


Ford and Stalin.

How to Live in Humaneness



Alternative Principles
of Globalization

St. Petersburg

2004

INTERNAL PREDICTOR OF THE USSR

Ford and Stalin. How to Live in Humaneness

*Alternative Principles
of Globalization*

St. Petersburg

2004

- © These materials represent the heritage of the Russian culture. Therefore no private individuals or companies possess copyright with regards to these materials. In case someone ventures to privatize copyright in accordance with the applicable law, he will face the retaliation for theft, manifesting itself in the unpleasant “mystical” developments, reaching far beyond the legal limits. With all that, everyone whose wishes are based on personal *understanding of public good* has full power and authority to copy and circulate these materials by the whole or by part, also with commercial purposes. Those who use these materials in their activities, bear full personal responsibility if fragmentary citing or reference bring about the meanings, different to the true contents of these materials as a whole, and thus he has a chance to face the “mystical” retaliation, overpassing the legal punishments.

CONTENTS

<i>The Preface to the English Edition</i>	5	
<i>Foreword</i>	7	
Part I SOCIALLY USEFUL		
Management Principles		
<i>Have Been Proclaimed Long Ago</i>		9
1. Globalization as a Means to Counter Globalization	11	
2. Henry Ford and Industrialization in the USSR	14	
3. Marxism Talking on «Fordizm»	18	
4. A Campaign for What: for Capitalism? Or for Socialism?	22	
4.1. Humanism in Deed and in Word	22	
4.2. What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?.....	30	
Digression 1:		
<i>On System-Forming Delusions</i>	48	
Digression 2:		
<i>The Axioms of Modern Economics</i>	57	
4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America.....	63	
Digression 3:		
<i>Objective Rights and Subjective Laws</i>	66	
Digression 4:		
<i>The Moral and Ethic Results of Bourgeois Reforms in Russia</i>	77	
4.4. The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor to the Welfare of Laborers.....	87	
Digression 5:		
<i>Directly Productive and Auxiliary Labor, Managerial Labor, Remuneration of Labor</i>	95	
Digression 6:		
<i>Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization</i>	113	
4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy	141	

Digression 7: <i>The Post-Stalin USSR was an Anti-Socialist State</i>	143
Part II	
Historical Experience of Bolshevism in 20 th Century and its Prospects	175
5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism in 20th Century	176
6. Essence and Results of Stalin’s Bolshevism	195
6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch.....	195
6.2. On Hidden Motive of Revolutions of 1917.....	209
6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»: Socialism at an Individual Country.....	216
6.4. Unpreparedness of Russia for Socialism and its Consequences.....	231
6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming the Power of Marxism.....	237
6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism in the Second World War of the 20 th Century.....	266
6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage».....	285
6.8. Stalin’s Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks.....	322
6.8.1. <i>Refuse Marxism</i>	322
6.8.2. <i>To Overcome the Atheism</i>	336
6.8.3. <i>To solve the problems.</i>	351
7. The Prospects of Bolshevism	397
SUPPLEMENTS 1. The Biblical Doctrine of Global Slavery	399
2. The interview with Joseph E. Shtiglits	406

The Preface to the English Edition

The mother tongue of the authors of this work is Russian. The translators of this edition are native Russian speakers as well.

Text comprehension implies matching a definite word or sentence order with particular images, imaginative notions, whose foretypes (protoplasts) are located either in life (when narrating about it), or inside the authors' mentality (when fantasizing or designing the future).

Considering the fact that the authors largely focus on the topics that are not traditionally discussed in historically established cultures, Russia or the rest of the world, including the West, which is caused by inertia of thinking, there are quite a few new notions that are not common knowledge in Social Science as yet. According to Kozma Prutkov, «Lots of things are incomprehensible to us not because our notions are poor but because these things go far beyond our notions». That is why a reader of this text is supposed to labor hard even if he is a native Russian speaker, and it gets even harder due to specific style of the Russian original. As a result, the interpreters had to cope with both word choice and grammar structures to make the translation sound adequately and transmit the same message as the original version. Moreover, different chapters were translated by different people. And despite we tried to do our best when editing the translation and attempting to gain a single style for the book as a whole, it still may happen that the personal differences between the interpreters' outlooks and their language cultures are expressed differently in different parts of the same book, so the same phenomena may be described with different terminological frameworks.

That is why we apologize to our English-speaking readers for possible inaccuracies, style imprecisions or some difficulties which might occur in the course of reading. The readers having a command of Russian are kindly invited to the web site at the address www.mera.com.ru in case they have a need to adjust their understanding of the text.


If any readers would be so kind as to offer their own version of the translation of a book as a whole or give a revised translation of particular fragments, they can send it to the address moderator@mera.com.ru. Both original Russian text and the English language version belong to the Non-Author culture, which implies their free distribution, so the interpreters, offering their optional translations and corrections, have neither moral nor

ethical basis for exclusive copyright for the text, hereby offered to the readers.

The authors thank Russian students Maria Gerasimchuk, Dmitriy Orlov, Julia Shishkina, Yelizaveta Vasserman and Ivan Zuev for their devoted contribution in translating this book into English.

Foreword

This work concerns the outlook on economy and social life belonging to two men who are usually thought to be very different.



The first one is Henry Ford I, founder and head of «Ford Motors Company», one of the world's largest automotive corporations. The other one is Joseph Stalin — a politician, sociologist and economist, whose world understanding and will were embodied in the foundation and prime of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the «superstate № 2» of the 20th century, the «super concern» state.

Despite what used to be taught at schools about the fight between capitalism and socialism those two people share a similar view on normal social life. The difference lies in Henry Ford's focusing mainly on microeconomy and relations between people as employees of a single enterprise, avoiding the issues of macroeconomy and building state institutions, while Joseph Stalin concentrated on the issues of developing political economy as a science, on cultural transformation and *arranging the macroeconomy by the scheme of a «super concern» state*, leaving the microeconomic issues to society's creative force.

Thus they in fact complement each other and therefore pave the way to uniting the people of Russia and America as well as the people of

the world in a common culture based on morals and ethics of a conscientious laborer.

But contemporaries as well as descendants refused to understand both of them. And the world has paid for this reluctance to understand with World War II followed by the «cold war» between NATO and the USSR and with the deformed globalization that is currently taking place.

Though this work quotes both Ford and Stalin extensively where it is necessary, those are merely quotations. Their heritage should be studied not by quotations but by their works in order to form a complete and coherent understanding of who and in what way was wrong or right.

But if the heritage of Ford and Stalin is understood, expanded and realized then the historic perspective of all peoples will acquire a new, a better quality...

Part I

SOCIALLY USEFUL Management Principles *Have Been Proclaimed Long Ago*

1. Globalization as a Means to Counter Globalization

«Anti-globalists» are people who for various reasons oppose «globalization». But most of them don't bother about understanding what *precisely* they are fighting for and what *precisely* they oppose to. Therefore they get nothing but hooliganism as a result. Given such an essentially vague and purely nihilistic attitude to globalization the «anti-globalists» are no smaller an evil than the historically real «globalization», which they are so unhappy with. In order to choose none of the two evils one needs to become familiar with the social meaning of both the words and the phenomena they signify.

«Globalization» is a term of political science, which became known to people interested in politics and economics in a few recent years. «Globalization» became the term for the economic and cultural phenomena that affect historically formed cultures of peoples living in different parts of the world (including the economic structure). Such phenomena on the one hand disrupt those cultures and ways of life and on the other hand integrate them into some global culture that is yet starting to come into being. In the historical perspective this global culture is to unite the whole of mankind.

Will this culture be bad or good? This is still an open question in many aspects.

But it is this very question that anti-globalists are not interested in, because they act on their prejudice of globalization being invariably bad. Such an attitude is bad in itself. The point is that:

Historically real globalization is the result of actions of many people who pursue their own interests or the interests of their groups. And those interests are mostly not of a global scale.

What is now being termed «globalization» happened before but did not have a name. Over the whole course of recorded history «globalization» appears to be a process of national cultures penetrating one another. In the past international trade and the policy of conquest stimulated it. Nowadays it is stimulated directly by the integration of technologies belonging to different national economies into a world economy of the mankind. The economic constituent of this process consists in

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

concentration of control over the society's productive forces. The mankind of today cannot exist without production and distribution systems controlled this or that way. In other words globalization is a historically objective process which takes place not depending on wishes and will of a single opponent to «globalization in general».

Thus, because globalization is the result of actions taken by many people seeking to provide for their private — and not in the least global — interests then it is really useless to fight it. In order to stop globalization one must totally ban all export-import transactions, do away with tourism, migration, concert tours of all performers, art and other exhibitions, translating business correspondence, works of art and academic papers, minimize diplomatic activity and eliminate mafias.

Judged on the basis of the above-mentioned vision a sincere effort of fighting *globalization in general* — *as an inherent principle of civilization development on our planet* — is a form of insanity. But to put up with globalization as it proceeds in the historic reality of today is to bring horrible afflictions to the mankind in future.

The point is that though globalization results from the social element of many people's private activities of the people's pursuing their own ends not in the least of a global scale, the historically real globalization is a controlled process. This happens because along with average people who devote themselves to vanity and avoid considering their private and largely social affairs on the global scale, there have been among the mankind from immemorial time more or less numerous social groups whose members in the succession of generations pursue some definite objectives regarding the entire mankind and develop and apply the means to accomplish those objectives. As the choice of objectives and means to accomplish them is subjectively determined by the «globalists»'s morals, globalization in itself may be directed towards accomplishing mutually exclusive objectives by mutually exclusive means following mutually exclusive scenarios.

But as globalization is generated by actions of many people who are not globalists and as it is impossible to stop it, only one option remains. Globalization proceeding toward accomplishing unacceptable objectives by unacceptable means following unacceptable scenarios must be opposed by a profoundly different globalization, acceptable from the point of its objectives, the means to accomplish them and scenarios along which those objectives are accomplished by those means.

1. Globalization as a Means to Counter Globalization

This approach to the issue of historically real globalization and its possible alternatives leads us directly to the question of an objective, i.e. pre-destined for the man and the mankind, Good and accordingly of an objective Evil.

2. Henry Ford and Industrialization in the USSR

In the 20th century or at least its largest part the historically real issue of objective Good and Evil viewed globally always led to the question: which one of these two categories is represented by the «American way of life» and «American dream» and which one is represented by «the Soviet way of life» and «the ideals of bolshevism».

Many people *including representatives of the well-read «intelligentsia»* adhere to the view that history has given a final answer to this question even after September 11th, 2001¹. Namely, they think that the «American way of life» and the «American dream» suit human nature and the nature of human society better and therefore are universal and viable, while the Soviet way of life and the ideals of bolshevism are the product of a far-fetched social experiment and therefore are a historical bankrupt. This bankruptcy was manifested, and to many convincingly, by the irreversible failure of the USSR in terms of state institutions, social structure and culture. And the current status of the «former USSR» and the USA is one of the facts belonging to the globalization, which defines its future perspective.

