David J. Hayward (1991) The International Flows of Industrial Exports from U.S. Regions. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 81(3), 371-390 for greater detail on western aid to the USSR under Lenin and Stalin.

actions bore fruit in the third world.

Victory in World War II consolidated Stalin's power and helped create the image of the “battler against fascism.” Victory in a war of that scale can not be underestimated as a source of legitimacy (Alexandrov, 2008 and Haugen, 2006 are both useful here in laying out more detail in this complex topic). In addition, using the assets and expertise of western elites to rebuild the socialist economy created the illusion that Stalin was orchestrating the recovery effort.

On the ethnic front, the right-wing in eastern Europe was slaughtered or sent into exile. Operation Keelhaul, orchestrated by Eisenhower, sent thousands of Slavic anti-communists back to Stalin. Several major Ukrainian nationalists were murdered after the war, making the Ukrainian resistance within the USSR all the more difficult. NKVD units were deployed to other countries with the sole motive of eliminating any possible opponent. Yet, American capital continued to pour into the “enemy” land (Naleszkiewicz, 1966; see both the conclusion and introduction) and gave the poorly endowed Soviet experiment an artificially long life.

### Conclusions

Stalin has fared a bit better in western texts than Hitler has. It is socially acceptable to intone that Stalin industrialized the USSR, but “at a great cost.” It is not socially acceptable to say the same about Hitler's Germany. Stalin's treatment might be reduced to these realities: a) American academics had a love affair with Marxism that has still to be ended, b) Stalin won, Hitler lost, c) Marxism was always more interesting theoretically than National Socialism, d) Hitler's treatment of his political opponents was of the “wrong” groups. No one really knows anything about Ukraine, but we all know about the Jews.

Certainly, the genocidal rhetoric of Himmler was identical to that of Ehrenberg. Stalin's crimes were worse, and Stalin had even less time to commit them than Hitler did. There is some good reason to hold that Hitler was genuinely popular, until maybe 1943, but Stalin's popularity cannot really be measured. If the size of the Soviet camps are an indication, then it might be that Stalin was loathed, and yet, victory can build a “legacy” like nothing else. Had Hitler won the war, maybe American academics would be filling the coffee houses with national socialist views rather than international socialist ones. True – Hitler did pass many laws protecting the rights of his workers while Stalin did no such thing. Stalin experimented on prisoners as Hitler did. Stalin committed genocide, so did Hitler. Stalin was surrounded by psychopaths, so was Hitler. Really, there is no difference except that Hitler lost.

There is no reason to believe that Stalin, regardless of Lenin's own late views, was any different than Lenin. Stalin continued Lenin's earlier policies. Lenin was different only in that he simply had a weaker country to work with. Lenin's *Cheka* were no less ruthless than Stalin's NKVD (Murray, 2011). Trotsky was more vicious than either of them, but the longstanding refusal to see him in anything but idealized form needs to be explained.

Stalin created a massive empire from the eastern border of China to Romania. The Soviets backed Syria, Iraq, Angola, Mozambique, Cuba, North Korea and even India for a time. This is no small achievement. However, capitalism being what it is, did not see an enemy in Stalin, just “another way of doing business.” When the USSR sought to move into western trading areas, the “Cold War” almost became hot. Ideology was not the problem, but the creation of a “new world order” could only have one hegemon. The Soviet's dependency on American grain in the 1970s is well known, which, that by itself requires some analysis. How much of a “war” the Cold War really?

One way to deal with this is to say that American capitalists were simply more powerful than the state and, at least since the Civil War, have always been. It is normal to

assume that states are the most powerful actor in a specific territory and political language always seems to reflect this. When a government is utterly dependent on firms such as Boeing, Northrop, and ConAgra, not to mention the banks that underwrite “public” debt, then that government is merely the coercive arm of capital. The combined weight of all the technical, agricultural, financial, chemical and computer giants in America can be contained by any state. It might be that the government (that is, the state) simply did not have the resources to control *everything* in America in the way that Moscow was able to. Moscow could experiment on the camp population without a domestic murmur. In the US, Abbot Laboratories needed a different method. (Lee, 1986; this work was used to gather the information in this analysis. It does not necessarily agree in every detail with Lee or Meek).

Stalin “created” a industrial empire through forced labor, foreign investment and a large population. Terror cannot create economic growth, but it can mobilize the resources needed to maintain it. Tsarist Russia was also industrializing rapidly. Stalin tested the limits of liberal tolerance, forcing the issue whether or not there were any limits to state power if the aims of this power were “human equality and dignity.” Marxism and Leninism, in the name of human dignity, slaughtered tens of millions in North Korea, Russia, Ukraine and China. Cambodia was China's instrument as Vietnam was Russia's. The defeat of Hitler might have saved the lives of millions, yet those deaths occurred instead in the east rather than the west. Modernism ushered in a new civilization based on the technological domination of production. It also ushered in a techno-totalitarianism that both Hitler and Stalin used to their advantage. You cannot have one without the other.