Along with that since the mid 19th century and up to present time the course of globalization and *its quality (goals, means to accomplish them, scenarios)* has been determined by the extent to which the people of the USA and Russia have used their chances to provide mutual help and cooperation in developing the cultures of both two countries. That is why in order to understand the future trends of globalization and discover a *variant of it that is objectively executable to the benefit of all the peoples of the world* it is insufficient simply to proclaim the failure of the USSR

¹ On this day the «American life style» and the «American dream» were attacked by «international terrorism». Hi-jacked passenger jets hit the towers of the World Trade Center located in New-York City and brought them down, as well as one wing of the Pentagon facilities in Washington. The fourth hi-jacked jet was reported by mass media and US officials to have crashed in Petersburg countryside without hitting anything presumably due to loss of control as the hostages tried to oppose the hijackers.

Could all of this happen without connivance or direct complicity of US special services? — Let everyone decide on his or her own.

2. Henry Ford and Industrialization in the USSR

and the seemingly cloudless future of the USA (even more so after September 11th, 2001). One must turn to our common history.

Usually when one needs an example of a positive cooperation between Russia and the USA one recalls the World War II. But in our opinion the cooperation between Russia (the USSR) and the USA in that period is not the kind of phenomenon that is exemplary to the present and future politicians, businessmen and common people in both countries. The reason is that the unity between the USSR and the USA during the WWII existed due to a common enemy. The *hypothetic* victory of that enemy would have ended the history of both countries and their peoples. But to discover a way to a *peaceful and bright future of all the peoples of mankind* one needs not to answer the question «whom should we be friends against?» but the question «in the name of what ideals should we be friends and how could we make our common ideals a reality?» That is why we should find another example of fruitful cooperation in our past.

The industrialization of the USSR — new branches of industry coming into being and old ones being modernized — was going on simultaneously with the «great depression» in the USA and world economic crisis. While the crisis paralyzed the economies of all industrialized countries for many Western companies sales to the Soviet market became a way of surviving financially. The so-called «class interests», «class solidarity» of capitalists in the fight against the «world evil of communism» for many of them receded into the background. They were ready to work for the socialist regime of the USSR contrary to their class interests for the sake of preserving their firms and keeping their present social status.

In the years preceding the «great depression» the *anti-Marxist nature of Stalin's bolshevism*¹ was yet unclear. That is why the struggle between Trotskyites and Stalinists in the governing bodies of the *All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) [ACP (B)]* and their struggle outside the party for control over the minds of Soviet citizens were taken by many

¹ On these issues one should refer to the books “It is Time I Should Start the Tale of Stalin...”, “The Brief Course...” by the Internal Predictor of the USSR (IP of the USSR).

The above-mentioned and other works by Internal Predictor of the USSR can be found at www.mera.com.ru and are also included into the complete Information base on sociology, worked out by the Internal Predictor of the USSR distributed on compact disks.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

people (including foreigners) for the customary fighting between leaders and their teams which is more or less in the nature of all political parties. Rearranging life in Russia on the principles of Marxist «socialism» was a part of the global project to rearrange relationships in societies throughout the world. Therefore there are reasons to believe that the «great depression» of 1929 itself was organized on purpose by the «world backstage»¹ in order to force the private capital of industrially developed countries under threat of bankruptcy to work for the benefit of building *Marx's model of the «socialism»* in the USSR. Such were the immediate tasks of «globalization» in that historic period.

Consequently industrialization in the USSR was lent active political support by a part of the backstage masonry² and received investments from the foreign private capital, including the private capital of the USA that diplomatically acknowledged the USSR only in November 1933. Under those conditions the Soviet government enjoyed the opportunity to choose from among many firms eager to take part in building socialism in the USSR and those were the most advanced firms of every branch of industry. «Ford Motors» (founded 1903) was among the leaders of the automotive branch throughout the whole of the 1st quarter of the 20th century. Therefore it is not surprising that it was given preference over others and received an opportunity to contribute to the Soviet automotive industry's coming into being.

As a result the foundation of the automotive and tractor industries of the USSR in the Stalinist period was heavily assisted in terms of technology and staff training by Henry Ford I (1863 — 1947), one of the most prominent businessmen of the first half of the 20th century. The first Soviet mass-production tractor «Fordson — Putilovets» (1923) — a «Ford» tractor «Fordson» adapted for production and operation in the USSR — was designed and put into full production in the years of World War I. A car factory was constructed (1929 — 1932) in Gorky³; Moscow

¹ If one is interested in what can cause a financial and economic crisis and depression and how it can be done on somebody's demand please refer to the works of IP of the USSR “The Brief Course...”, “The Economic «Rupture» Must Be Excised”, abstract of “On Understanding the Macroeconomy of State and World”.

² Douglas Reed provides the facts referring to this issue in his book “Dispute on Zion”.

³ Gorky is named Nizhnyi Novgorod nowadays.

2. Henry Ford and Industrialization in the USSR

«ZiL» car factory¹ was modernized during the first five-year plan, staff for both of these factories received training. Everything mentioned above was accomplished with the help of Henry Ford and various experts from «Ford Motors» and their help played a *decisive* role in it.

But «Ford Motors» stands out among the many private firms that took part in the industrialization of the USSR because of Ford's personality. Ford was its founder and chief executive for over 40 years. That Ford's personality stands out against the background of many capitalist businessmen of the first half of the 20th century was reflected in the Soviet propaganda in a peculiar way.

¹ The factory named after Likhachev. At the time it was named ZiS (factory named after Stalin) and was headed by Ivan Lihatchov (1896 — 1956) in the period of 1926 — 1930 and 1940 — 1950. He had an agricultural background, started as a worker at the Putilov factory in 1908. He served in the Baltic Navy during World War I (1914 — 1918) and was a soldier in the Red Army in the years of the Civil War. Later he was promoted to a Red Army commander, then an official of the VChK (National Emergency and Security Committee). In 1953 he was appointed Minister of motor transport and highways in the Soviet government.

3. *Marxism Talking on «Fordizm»*

«**FORDIZM**, a system of organizing mass production on the line originated in the USA in the first quarter of the 20th century. (...) The founding principle of Fordizm and of the new methods of organizing production and labor it gave rise to was the assembly belt. (...) Every worker placed along the assembly line performed one operation consisting in several (sometimes even one) working movements (for example turning a nut with a wrench) that required virtually no qualification. As Ford indicates 43 % of workers required one-day long training, 36 % — from 1 day up to one week, 6 % — one or two weeks, 14 % from one month up to 1 year¹.

Introducing the assembly line along with several other technical innovations (product typification, standardization of component parts, their interchangeability and so on) enabled a sharp growth of labor productivity and decrease in manufacture costs² and initiated mass production (...) At the same time Fordizm intensified labor to an unprecedented extent, made it dull and mechanical. Fordizm counts on turning workers into robots and requires an extreme nervous and physical exertion. Compulsory pace of work set by the assembly line made it necessary to substitute piecework payment by payment by the hour³. The word «Fordizm» like «Tailorizm» before it became synonymous to exploitation of workers characteristic of

¹ Statistical data given here are taken from the book “My Life and Work” by H. Ford. It will become clear from further evidence that they provide documentary proof of the fact that Marxists slander Ford by this article while being aware of the truth. If it isn’t so it only remains to conclude that they are hopelessly dumb and are capable of making sense neither out of a book’s text nor of the happenings of life.

² When compared to contemporary competitors.

³ The sentence is worded in a way, which implies that payment by the hour is the best and most just method of remuneration. Marxists are not interested in that this very method is inconsistent in the conditions of modern industry where manufacturing processes are carried out collectively and where *the principle of professional specialization* is employed, and this fact will be exemplified further in the text. These men of no scruples and intelligence seek only to maintain the class approach in its purity while turning a blind eye to the differences in morality of concrete people, and to accuse H. Ford of being an exploiter of the working class in his intentions and actions.

3. Marxism Talking on «Fordizm»

the monopoly stage of capitalism, which is bent on increasing profits of capitalist monopolies.

Seeking to suppress the feeling of discontent among workers and to prevent them from organizing a fight for their rights and interests Ford introduced a military-like discipline in factories, encouraged spying among workers, ran his own police for severe punishment of active workers. For many years Ford did not permit trade unions at his factories.

In his book “My Life and Work” Ford claimed to play the role of some «social reformer» and asserted that his methods of production and labor organization could turn a bourgeois society into a «society of affluence and social harmony». Ford praised his system as the one catering for the workers making special emphasis on wages at his factories being higher than the average wage in the industry. However higher wages are connected with higher working pace, quick wear of workforce, the task to attract more and more new workers to substitute those put out of action.

Bourgeois ideologists regard the workers’ opposition to destructive social consequences of Fordizm as an opposition to technical progress. Actually the workers fight not against technical progress but against the capitalist way to use its achievements. Modern technological revolution, improvement of the workers’ education and training, strengthening of their struggle have turned Fordizm into an obstacle for labor productivity growth.

In the early 1970-s some capitalist firms are conducting experiments on modernizing assembly line production in order to make the work less monotonous, more meaningful and attractive and consequently more effective. To that end assembly lines are restructured: they are shortened, operations are combined, workers are moved along the line to perform a cycle of operations and so on. Measures of this kind are often depicted by bourgeois sociologists as the concern businessmen have for «humanizing labor». But actually they are caused by the urge to adapt Fordizm to the present conditions and thereby improve the methods of exploitation of the working people.

Only within socialism can labor be truly humanized. The man becomes a creative personality and is sure that his activity is

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

socially valuable. He comprehends the science of controlling¹ production, state, society. Any form of technical progress including the assembly line is applied with the average socially normal labor intensiveness and their application is accompanied by facilitation and improvement of labor conditions» (“The Big Soviet Encyclopedia”, pub. 3, v. 27, pp. 537, 538).

It is typical of the “The Big Soviet Encyclopedia” in the third edition to have plenty of articles that only inform of the viewpoint one should share on this or that natural or social phenomenon in order to be loyal to the stagnant regime but **give no information on what the phenomenon that the article is devoted to is in essence.**

The article «Fordizm» quoted above with minor abridgements can be placed among the same kind. Consequently it does not contain a single word of gratitude to H. Ford for the support he lent in motorizing Soviet agriculture and for his contribution to *establishing the Soviet automotive industry on the basis of «Fordizm»* principles that were so severely condemned by Marxist talkers. According to the logic of the article’s authors’ argumentation one must admit the following: at Ford’s own factories «Fordizm» principles are bad, and at the Gorky car factory they are good, though work is organized pretty much the same way. Both factories have an assembly line that sets the pace of work for the entire collective, and the management seeks to increase the line’s speed. Labor discipline is demanded or otherwise the assembly line will stop or rejects will be plentiful. Manufacturing process is divided into most simple operations that are monotonous to perform throughout the working day and do not require long-term training or higher education and so on.

On the whole this article is a fine specimen of Marxist propaganda slandering anyone who thinks differently and independently and therefore is able to solve the problems that one faces in life inventively. And this is one of the things that H. Ford and J.V. Stalin have in common. The historic myth claims that H. Ford and J.V. Stalin are very different people and the only thing that unites them is that they were contemporaries. Actually they are united by something else: in the dominating cultural

¹ One wonders where on Earth have they found a *metrologically consistent* (there can be no other) science of control generally and of controlling production and distribution, the state, society in particular in Marxism?

3. Marxism Talking on «Fordizm»

tradition their aspirations and deeds are in the same way deliberately either buried in oblivion or obscured by lies. And believing those lies and myths results in misunderstanding their visions and doings equally by those who admires both of them and those who slight or hate them.

In order to understand the place they hold in history and the momentum their aspirations and deeds had in regard to the future one must turn to their own sayings. And if this is done we shall get a chance to experience a globalization of a totally different nature, of the kind that only parasites can oppose to.

4. A Campaign for What: for Capitalism? Or for Socialism?

4.1. Humanism in Deed and in Word

Let us turn to the book by H. Ford “My Life and Work”¹ which was published in the USA in 1922 and first came out in Russian translation in the USSR as early as 1924. Let us start by dealing with the simplest issue of «humanizing labor» keeping in mind that H. Ford himself was not a «Fordist» in the very same way that Marx was not a «Marxist» and Muhammad was not a «Mohammedan».

In other words Ford’s own creative approach to life and business distinguishes him from many others who imitated him in introducing assembly line, «scientific methods» of organizing labor, etc. But they did not understand that what Ford did was inspired by a true concern about improving the life of common people by the means available to him and not by a hypocritical wish of a self-seeking financier to present himself as a humanist, reformer and «benefactor».

The proportion of disabled people among healthy people in a society and their actual way of life are universally recognized indicators, which tell how «humanistic» this society and labor in this society are. Henry Ford writes the following about this problem that is becoming more and more actual as medicine is becoming more and more capable of *forcing a human soul to live in a maimed or ill body*:

«We have always with us the maimed and the halt. There is a most generous disposition to regard all of these people who are physically incapacitated for labor as a charge on society and to support them by charity. There are cases where I imagine that the support must be by charity — as, for instance, an idiot. But those cases are extraordinarily rare, and we have found it possible, among the great number of different tasks that must be performed

¹ We take quotations from the book by Ford (in Russian translation) out of an electronic file obtained in the Internet. That is why we mark quotations with names of chapters only without providing the numbers of pages. The file being quoted can be found in the «Other authors» section in the Internal Predictor of the USSR CD information base.

4.1. Humanism in Deed and in Word

somewhere in the company, to find an opening for almost any one and on the basis of production. The blind man or cripple can, in the particular place to which he is assigned, perform just as much work and receive exactly the same pay as a wholly able-bodied man would. We do not prefer cripples — but we have demonstrated that they can earn full wages.

It would be quite outside the spirit of what we are trying to do, to take on men because they were crippled, pay them a lower wage, and be content with a lower output. That might be directly helping the men but it would not be helping them in the best way. The best way is always the way by which they can be put on a productive par with able-bodied men. I believe that there is very little occasion for charity in this world — that is, charity in the sense of making gifts. Most certainly business and charity cannot be combined; the purpose of a factory is to produce, and it ill serves the community in general unless it does produce to the utmost of its capacity. We are too ready to assume without investigation that the full possession of faculties is a condition requisite to the best performance of all jobs. To discover just what was the real situation, I had all of the different jobs in the factory classified to the kind of machine and work — whether the physical labor involved was light, medium, or heavy; whether it were a wet or a dry job, and if not, with what kind of fluid; whether it were clean or dirty; near an oven or a furnace; the condition of the air; whether one or both hands had to be used; whether the employee stood or sat down at his work; whether it was noisy or quiet; whether it required accuracy; whether the light was natural or artificial; the number of pieces that had to be handled per hour; the weight of the material handled; and the description of the strain upon the worker. It turned out at the time of the inquiry that there were then 7,882 different jobs in the factory. Of these, 949 were classified as heavy work requiring strong, able-bodied, and practically physically perfect men; 3,338 required men of ordinary physical development and strength. The remaining 3,595 jobs were disclosed as requiring no physical exertion and could be performed by the slightest, weakest sort of men. In fact, most of them could be satisfactorily filled by women or older children. The lightest jobs were again classified to discover how many of them required the use of full faculties, and we found that 670 could be filled by legless men, 2,637 by one-legged men, 2 by armless men, 715 by one-armed men, and 10 by blind men. Therefore, out of 7,882 kinds of jobs, 4,034 — although some of them required strength — did not

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

require full physical capacity. That is, developed industry can provide wage work for a higher average of standard¹ men than are ordinarily included in any normal community. If the jobs in any one industry or, say, any one factory, were analyzed as ours have been analyzed, the proportion might be very different, yet I am quite sure that if work is sufficiently subdivided — subdivided to the point of highest economy — there will be no dearth of places in which the physically incapacitated can do a man's job and get a man's wage. It is economically most wasteful to accept crippled men as charges and then to teach them trivial tasks like the weaving of baskets or some other form of unremunerative hand labor, in the hope, not of aiding them to make a living, but of preventing despondency.

When a man is taken on by the Employment Department, the theory is to put him into a job suited to his condition. If he is already at work and he does not seem able to perform the work, or if he does not like his work, he is given a transfer card, which he takes up to the transfer department, and after an examination he is tried out in some other work more suited to his condition or disposition. Those who are below the ordinary physical standards are just as good workers, rightly placed, as those who are above. For instance, a blind man was assigned to the stock department to count bolts and nuts for shipment to branch establishments. Two other able-bodied men were already employed on this work. In two days the foreman sent a note to the transfer department releasing the able-bodied men because the blind man was able to do not only his own work but also the work that had formerly been done by the sound men.

This salvage can be carried further. It is usually taken for granted that when a man is injured he is simply out of the running and should be paid an allowance. But there is always a period of convalescence, especially in fracture cases, where the man is strong enough to work, and, indeed, by that time usually anxious to work, for the largest possible accident allowance can never be as great as a man's wage. If it were, then a business would simply have an additional tax put upon it, and that tax would show up in the cost of the product. There would be less buying of the product and

¹ The quoted file gives «partially capable» instead of «partially able-bodied» though it follows from the context that what is meant is limited work capacity. Unfortunately the Russian translation contained in the file being quoted leaves much to be desired in various other passages as well.

4.1. Humanism in Deed and in Word

therefore less work for somebody. That is an inevitable sequence that must always be borne in mind.

We have experimented with bedridden men — men who were able to sit up¹. We put black oilcloth covers or aprons over the beds and set the men to work screwing nuts on small bolts. This is a job that has to be done by hand and on which fifteen or twenty men are kept busy in the Magneto Department. The men in the hospital could do it just as well as the men in the shop and they were able to receive their regular wages. In fact, their production was about 20 per cent., I believe, above the usual shop production. No man had to do the work unless he wanted to. But they all wanted to. It kept time from hanging on their hands. They slept and ate better and recovered more rapidly.

(...)

At the time of the last analysis of employed, there were 9,563 sub-standard men. Of these, 123 had crippled or amputated arms, forearms, or hands. One had both hands off. There were 4 totally blind men, 207 blind in one eye, 253 with one eye nearly blind, 37 deaf and dumb, 60 epileptics, 4 with both legs or feet missing, 234 with one foot or leg missing. The others had minor impediments² (Ch. 7, «The Terror of the Machine»)

¹ In his book H. Ford writes that among other things «Ford Motors» kept its own hospital. Medical services at that hospital were charged, but those charges and the personnel's wages were maintained at a ratio that would enable them to pay the charges out of their wages. In other words two birds were killed with one stone: health care was accessible and an economical attitude to one's health received a monetary stimulus — though medicine is affordable it is not only more pleasant to be healthy, it is more profitable.

² This paragraph is followed by an extract containing the statistical data on personnel training that are given in the above-mentioned article «Fordizm» from the «Big Soviet Encyclopedia»:

« The length of time required to become proficient in the various occupations is about as follows: 43 per cent. Of all the jobs require not over one day of training; 36 per cent. require from one day to one week; 6 per cent. require from one to two weeks; 14 per cent. require from one month to one year; one per cent. require from one to six years. The last jobs require great skill – as in tool making and die sinking».

The broader context where the data given by the encyclopedia are taken from shows that the authors of the article «Fordizm» were deliberately slandering Ford, i.e. they had a malicious intent and were performing an order on propaganda.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Having read this an impudent Marxist propagandist will say that the infamous capitalist made his fortune out of invalids' work disguising the desire to make profit by talking about human dignity of the cripples employed at his factories, comparing his «own» cripples to the cripples fully supported by social security institutions (as it supposedly should be in a society of established socialism and communism).

But when a cripple is fully supported by social security institutions and his creative and personal potential is not called for it leads to a corruption that only strong personalities can resist. It is so because man is a social being and if he is not a confirmed parasite he feels himself a normal person only when the society accepts his labor and recognizes the value of his labor's product. Many invalids and cripples lapsed into spiritual degradation because they were not called for by society, the people around them refused to accept their wish to work having no ability and inclination to help a cripple realize himself or herself in valuable labor. Being fully provided for by social security was the last straw. Besides, historically real «charitable» foundations become a «washing machine» for money laundering and a sinecure for all kinds of parasites no matter whether those foundations operate under capitalism or under socialism.

H. Ford is more just in his attitude to employment of the sick and cripples than the bureaucratic practice of the Soviet «SOBES» (social care system in the USSR) that was satirized as far back as 1927 in a novel by I. Ilf and E. Petrov "12 chairs" (known in the West as "Diamonds to sit on"). On the other hand a significant part of Marxist political work (propaganda) was nothing else but being parasitic on the labor of others while enjoying full social support according to their status in the hierarchy of bureaucratic state machinery and sociological academic and research institutions. Therefore it is clear why Marxists slander H. Ford who does not tolerate stimulating parasitism under the pretence of «social security» and «trade unions», which would enable parasites to have their share.

Besides, H. Ford sought to ensure that the enterprise under his management did not produce people with occupational diseases and cripples by itself. Many people have heard the anecdote about the following posters hanging around in workshops at Ford's factories: «*Worker, remember: God created man but did not make any spare parts!*» In fact even if such posters did hang in workshops they comprised

4.1. Humanism in Deed and in Word

only a part of the accident prevention system. They were not the only «means» of ensuring safety or an excuse of the «God help those who help themselves» kind used by a miser who holds saving on personal safety for a major principle of running a business.