#### **Bibliography:**

### Primary Sources

Lenin, V. (1922) Interview with the Correspondent of The New York Herald. From the Online Archive at Marxists.org  
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1922/apr/14.htm>

Lenin, V (1999) Left-wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder. Resistance Books

Pipes, R. (1996) The Unknown Lenin : From the Secret Archive

Trotsky, L (1920) Terrorism and Communism. Dictatorship versus Democracy. A Reply to Karl Kautsky. Workers Party of America  
Online edition: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1920/terrcomm/index.htm>

Trotsky, Leon (1937) The Stalin School of Falsification. Max Shachtman, trans. Pioneer Publications

Tucker, Robert (1992) Stalin in Power: The Revolution from Above, 1928-1941. Norton

Stalin, J. (1955). Works. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publications House of the CPSU

Session of the Petersburg Committee of the Social Democratic Labor Party (Bolshevik), November 1(14), 1917

### Secondary Sources

Aleksandrov, G. (2008). Joseph Stalin: A Short biography. Michigan: Foreign Languages Pub. House. (This work is generally pro-Stalin. It is interesting only in the sense that it showed the basic image Stalin wanted broadcast to the world.)

American Youth Congress. (1954). News, Issues 60-71. Michigan: the University of Michigan. (This is a basically liberal group that wanted 'cooperation' between the U.S. and the USSR on political and educational areas.)

Brandenberger, D., A. M. Dubrovsky (1998) 'The People Need a Tsar': The Emergence of National Bolshevism as Stalinist Ideology, 1931-1941. Europe-Asia Studies, 50(5): 873-892

Bunich, Igor (1992) The Party's Gold. St. Petersburg

Draper, Hal (1990) The Myth of Lenin's "Concept of The Party." From the Online Archives of Marxists.org  
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/draper/1990/myth/myth.htm#section3>

Combs, R (2008) Inside the Soviet Alternative Universe: The Cold War's End and the Soviet Union's Fall Reappraised. Pennsylvania State University Press

Prefobrhzhensky, EA (1979) In The Crisis of Soviet Industrialization: Selected Essays, D. A. Fitzer (ed). M. E. Sharpe

Haugen, B. (2006). Joseph Stalin: dictator of the Soviet Union. Compass Point Books

Lee, WT and R Starr (1986). Soviet Military Policy since World War II. Hoover Institution Press

Korey, William (1950) Zinov'ev's Critique of Stalin's Theory of Socialism in One Country, December, 1925-December, 1926. American Slavic and East European Review 9(4): 255-267

Meek, Ronald. (1954) Stalin as an Economist. The Review of Economic Studies 21: 232-239

Mironov, BN (1999) New Approaches to Old Problems: The Well-Being of the Population of Russia from 1821 to 1910 as Measured by Physical Stature. Slavic Review, 58(1), 1-26

Mironov, BN (2010) Wages and Prices in Imperial Russia, 1703-1913. Russian Review, 69(1), 47-72

Goulevitch, A. (1962) Tsarism and Revolution. Omni Publications

Moss, Vladimir (2011) Essays on the Russian Autocracy. Cafe Press

Joravsky, David (1977) The Mechanical Spirit: The Stalinist Marriage of Pavlov to Marx. Theory and Society 4(4): 457-477

Van Ree, Erik (1993) Stalin's Organic Theory of the Party. Russian Review 52(1): 43-57

Zalampas, M. (1989). Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich in American Magazines, 1923-1939. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press

Seymour, J. (1978) Lenin and the Vanguard Party. Spartacist League  
<http://www.bolshevik.org/Pamphlets/LeninVanguard/LVP%200.htm>

С.Г. Кара-Мурза (2011). Кризисное обществоведение. Часть первая. Москва: Научный эксперт

#### Articles on the Western Creation of the USSR

Naleszkiewicz, Wladimir. (1966). Technical Assistance of the American Enterprises to the Growth of the Soviet Union, 1929-1933. Russian Review 25(1): 54-76

Carley, Michael Jabara and Richard Kent Debo (1997) Always in Need of Credit: The USSR and Franco-German Economic Cooperation, 1926-1929. French Historical Studies, 20(3), 315-356

Lonsdale, Richard E., John H. Thompson (1960) A Map of the USSR's Manufacturing. Economic Geography, 36(1), 36-52

Erickson, Rodney A. and David J. Hayward (1991) The International Flows of Industrial Exports from U.S. Regions. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 81(3), 371-

Dienes, L (1971) Investment Priorities in Soviet Regions. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 62(3), 437-454

Levine, H (1974) An American View of Economic Relations with the USSR. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 414, 1-17

United States Senate (1982) Transfer of United States High Technology to the Soviet Union and Soviet Bloc Nations Hearings before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, 97th Congress Second Session, May, Washington, D.C

Sutton, A (1968) *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development: 1917–1930*. Hoover Institution

Sutton, A (1971) *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development: 1930–1945*. Hoover Institution

Sutton, A (1973) *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development: 1945–1965*. Hoover Institution

Sutton, A (1973a) *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union*. Arlington House