Ford shared a completely different approach to industrial safety:

«Machine safeguarding is a subject all of itself. We do not consider any machine — no matter how efficiently it may turn out its work — as a proper machine unless it is absolutely safe. We have no machines that we consider unsafe, but even at that a few accidents will happen. Every accident, no matter how trivial, is traced back by a skilled man employed solely for that purpose, and a study is made of the machine to make that same accident in the future impossible.

(...)

No reason exists why factory work should be dangerous. If a man has worked too hard or through too long hours he gets into a mental state that invites accidents. Part of the work of preventing accidents is to avoid this mental state; part is to prevent carelessness, and part is to make machinery absolutely fool-proof» (Ch. 7. «The Terror of the machine»).

Impudent Marxists can say that these are just lies and empty talking. Yet Ford's approach to design of industrial equipment and organization of operating it includes both parts of the slogan proclaimed by the CPSU¹ as late as the 1960s: «Replace safety measures by safe equipment!» At the same time Ford unlike liars from the CPSU Central Committee of the “zastoi” (stagnation) period does not contrast «*safe equipment*» to «*safety measures*» (i.e. *safe methods of work organization and of operating industrial equipment*). He considers them to be the two constituents of industrial safety whereby both the equipment and work organization must be safe. Besides, Ford did some practical work to solve the problem of safe equipment and achieved success half a century before the CPSU called for it without having a practical solution. And those who denounce the inhumanity of Fordizm in the form it was applied by Ford himself should also bother to learn that Ford concludes the 7th chapter with the following words:

«Workmen will wear unsuitable clothing — ties that may be caught in a pulley, flowing sleeves, and all manner of unsuitable

¹ Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

articles¹. The bosses have to watch for that, and they catch most of the offenders. New machines are tested in every way before they are permitted to be installed. As a result we have practically no serious accidents. Industry needs not exact a human toll».

The attitude of personnel to their own safety described by Ford makes it clear that **true humanism of labor and of social relations on the whole** does not totally and exclusively depend on somebody from among the owners or managers of an enterprise. It is determined by cultural development on the whole and by the standard of work at a given enterprise in particular.

Yet sometimes the worker permits himself to start working in clothes unfit for it or to work drunk or «tipsy». He avoids wearing security clothes and accessories (breathing masks, light-protective spectacles etc.) and violates technology and *organization procedures of specific works* («*safety measures*» standards). He does this under the pretext of increasing performance but actually for the sake of raising his income «right now» or for the sake of «simplifying» technology and work organization in order to «lighten» his work to the detriment of product quality and safety. The worker thinks it possible to manufacture reject products that could heavily injure or cause some other losses to the customer or third persons. If all this is the case one need not put the blame of employees (including the working class idealized by Marxism for no reason whatsoever) for occupational injuries, occupational diseases, reject products etc. on the management and capitalists — whether in a socialist or a capitalist state.

Ford unlike the Marxists who controlled Russia's economy and gave rise to no less than a custom of concealing mass occupational injuries and

¹ A device consisting of two multi-pass blocks and a rope passed through them, one end of the rope being attached to one block and the other end (running end) being pulled either manually or by means of a winch when weights need to be moved. One block is mounted on a beam; the other is fixed on the rope being passed several times through both blocks to form rings. Either a crook or a claw is mounted on the free block. The hoist is intended for lifting and moving heavy weights. When operating the hoist the worker must wear clothes reducing the risk of its getting between the blocks.

Ties and broad sleeves may also cause injuries when caught by moving parts of machinery: drills, shafts, cutters, component parts while turnings etc.

4.1. Humanism in Deed and in Word

diseases is indeed a humanist because he makes it a direct responsibility of the supervisors to «catch the sinners» caring about the «sinners»'s health and about the welfare of their families notwithstanding what the «sinners» themselves having a self-confident and irresponsible attitude think to be appropriate. **And this is truly a difficult task — to protect fools from themselves and at the same time make them grow wiser if possible.**

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

Everyone knows that Ford manufactured cars. That is why one might get an impression that Ford managed to occupy a «microeconomic» niche and afterwards made profit from maintaining a virtual monopoly for decades, and that his principles and experience cannot be applied outside this «microeconomic» niche, therefore there is nothing to learn from him. Yet Ford achieved success not only as a manufacturer of cars but also as an owner of a railroad, though he did it not on his own accord but pressed by the circumstances. The fact is that the Detroit-Toledo-Ironton railroad formed a part of «Ford Motors» production cycle. It provided freight services necessary to connect remote trade shops into a single car-manufacturing procedure. Ford writes as follows about the quality of those services:

«For years past we had been trying to send freight over this road because it was conveniently located, but we had never been able to use it to any extent because of the delayed deliveries. We could not count on a shipment to within five or six weeks; that tied up too much money and also broke into our production schedule. There was no reason why the road should not have had a schedule; but it did not. The delays became legal matters <on damaged incurred by freight-owners due to delays in delivery>¹ to be taken up in due legal course; that is not the way of business. We think that a delay is a criticism of our work and is something at once to be investigated. That is business» (Ch. 16. “The Railroads”).

Having got tired of fighting the railroad’s management and of the uncertainty its bad performance introduced into «Ford Motors» business, Ford bought the railroad:

«We bought the railway because its right of way interfered with some of our improvements on the River Rouge. We did not buy it as an investment, or as an adjunct to our industries, or because of its strategic position. The extraordinarily good situation of the railway seems to have become universally apparent only since we bought it. That, however, is beside the point. We bought the railway because it interfered with our plans. Then we had to do something with it. The only thing to do was to run it as a productive enterprise, applying to it exactly the same principles as

¹ Here and further throughout the text <angular brackets> are used to designate our notes and commentaries.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

are applied in every department of our industries» (Ch. 16. “The Railroads”).

Ford says the following about the road’s life and the situation on it before and after its acquisition by «Ford Motors»:

«The Detroit-Toledo & Ironton Railway was organized some twenty-odd years ago¹ and has been reorganized every few years since then. The last reorganization was in 1914. The war and the federal control² of the railways interrupted the cycle of reorganization. The road owns 343 miles of track³, has 52 miles of branches, and 45 miles of trackage rights over other roads. It goes from Detroit almost due south to Ironton on the Ohio River, thus tapping the West Virginia coal deposits. It crosses most of the large trunk lines and it is a road which, from a general business standpoint, ought to pay. It has paid. It seems to have paid the bankers. In 1913 the net capitalization per mile of road was \$105,000. In the next receivership this was cut down to \$47,000 per mile. I do not know how much money in all has been raised on the strength of the road. I do know that in the reorganization of 1914 the bondholders were assessed and forced to turn into the treasury nearly five million dollars — which is the amount that we paid for the entire road. We paid sixty cents on the dollar for the outstanding mortgage bonds, although the ruling price just before the time of purchase was between thirty and forty cents on the dollar. We paid a dollar a share for the common stock and five dollars a share for the preferred stock — which seemed to be a fair price considering that no interest had ever been paid upon the bonds and a dividend on the stock was a most remote possibility. The rolling stock of the road consisted of about seventy locomotives, twenty-seven passenger cars, and around twenty-eight hundred freight cars. All of the rolling stock was in extremely bad condition and a good part

¹ I.e. in the very beginning of the 20th century.

² What is meant is the US Administration.

³ 343 English miles correspond to approximately 550 kilometers, and as Ford says it sometimes takes up to 5 or 6 weeks for a shipment to go this distance. It means that the average speed of transportation on this railroad could be as low as 0.65 km/h while at the time a steam engine could haul a train of 20 to 30 carriages (even if they were two-axle) at a speed of some 40 — 50 km/h. Comparing the two figures may say something about the quality of management at the railroad before it was acquired by «Ford Motors» and after that.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of it would not run at all. All of the buildings were dirty, unpainted, and generally run down. The roadbed was something more than a streak of rust and something less than a railway. The repair shops were over-manned and under-machined. Practically everything connected with operation was conducted with a maximum of waste. There was, however, an exceedingly ample executive and administration department, and of course a legal department. The legal department alone cost in one month nearly \$18,000.

We took over the road in March, 1921. We began to apply industrial principles. There had been an executive office in Detroit. We closed that up and put the administration into the charge of one man and gave him half of the flat-topped desk out in the freight office. The legal department went with the executive offices. There is no reason for so much litigation in connection with railroading. Our people quickly settled all the mass of outstanding claims, some of which had been hanging on for years. As new claims arise, they are settled at once and on the facts, so that the legal expense seldom exceeds \$200 a month. All of the unnecessary accounting and red tape were thrown out and the payroll of the road was reduced from 2,700 to 1,650 men.

Following our general policy, all titles and offices other than those required by law were abolished. The ordinary railway organization is rigid; a message has to go up through a certain line of authority and no man is expected to do anything without explicit orders from his superior. One morning I went out to the road very early and found a wrecking train with steam up, a crew aboard and all ready to start. It had been "awaiting orders" for half an hour. We went down and cleared the wreck before the orders came through; that was before the idea of personal responsibility had soaked in. It was a little hard to break the "orders" habit; the men at first were afraid to take responsibility. But as we went on, they seemed to like the plan more and more and now no man limits his duties. A man is paid for a day's work of eight hours and he is expected to work during those eight hours. If he is an engineer and finishes a run in four hours then he works at whatever else may be in demand for the next four hours. If a man works more than eight hours he is not paid for overtime — he deducts his overtime from the next working day or saves it up and gets a whole day off with pay. Our eight-hour day is a day of eight hours and not a basis for computing pay.

The minimum wage is six dollars a day. There are no extra men. We have cut down in the offices, in the shops, and on the roads. In

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

one shop 20 men are now doing more work than 59 did before. Not long ago one of our track gangs, consisting of a foreman and 15 men, was working beside a parallel road on which was a gang of 40 men doing exactly the same sort of track repairing and ballasting. In five days our gang did two telegraph poles more than the competing gang!

The road is being rehabilitated; nearly the whole track has been re-ballasted and many miles of new rails have been laid. The locomotives and rolling stock are being overhauled in our own shops and at a very slight expense. We found that the supplies bought previously were of poor quality or unfitted for the use; we are saving money on supplies by buying better qualities and seeing that nothing is wasted. The men seem entirely willing to cooperate in saving. They do not discard that which might be used. We ask a man, "What can you get out of an engine?" and he answers with an economy record. And we are not pouring in great amounts of money. Everything is being done out of earnings. That is our policy.

The trains must go through and on time. The time of freight movements has been cut down about two thirds. A car on a siding is not just a car on a siding. It is a great big question mark. Someone has to know why it is there. It used to take 8 or 9 days to get freight through to Philadelphia or New York; now it takes three and a half days. The organization is serving.

All sorts of explanations are put forward, of why a deficit was turned into a surplus» (Ch. 16. "The Railroads").

If one looks at how quick freight is shipped from «A» to «B» in terms of the railroad's performance then under Ford's management it increased more than twofold, let alone the number of employees, which was reduced by more than one and a half. Though Ford does not quote any numbers concerning freight turnover we must assume that the demand for transportation in that area *at the rates valid at that moment* was fully met by the railroad.

It could seem to be a fine example to use in a campaign for free-market capitalism... if one forgets about the chaos that reigned at that same railway along with free-market capitalism before its acquisition by «Ford Motors».

In the last quarter of the 19th century — first quarter of the 20th century a net of railroads covered the USA. They were a country of an

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

immaculately clear liberal market economy whereby state officials did not interfere with private businesses both on the level of states (region) and the state union (federal level). Such a state of affairs is one of the ideals modern Russian liberals seek to make a reality in Russia. They explain the fact that the average man does not sense a tangible result of the economic reforms, which they have been carrying out since 1991 by saying that this free-market system has not been introduced.

But it follows from what Ford says about business management on the Detroit-Toledo-Ironton railroad before it was acquired by «Ford Motors» that even in presumably ideal conditions the market mechanism does not guarantee the quality of services provided. It likely does not always encourage the owner to run a business on the self-repaying basis providing profits to shareholders who have invested into the business. This means that the issue of free purchase and sale does not determine the reasons of success or failure in business including their financial representation.

In this particular case explaining the railroad's success under Ford's management by saying that there was a change in market opportunities and «the deficit was replaced by profits» means naming the effect instead of the cause. Before the acquisition by «Ford Motors» the railroad was unprofitable not because there were no market opportunities. It became profitable after its acquisition not in the least because market conditions became favorable. Ford says the following about the abject state in which the Detroit-Toledo-Ironton railroad was before its acquisition by «Ford Motors»:

«Nothing in this country furnishes a better example of how a business may be turned from its function of service than do the railroads. We have a railroad problem, and much learned thought and discussion have been devoted to the solution of that problem. Everyone is dissatisfied with the railways. The public is dissatisfied because both the passenger and freight rates are too high. The railroad employees are dissatisfied because they say their wages are too low and their hours too long. The owners of the railways are dissatisfied because it is claimed that no adequate return is realized upon the money invested. All of the contacts of a properly managed undertaking ought to be satisfactory. If the public, the employees, and the owners do not find themselves better off because of the undertaking, then there must be something very wrong indeed with the manner in which the undertaking is carried through.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

I am entirely without any disposition to pose as a railroad authority. There may be railroad authorities, but if the service <to people of society> as rendered by the American railroad to-day is the result of accumulated railway knowledge, then I cannot say that my respect for the usefulness of that knowledge is at all profound. I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the active managers of the railways, the men who really do the work, are entirely capable of conducting the railways of the country to the satisfaction of every one, and I have equally no doubt that these active managers have, by force of a chain of circumstances, all but ceased to manage. And right there is the source of most of the trouble. The men who know railroading have not been allowed <by the system which has formed> to manage railroads.

(...) The guiding hand of the railway has been, not the railroad man, but the banker¹. When railroad credit was high, more money was to be made out of floating bond issues and speculating in the securities than out of service to the public. A very small fraction of the money earned by the railways has gone back into the rehabilitation of the properties. When by skilled management the net revenue became large enough to pay a considerable dividend upon the stock, then that dividend was used first by the speculators on the inside and controlling the railroad fiscal policy to boom the stock and unload their holdings, and then to float a bond issue on the strength of the credit gained through the earnings. When the earnings dropped or were artificially depressed, then the speculators bought back the stock and in the course of time staged another advance and unloading. There is scarcely a railroad in the United States that has not been through one or more receiverships, due to the fact that the financial interests piled on load after load of securities until the structures grew top-heavy and fell over. Then they got in on the receiverships, made money at the expense of gullible security holders, and started the same old pyramiding game all over again.

¹ In fact a «financier» in this context nearly always means a «stock exchange speculator».

Similarly almost every time Ford uses the word «banker» one should read «usurer» instead. That is why we have substituted the word «banker» for «usurers» in the remaining part of the quotation whenever it is unambiguously clear that lending loans on interest is meant. This is a norm, which the US banking system operates by, and this substitution simply clears things up calling social phenomena by their proper names.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

The natural ally of the usurer is the lawyer. Such games as have been played on the railroads have needed expert legal advice. Lawyers, like bankers¹, know absolutely nothing about business. They imagine that a business is properly conducted if it keeps within the law or if the law can be altered or interpreted to suit the purpose in hand. They live on rules. The bankers took finance out of the hands of the managers. They put in lawyers to see that the railroads violated the law only in legal fashion, and thus grew up immense legal departments. Instead of operating under the rules of common sense and according to circumstances, every railroad had to operate on the advice of counsel. Rules spread through every part of the organization. Then came the avalanche of state and federal regulations, until today we find the railways hog-tied in a mass of rules and regulations. With the lawyers and the financiers <i.e. usurious bankers and stock exchange speculators> on the inside and various state commissions on the outside, the railway manager has little chance. That is the trouble with the railways. Business cannot be conducted by law <as well as from the outside, i.e. without understanding their essence what is very typical of most state officials as well as of usurious bankers and stock exchange speculators>» (The very beginning of Ch. 16. “The Railroads”).

«Too many railroads are run, not from the offices of practical men, but from banking offices <i.e. to usurious institutions and their lawyers>, and the principles of procedure, the whole outlook, are financial — not transportation, but financial. There has been a breakdown <of the railroad industry> simply because more attention has been paid to railroads as factors in the stock market² than as servants of the people. Outworn ideas have been retained, development <technical and organizational> has been practically stopped, and railroad men with vision have not been set free to grow.

Will a billion dollars solve that sort of trouble? No, a billion dollars will only make the difficulty one billion dollars worse. **The**

¹ And moreover so a «financier» who is a stock exchange speculator mostly acting as a parasite on production and on processes of macroeconomic control.

² The conclusion Ford makes about US railroads can be applied for interpreting the increase in railroad fares by 30 % in Russia, which took place on January 15th, 2002, and for the production slump at the majority of Russian enterprises that occurred in the course of reforms, especially in high-tech industries.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

purpose of the billion is simply to continue the present methods of railroad management, and it is because of the present methods that we have any railroad difficulties at all (put in bold type by the authors).

The mistaken and foolish things we did years ago are just overtaking us. At the beginning of railway transportation in the United States, the people had to be taught its use, just as they had to be taught the use of the telephone. Also, the new railroads had to make business in order to keep themselves solvent <i.e. self-repaying>. And because railway financing began in one of the rottenest periods of our business history, a number of practices were established as precedents which have influenced railway work ever since» (Ch. 16. “The Railroads”).

Having expressed his opinion on the cause of the mess in railroad business, having related how they got over it using *common sense that is ALWAYS directed towards acting to the benefit of society*, Ford summarizes his railroad experience:

«It is one of nature’s compensations to withdraw prosperity from the business which does not serve.

We have found that on the Detroit-Toledo & Ironton we could, following our universal policy, reduce our rates and get more business. We made some cuts, but the Interstate Commerce Commission <i.e. the American equivalent of the Soviet and Russian State committee on rates and prices> refused to allow them? Under such conditions why discuss the railroads as a business? Or as a service?» (Ch. 16. “The Railroads”, the very end).

Another quotation from Ford’s book describes in an uncompromising and blunt manner how usurious bank capital parasitically dominates in *all Western economies* and most of all in the USA:

«We are not against borrowing money and we are not against bankers. We are against trying to make borrowed money take the place of work¹. We are against the kind of banker who regards a

¹ This means that Ford objects to a society (including economic science, law and legislature) which does not distinguish between:

- profit gained by means of interest on loans and
- profit gained by enterprises of the industrial sector of economy by means of trade.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

business as a melon to be cut <i.e. as on object a usurer can parasite on>. The thing is to keep money and borrowing and finance generally in their proper place, and in order to do that one has to consider exactly for what the money is needed and how it is going to be paid off.

Money is only a tool in business. It is just a part of the machinery. You might as well borrow 100,000 lathes as \$100,000 if the trouble is inside your business. More lathes will not cure it; neither will more money. Only heavier doses of brains and thought and wise courage can cure. A business that misuses what it has will continue to misuse what it can get. The point is — cure the misuse. When that is done, the business will begin to make its own, money, just as a repaired human body begins to make sufficient pure blood.

Borrowing may easily become an excuse for not boring into the trouble. Borrowing may easily become a sop for laziness and pride. Some business men are too lazy to get into overalls and go down to see what is the matter. Or they are too proud to permit the thought that anything they have originated could go wrong. But the laws of business are like the law of gravity, and the man who opposes them feels their power.

He also objects to attempts of raising parasitism achieved through financial manipulations to the level of a highly important task. Compare Ford's point of view with the Koran, sura 2:

«276 (275) Those who feed on interest will rise <on Judgment day> in the same way as those whom Satan casts down with his touch. This will be the punishment for having spoken: «Trade is same as usury». And God has allowed trade and forbidden usury. Those who will hear the word of God and keep away will be (forgiven) what had preceded. His cause belongs to God. And those who carry one are dwellers of flame <hell>, they are in it forever! 277 (276) God destroys usury and breeds charity. Truly God has no love for every sinner! (277) Those who have found faith did good, and built prayer, and lent purification. Those will have their reward from God, and have no fear, and they will not be sad!»

In other words all past, present and future complications in US relations with Islamic countries, and most probably with the rest of the world, have been pre-defined by the fact that the US have built capitalism not according to Ford but contrary to his views — along with the Bible which prescribes usury to Jews as the global system-forming factor (Deuteronomy, 23:19, 20; Deuteronomy, 28:12), directed towards achieving some clearly set out aims (Isaiah, 60:10 — 12). See Supplement 1.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

Borrowing for expansion is one thing; borrowing to make up for mismanagement and waste is quite another¹. You do not want money for the latter — for the reason that money cannot do the job. Waste is corrected by economy; mismanagement is corrected by brains. Neither of these correctives has anything to do with money. Indeed, money under certain circumstances is their enemy. And many a business man thanks his stars for the pinch which showed him that his best capital was in his own brains and not in bank loans. Borrowing under certain circumstances is just like a drunkard taking another drink to cure the effect of the last one. It does not do what it is expected to do. It simply increases the difficulty. Tightening up the loose places in a business is much more profitable than any amount of new capital at 7 per cent.

The internal ailments of business are the ones that require most attention. “Business” in the sense of trading with the people is largely a matter of filling the wants of the people. If you make what they need, and sell it at a price which makes possession a help and not a hardship, then you will do business as long as there is business to do. People buy what helps them just as naturally as they drink water» (Ch. 11. “Money and Goods”).

«Had we been able to obtain the money at 6 per cent. flat — and we should in commissions and the like have had to pay more than that — the interest charge alone on a yearly production of 500,000 cars would have amounted to about four dollars a car. Therefore we should now be without the benefit of better production and loaded with a heavy debt. Our cars would probably cost about one hundred dollars more than they do²; hence we should have a smaller

¹ This suggests that banks should not be the usurers’ «kolkhozes» («collective farms») (among their number are not only the stockholders who own the bank but also the average depositors who receive their share of the bank’s usurious income by means of interest on deposits), they should be investment funds which can lend help to any entrepreneur starting a new business or expanding the existing one for the benefit of the society.

² Raising the price by \$100 — taking into account the necessity to clear not only the loan interest (\$4 per car) but the loan itself. The effect a \$100 increase in price would have is illustrated through the table given by Ford in his book. The table reflects the trends of car output and reduction of prices for a 12-year time period.

Time period	Price in USD	Output of cars
1909 — 10	950	18 664
1910 — 11	780	34 528

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

production, for we could not have so many buyers; we should employ fewer men, and in short, should not be able to serve to the utmost. You will note that the financiers proposed to cure by lending money and not by bettering methods. They did not suggest putting in an engineer; they wanted to put in a treasurer.

And that is the danger of having bankers¹ in business. They <usurers> think solely in terms of money. They think of a factory as making money, not goods. They want to watch the money, not the efficiency of production (put in bold type by the authors). They cannot comprehend that a business never stands

1911 — 12	690	78 440
1912 — 13	600	168 220
1913 — 14	550	248 317
1914 — 15	490	308 213
1915 — 16	440	533 921
1916 — 17	360	785 432
1917 — 18	450	706 584
1918 — 19	525	533 706
1919 — 20	575 to 440	996 660
1920 — 21	440 to 335	1 250 000

Ford is nearly apologizing for the rise in prices and the fall in output occurring in 1918 — 1919. He adds the following comment to the table: «The two latest years were the years of war, and the factory was busy with military orders» (Ch. 10. “How Cheap Can One Manufacture Goods?”)

The second half of the 20th century was characterized by different macroeconomic parameters and the trend in car prices was also different: in the early 1960’s *stock-produced* (i.e. *without tailoring the car to the customer’s specific requirements*) «Lincoln» and «Cadillac» cars (American luxury cars of the same class as «Chaikas» made at the Gorky car factory if anyone still remembers those) cost about 5000 dollars; in the early 1970’s their price rose to \$7000; in the 1990’s stock-produced cars of this class cost around \$60000 — 70000. This is just one of the many examples of the accelerating price growth during these 40 years that takes place while science and technology make regular progress. This progress should reduce production costs further and further yet it is hampered by system-forming bank usury. Price growth made emission of dollars necessary in order to maintain the population’s solvent demand, this led to the dollar’s loss of purchasing power and is one of the reasons which caused the global financial and economic misfortunes of the late 20th and early 21st century.

¹ And in fact it was a dependence on usurers. In this quotation and below in all the occasions when lending loans on interest is meant the word «banker» was substituted for the word «usurer». The reasons have been explained above.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

still, it must go forward or go back. They regard a reduction in prices as a throwing away of profit instead of as a building of business.

Bankers play far too great a part in the conduct of industry. Most businessmen will privately admit that fact. They will seldom publicly admit it because they are afraid of their bankers <organized on mafia-like principles>. **It required less skill to make a fortune dealing in money than dealing in production** (put in bold type by the authors: the same conditions were created by the rascal-reformers¹ in Russia). The average successful banker is by no means so intelligent and resourceful a man as is the average successful businessman. Yet the banker through his control of credit² practically controls the average businessman.

There has been a great reaching out by bankers <usurious institutions> in the last fifteen or twenty years — and especially since the war — and the Federal Reserve System for a time put into their hands an almost limitless supply of credit. The banker is, as I have noted, by training³ and because of his position, totally unsuited

¹ The American writer Vidal Gore (a relative of the former US Vice-president Albert Gore, George Bush junior's rival in the 2000 presidential election, Jacqueline Kennedy's stepbrother) in his interview to the RTR channel (broadcast on the night of March 15/16th, 2002) disagreed with the maxim lately much overused by the Russian reformers whose authorship they attribute to Leo Tolstoy, namely, «patriotism is the last resort of rascals». Vidal Gore said that in our historic era «reform is the last resort of rascals».

² When financial and economic processes taking place in a society are described in terms of a mathematical science known as «*game theory*» it turns out that the institution of loan on interest is a *game with a nonzero sum*. It means that this is a game where only one side is pre-programmed to win by the very principles the game is based on without any alternatives. In our case this side is the usurer, and in the historic reality it is the international mafia corporation of usurers.

The usurer (corporation of usurers) maintains loan interest at a level exceeding production growth rate measured in constant prices. By these means the debtor's paying capacity and the paying capacity of anyone who buys from the debtor passes over to the usurer's purse because the loan to be paid back together with the interest is included into the product's cost and price. This way the corporation of usurers parasites on the entire society regardless whether the society employs a financial and credit system or is engaged in natural economy.

³ A non-usurious banker should get a different training. He should be concerned with the multiindustrial production and product distribution aimed

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

to the conduct of industry. If, therefore, the controllers of credit have lately acquired this very large power, is it not to be taken as a sign that there is something wrong with the financial system that gives to finance instead of to service the predominant power in industry? It was not the industrial acumen of the bankers that brought them into the management of industry. Everyone will admit that. They were pushed there, willy-nilly, by the system itself^f. Therefore, I personally want to discover whether we are operating under the best financial system.

Now, let me say at once that my objection to bankers has nothing to do with personalities. I am not against bankers as such. We stand very much in need of thoughtful men, skilled in finance². The world cannot go on without banking facilities. We have to have money. We have to have credit. Otherwise the fruits of production could not be exchanged. We have to have capital. Without it there could be no production. But whether we have based our banking and our credit on the right foundation is quite another matter.

It is no part of my thought to attack our financial system. I am not in the position of one who has been beaten by the system and wants revenge. It does not make the least difference to me personally what bankers do because we have been able to manage our affairs without outside financial aid. My inquiry is prompted by

at serving the morally healthy interests of people, state institutions and public organizations. He should view the policy on investments, credit and insurance only as a means to control multiindustrial production and distribution *aimed at serving public interests*.

¹ This is true. In the history of modern global civilization the usurious banker's position within the capitalist system of the Western type is a system-forming factor programmed by the Bible's sociology. This was discussed more than once in the books "The Brief Course...", "The «Rupture» of Economy Should be Excised" and other written by the Internal Predictor of the USSR. From this point the usurer's domination is a forced domination. The domination is based on the fact that the institution of loan on interest is a game with nonzero sum where the corporation of usurers is pre-programmed to win without an alternative. Yet they are not the masters of the «game». They are merely an instrument.

² That is people capable of controlling the inter-industry proportions of investments and the rhythm of investments within industries during the process of their technological re-equipment. Non-usurious bankers are required to do nothing else.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

no personal motive whatsoever. I only want to know whether the greatest good is being rendered to the greatest number» (Ch. 12. “Money — Master or Servant”).

In his book Ford tells about the abject state of the Detroit-Toledo-Ironton railroad before it was acquired by «Ford Motors» and about his own relations with the usurious and stock exchange speculations sector of economy. And it is easy to see that these examples completely explain why all the post-1991 reforms bring no tangible result to the «average man». The point is that the «financiers» and lawyers in their majority (with minor exceptions), i.e. as professional corporations which took the cause of introducing reforms into their hands are capable of establishing neither an ethic nor a technical progress simply because those «financiers» and lawyers have knowledge neither of sciences and applied technologies nor of how enterprises are organized internally and communicate with their environments in every branch of industry. They are unfamiliar with the employee’s psychology and with the psychology of society on the whole. And they presumptuously turn a deaf ear on the words of true experts in those fields¹.

But by having said all of this Ford has in fact stood up against the very basis of the US financial system and consequently against capitalism of the Western type. His words about that «it was no part of his thought to attack» their financial system are no more than sheer politeness and a provision for some of his readers’ folly made after he has already disclosed every flaw belonging to the credit and financing system of the biblical type that is mollified or meticulously concealed by the dominating trend of economic science.

Those few quotations from Ford name the essential thing about Western capitalism that remained undisclosed by Marx in the implications and idle talk of his “Capital”. This essential is to this day being concealed under the cover of implications, idle talk and ignorance by Marxists who pretend to oppose capitalism which is a system of minority being parasitic on the majority yet by their ignorance and twaddle they back up this systemic parasitism.

¹ This way they reveal their own folly by denying others to be intellectuals upon the principle: «If you are so smart, show me your money?» The answer to this question mainly should be as follows: «You’ve got it thanks to me and to many others».

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

These *revelation-like* statements Ford makes regarding the system-forming role that usury and stock exchange speculations play in the economy of Western capitalism are also one of the reasons why true «esoteric» Marxists and their masters have had to put it mildly a grudge against Ford while he was alive and continue having a grudge against him half a century after his death. That is why Marxists keep establishing an image of Ford being a fierce exploiter of the working class.¹

On the other hand the liberal bourgeois «democrats» who support market economy are also in a predicament. Ford's writings indicate that it is hardly possible to turn him into a propagandist image of a capitalist entrepreneur, a «self-made man» who personifies the fact that it is possible to make the «American dream» come true when following the «American way of life». In fact one can turn Ford into such an image only by slandering him and creating false notions of his personality, his approach to business and people, his very work in the society. But it is too tempting to get an ally of such a formidable authority: Ford is truly an outstanding personality. And so the liberal supporters of the market make every effort to do it. Let us give as an example the article headed “Henry Ford in Russia” by Alexander Livshits² printed in the “Izvestia” newspaper of January 11, 2002 (p. 2, «Observer's column»).

«The American Henry Ford made a car-factory out of a bicycle-shop. He invented the assembly line³. Set up production of cheap

¹ See the novel by an American writer E. Sinclair (1878 — 1968) “The motor-car king” (1937) that was published in the USSR and re-published several times while books by Ford himself were locked up in «spets-hrans» («special depositories»). This is how V. Lenin described E. Sinclair: «... a socialist of senses, theoretically uneducated».

² He once held the posts of President Yeltsin's advisor on economic issues, the minister of economics in 1996 — 1997, at present (first quarter of 2002) he is a free-lance advisor on economics to the government of the Russian Federation.

³ To be precise it was not Ford who invented the assembly line, yet it was Ford who was successful in applying it. The assembly line was known and used since times immemorial. For example one of the sources on shipbuilding history reports that in Venice galleys were built on the assembly line (to provide re-enforcements to the fleet in the shortest time possible) as early as the Middle ages. There was a well worked-through project, mass production of standard hull and sparring (masts and other parts of rig) components stocked in advance. After the hull was assembled on the building berth and launched it

→ → →

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

cars. People started driving. So one had to build roads. And the whole economy followed. Henry himself became a rich man. Had Ford been born in the USSR, he would most probably end up at a defense factory. What's the limit? World's best armoured troop-carrier. An order conferred. A quarterly bonus payment. His business talent would have to be stifled. Or he would have been sent to chop trees in Siberia.¹

Ford would also have a difficult time in modern Russia. How can one manufacture cars when banks refuse to give long-term loans? But this is not the main point. Russian bureaucracy would knock Henry down. Not only is it a fierce one. It requires lots of money to spend. And what the businessman spends on bribing officials he makes up in the price of his product.² (...)

Civilized businessmen think bribes unacceptable. That is why they pass Russia by. And investments are desperately needed. The government, so to say, has grasped the problem. It has passed three anti-bureaucratic laws. It has made registering and getting a license way easier for juridical persons. (...)

What did we get from the government's innovations? Up to now only one thing is clear: that the government has made a move in the

was towed along a canal on the banks of which there were warehouses and workshops. Equipment and outfit to be mounted on the ship were taken from those warehouses and loaded on board. A turnkey fighting unit was built in less than 24 h.

¹ And why not taking up the post of Chairman of the State planning committee of the USSR? — Ford's world understanding is more in line with conscientious work in this office than with *abusing his authority in the rank of a factory's director in pursuit of personal enrichment which would be an example of what Livshits calls a «business talent»*. It was people of Ford's way of thinking (not the people who shared the outlook of academician A. Aganbegyan, A. Livshits, E. Gaidar, M. Fridman and other *gangsters* under guise of scholars) that were lacking in the *Gosplan (State planning committee)* of the USSR and the Gosplans of Soviet republics, in the high school and science in general, and we shall make this evident later on.

² Is it really so that the mafia of usurers in Russia — mostly peopled by Jews — is inferior in its fierceness to the Russian bureaucracy, where Jewish positions (exactly how it is prescribed by the doctrine of Deuteronomy, Ch. 23:19, 20; Isaiah Ch. 28:12, Ch. 60:10 — 12, see Supplement 1) are also strong? And what is the money that industry and not some abstract «business» spends on usurious bankers made up by? — Under Livshits and Chernomyrdin loan interest rates used to soar up to 240 % per year and have never dropped below 20 %. Is it not a vicious act of sabotage?

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

right direction. It is hard to say more. It all depends on how new legislation will be followed. What is even more important is whether regional authorities will start re-defining bureaucratic rules or not. Following the principle: «federal law prohibits giving orders and our local law allows it»¹. Of course the local law is termed differently and uses different means to do it. (...)

Believe me, I am no reactionary. And I am not an enemy of the reforms. It is simply that I am sure that the average man is always right.² If he gains from reforms, everything has been done the right way³. If he loses, it's the other way round.

We'll see what we'll see. It is still possible that in future both registration and licensing procedures will have to be made stricter. There is nothing here to be afraid of. It takes years to build a system of state control. It was so in America. And when the government finally set the firm rules there came Henry Ford. And things got on».

One may ask: has Alexander Livshits read books by Ford proper and lies intentionally? Or he has not read those books and writes nonsense about how «Ford Motors» got started and was running business regardless of what Ford himself wrote about it, telling lies in an impudent manner due to his ignorance and weak mind because he is prejudiced against Ford by gossip and myths?⁴

¹ Livshits could very well have alluded to Lenin here. «Don't you dare to give orders!» — was one of the demands Lenin made of party executives who sought to take part in controlling economy at the very start of building socialism. Thus it is only the covers and slogans that change, the problems remain the same...

² In a crowd-“elitist” society where the “elite” is also a *crowd living by tradition and judging by authority (this is how the sociological term «crowd» is defined)* this statement means: the crowd is always right. This way one can get deep into troubles by indulging to corrupted and perverted crowd and following its tastes...

³ And this is a reluctance to deal with the issue of the objectivity of Good and Evil and an effort to impose somebody's subjective idea of them pretending that it is an objective one.

⁴ A. Livshits asks a rhetorical question:

«How can one manufacture cars when banks do not give long-term loans?»

Ford answered him in his book a long time before A. Livshits was born:

«Borrowing for expansion is one thing; borrowing to make up for mismanagement and waste is quite another. You do not want money for the

→ → →

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

And this man holds a doctor's degree, he is a professor... There are many doctors and professors of his like in Russia, they are the "elite".

It might well be time to disband the Supreme certification board and the whole hierarchy of academic degrees. So that scholars have no titles of honor but their own good name.

Actually Ford made the career of the industry's founder and «Ford Motors» became a flourishing PRODUCTION and *finance* corporation (not a FINANCE and «industrial» group) without any help of long-term bank loans. The business returned the money because it was beneficial to the entire society. In that historic period loan interests were moderate in the US and the population's solvent demand allowed for expanding business both in the qualitative and quantitative way because management efficiency ensured self-repayment.

Ford discovered how production and consumption development are paralyzed by the parasitic finance system based on mafia-like unhindered bank usury and stock exchange speculations. And he came to this conclusion even in a situation relatively favorable for renovating and expanding production.

Yet neither Alexander Livshits (former advisor on economic issues to the President of Russia, later supernumerary advisor to the government of the Russian Federation), nor the many chairmen of the RF Central Bank dismissed after a short time of holding the post, nor Russia's economic science and conventional sociology do not see¹ the paralyzing effect usury and stock exchange speculations have on micro economy as well as macroeconomy. Over all the years of the reforms loan interest rates have

latter — for the reason that money cannot do the job. Waste is corrected by economy; mismanagement is corrected by brains. Neither of these correctives has anything to do with money».

¹ Rather, they refuse to see and turn their back on this problem when it is pointed out directly. The analytical notes "On the Nature of Bank Activities and Improvement of Well-Being" and "On the Check Parameters of the Macroeconomic System and Organizing its Self-Control in a Socially Acceptable Mode" have been distributed in the State Duma and sent to the Ministry of economics that was at that time headed by professor E.Yasin with Ya. Urinson as one of his deputies (both of them of Jewish origin). The Duma kept silence, and the Ministry of economics replied politely that if we are concerned with publishing a thesis we should apply to the Academy of science and universities and not to their institution.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

by several times exceeded the *probable production growth rate calculated in constant prices*. Therefore no management no matter how efficient is capable of turning a furniture workshop into a high-tech enterprise of a national, let alone global scale. And if such loan interest rates remain valid and the outburst of «stock» transactions continues any enterprise that has advanced technology and organizational structure is bound to degrade to a most primitive rule-of-thumb production.

* * *

Digression 1: *On System-Forming Delusions*

In this connection it would be a sin not to recall the system-forming nature of science¹ and higher education.

Do state officials including A. Livshits, politicians, businessmen, economic reporters of mass media, economists and lecturers of finance and economics faculties at universities and colleges turn a blind eye on the fact that loan interest and speculations with «stocks» paralyze the society's economy because they are truly mistaken due to their weakness of mind, ignorance and amateurism? Or is this an evil design accomplished in a perfectly professional way by venal rascals and hypocrites whose objective is enslaving the rest of society while it is drugged by ignorance and stifled financially by the oligarchy of usurious bankers, stock exchange speculators and their backstage masters? Let everyone answer this question on one's own and act accordingly.

We should also point out the fact that financial and economic «blindness» of politicians, academicians, and scholars, is of a selective nature. Those very «blind» people show an amazing acuteness of sight and act very actively in finding faults with the government for its policy on taxes and subsidies. All the years of reforms mass media supported by

¹ «The Institute of the transition period economy» which has been headed by E. Gaidar for several years takes up a special place within this system. If given a name corresponding to the nature of his activity the institute would be called: «*The Institute of CREATING ECONOMIC PROBLEMS*» which it cannot provide solutions for due to feeble-mindedness».

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

academic authorities have been wailing about high taxes which are strangling production, making capital seek cover abroad, provoking double-entry book-keeping and hiding income to escape taxation by physical and juridical persons etc. Therefore the issue of taxation in its connection with usury must also be elucidated correctly.

The fundamental difference between the «pressure of taxation» belonging to true statehood and the usurious vampirism of the anti-national mafia consists in that after money circulation has emerged:

- Taxes take away from the producer a certain fraction of his actual production calculated in terms of value. After that if this fraction is not looted it is used to the benefit of the state. *If the state represents the interests of the vast majority of conscientious laborers all that has been exempted from them in the form of taxes returns to the society in the form of social security provided by the state.* In other words in such a state the «pressure of taxation» does not suppress anyone because everything exempted as taxes returns to the society this or that way.
- Usury sucks out of the society a pre-set fraction of produced items in value terms. This fraction historically really is almost always larger than the efficiency of taking the loan as shown by bookkeeping records. Consequently the society finds itself a slave of supra-national corporation of bloodsuckers — racist usurers.

Such blindness to the effect loan interest and tax rates have on production and consumption which cannot be neutralized by taxing the bank sector proves the fact that economic science and conventional sociology in Russia are of anti-national and anti-state nature because they act in the interests of the supra-national mafia of usurers and justify financial, investment and political strategies desirable for it in a believable «scientific» way.

At the same time there is an opinion widely spread in the society, which is essentially inconsistent: that *loan interest is supposedly vital as*

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

*the source to finance bank activities that are really necessary to the society*¹.

Consequently those who adhere to this view think that the fundamental requirement of prohibiting loan interest (*including interest on bank deposits*²) by law is an anti-systemic demand by «extremist laymen» that

¹ The bank system on the whole performs the following tasks on the macro level of the economy:

- is engaged in accounting of the macro level (keeps counts and transfers monies, accompanying purchase and sale deals of the majority of microeconomic subjects, at least it does so in the so-called «economically developed» countries);
- provides short-term loans to production sphere damping the failures in the rhythmic alternations in the economic subjects' paying capacity thereby speeding up products exchange and increasing running speed, stability and output capacity of the multiindustrial production and consumption system of the society;
- provides long-term loans to the sphere of production enabling enterprises to overcome investment peaks in their expenditure and thereby ensuring that old productive capacities are renewed, new capacities are introduced and the inter-industry proportions of productive capacities (i.e. the so-called mutual compliance between productive capacities of different industries) are maintained;
- provides loans to families enabling them to satisfy their consumer wants which provides for adaptation of nominal solvent demand to existing market prices. This increases sales of manufactured products and speeds up the delivery of certain services to the population (under an economic policy directed towards the satisfaction of morally healthy needs of population this option gives a chance of a rapid advance in the society's welfare).

The bank system is indispensable in solving the above-mentioned tasks, yet their solving is not an end in itself for which banks solely exist. This is a means to assemble the number of microeconomy into the systemic integrity of the macroeconomy, that microeconomy solving the majority of productive tasks emerging in the life of society and its members with the help of their technological activities.

² In fact a bank deposit is a loan lent by the depositor to the bank. Therefore interest on deposit is a kind of loan interest. Most banks pay interest on deposits out of income where the share of usurious income received from the credit services lent by the bank is quite substantial. In other words every depositor takes part in the usurers' robbing the society. The only difference between depositors is that the majority lose more by higher prices of purchased goods and services than they gain from income on deposits; and the minority gain more from income on deposits than they lose by prices on purchased goods and services which the money required to return loans with interest is included into.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

can supposedly ruin the institution of credit and the whole of macroeconomy. In their view the annual interest of 240 % in Russia of the Chernomyrdin and Livshits era are one extreme and *a 0 % annual interest as a system-forming requirement of organizing the credit and finance system in the future economy of the entire mankind and not only Russia* are another extreme.

From their point of view «normal» macroeconomy should have some «moderate» loan interest rates. Those rates on the one hand should allow banks to finance their essential activities and to pay out interest on bank deposits in order to encourage people towards using their savings for financing the development of enterprises that constitute the macroeconomic system of the society. On the other hand they should enable the majority of enterprises to make profit in all branches of industry and should not impair the population's solvent demand.

When specific figures are named for the highest possible loan interest rates they are usually within the bounds of 5 to 7 % per year.¹

¹ In order to understand why these numbers are named as the top limit for loan interest rates one must know the following. The average annual growth of the technosphere's energy potential measured against coal production during the 150 years preceding the beginning of the 21st century was 5%. As the volume of production is limited by the volume of energy which is put into the manufacturing processes then a loan interest rate which poses no threat to the stability of financial system and of technical renovation of the macroeconomy cannot exceed the growth rate of energy potential within the production sphere (on this issue please refer to the theory of similarity of multiindustrial production and consumption systems in "The Brief Course..." and "Dead Water" in post-1998 editions by the Internal Predictor of the USSR).

In conformity with such energy potential growth rate within the production sphere the limit of loan interest rate at 5 % per year during the whole of the mentioned century and a half lay within the bounds of safety for the macroeconomy of most countries. A 7 % rate was safe for the macroeconomy of usurious countries (crediting countries) whose income contained profits from loans lent to other countries and allowed to compensate for the discrepancy between the energy potential growth rate calculated in constant basic prices and the usurious demands expressed in loan interest rates by means of import. It is exactly this kind of income that devastated the economies of «third world» countries (most of them former colonies), which were ruined by usurious countries. This prevented their cultural transformation and made the people of those countries hate the usurers.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Actually the advocates of this point of view confuse two fundamentally different questions. They are:

- The question of financing the society's infrastructure that among others includes bank infrastructure that serves for making payments and bank transfers. It also keeps books of the multiindustrial production and consumption system on the macro-level.
- The question about anyone having a right to claim income that is essentially unearned. This income therefore has nothing to do with remuneration for past and future contribution to the society's welfare and with social security provided regardless of participation in labor.

Work is done by people, not by money. People make products and services that when consumed are paid for with money.

If one bears this in mind, one finds the confusion of the two above-mentioned questions done by supporters of the “moderate loan interest rates”. Such confusion is unacceptable in social life, in state policy, in social science. Because it *substitutes* the question of **slavery brought about by «moderate» loan interest rates** with the question about the necessity of financing bank infrastructure. And this slavery is historically really executed by means of systemic bank usury. This is the way by which this fundamental issue of organizing the society's life is excluded from discussion by confusing the two questions.¹

Systemic bank usury is a means of executing mafia financial slavery. And the institution of credit is a game in which only one team scores. Since usurious creditors always gain financially while the whole of the

But the point is that besides the factors of a purely financial and economic nature there are other factors significant for the society's life and the advocates of a «moderate» loan interest rate avoid discussing them. These very factors result in the ways nations react non-financially, as well as in the ways some people react personally when they see that entire regions of the Earth and their population are enslaved often by means of legalized system-forming usury which results initially from acknowledging the rightfulness of «moderate» loan interest rates.

¹ But it might be so that excluding the issue of slavery exercised by financial means from discussion is exactly what this policy is aimed at. We lay the blame for it on the economic science, which is the legacy of the era when Western-type capitalism was being implemented. And we lay the blame on the social and economic publicists who rely heavily on its authority.

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

society loses out. *But besides that the «moderate» loan interest is detrimental to the society for several other reasons.*

In a society where the bank system uses loan interest the statistic of *bank deposits made by citizens* makes the statistic on the amount of those deposits rise due to loan interest added to them. Interest on deposits for some of the depositors turns out to be comparable to their earned income. And for some other depositors they exceed income figures needed for consumption by the highest life standards. And this happens even when «moderate» loan interest rates are used that pose no threat to the macroeconomic stability and integrity. Besides, descendants of the original depositors inherit bank deposits. And notwithstanding the fact that they have not contributed to accumulating the original savings they have a legal right to enjoy this unearned income.¹

Therefore, having agreed to the introduction of «moderate» loan interest rates (including interest on bank deposits) and having legalized it, the society *encourages the richest from among depositors* to become parasites instead of cultivating respect towards conscientious labor and encouraging it. The society does so by acknowledging their right to enjoy unearned income and by re-distributing to their benefit products manufactured by those who have no bank deposits or bank only small savings that produce interest of no importance for their personal or family budget.

In a morally healthy society income can belong only to one of the following categories:

¹ Though it is beyond any doubt that every family should have a right of having property passed on from generation to generation, such as a certain amount of money savings, housing, etc., as it provides for stability of family «infrastructure» and of the family itself in succession of generations.

Current Russian legislature violates this natural family right (the mob of lawyers in the Duma know only about individual rights yet they have no idea about protecting collective rights: rights of family, labor collectives, peoples, the mankind) by stipulating what is in fact **a tax on the death of parents** collected from their children and grandchildren after they take possession of the parents' apartment if they lived separately.

This is just another example of how foul Russian bourgeois reformers act: being incapable to organize the social production and distribution which provides their citizens with normal life conditions and ensures that the budget is funded the state of bourgeois reformers shamelessly grabs at anything it can.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

- Wages, salaries and bonuses paid for taking part in labor activity
- Payments from social security institutions financed by state and public funds-in-trust that are not a remuneration for taking part in labor activity
- Income received as a *help* from another person who has a motivation of his own. This help should be lent on the basis of *a mutual agreement that does not violate the rights of the person receiving help* (help should solve problems and not create new ones).

But income received from loan interest, including interest on bank deposits is legalized theft. This racketeering is an anonymous one because the racketeer does not deal with the people he robs personally, and therefore those who are being robbed by him have no opportunity of countering him personally.

Opponents to the above-mentioned viewpoint on moderate loan interest rates including interest on bank deposits will have to explain the following to the average laborer:

- Why have some categories of unearned income been acknowledged as legal and other categories of unearned income — as illegal and criminal?
- Why seizing legalized unearned income on one's own accord has also been recognized as crime and is punished by law?

It is particularly desirable to explain it to the average laborer and not to the «average tax-payer» because in the historically real economy a tax-payer can turn out not to be a laborer though he pays taxes on his unearned income which is legalized in the society. And the laborer¹ has to provide food, clothes and all the things necessary for everyone including tax-payers who live an «honest» and law-abiding life on the unearned income that is legalized. The laborer has a right to know why he is supposed to provide for the life of those who can work but don't, and sometimes to provide them with a higher standard of consumption than the one his own family can afford.

¹ Substituting the average laborer with the «average tax-payer», which became a custom in the mass media is also a substitution of one matter with another. Are Russian lawyers so hopelessly dumb that they cannot understand this point? — And if they are not dumb why do they refrain from discussing this issue both in Russia and in the «international community»?

4.2 What Guarantees the Ruin of Economy?

The idea to form the so-called «middle-class» is connected with the wish of major parasite investors, who live mostly by unearned income, to get lost among the facelessness of this «middle», where people do labor but their income consists to a large extent of the unearned income from «stock» of different sorts. The parasite investors seek to achieve it in order that the «middle class» would pettily watch the pennies it gets from it and stand up for the whole corrupt parasitic system.

An example of how thoughtless «middle-class» penny-watchers rise to defend the corrupt parasitic system is their objection to re-organizing credit and finance system on the basis of eliminating loan interest and interest on bank deposits.

Objections of this sort proceed from the assumption that eliminating loan interest (including interest on bank deposits) will cut down the credit resource of the bank system, as people will no longer place money into banks. This will undermine the very institution of credit (and consequently the economy on the whole). Such objections are unfounded.

First, the price list (price-current) on any marketplace is determined by the society's nominal paying capacity including its crediting constituent and responds to any changes occurring on it. In other words the larger the portion of money loaned and not paid back in the volume of purchased products and services, the higher nominal prices.

Second, there are other means of macroeconomic regulation to ensure a credit status of the bank system, which will allow it to work efficiently¹.

But if every form of loan interest were banned by law, it would bring the society into a morally healthier state, it would improve its economy and finance, it would be accompanied by countless positive phenomena in other spheres of civilization's activity whose value cannot be calculated by means of accounting.

As a result, macroeconomy will be primarily controlled by the rational will of people. This will is now being ousted from the sphere of

¹ This can be proven by rigid accounting means on the basis of the theory of similarity of multiindustrial production and consumption system described in the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR "The Brief Course..." and "*Dead Water*" in post-1998 editions.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

macroeconomic management and suppressed in it by thoughtless automatism of collecting loan interest that ensures the welfare of the usurers' corporation no matter how bad their mistakes and misuses in the macroeconomic policy on credit and investments are.

Therefore **while loan interest is still in force**, especially «immoderate» loan interest that serves to generate debts that are sure to be impossible to pay back, i.e. serves to establish a system of slavery on the financial basis, the following holds true:

- **Evading taxes is a method of resisting usurious slavery**, moreover so when a large part of state budget is spent on «servicing» the state's liabilities to foreign and domestic usurers and profiteers from the stock exchange;
- The tax police and legal institutions serving it are in many aspects akin to the polizei whom the Nazi invaders hired among the locals in order to implement their strategy of enslaving the peoples of Russia.

Many entrepreneurs and employees cannot explain the difference and connection between usury and taxation as it has been done above, yet they feel both the difference and the connection between them. And because they feel them they formulate their policy on the micro-level of economy according to what was said above.

That is why the politicians who hope to legalize the income of physical and juridical persons, return the capital that had vanished abroad back to Russia are deceiving themselves. They will not achieve this without dealing away with systemic usury and speculations on «stock» as well as with scientific justification of their supposed necessity and inevitability in the economy of the civilization.

Russia feels it and is aware of this. And she won't be able to develop further until legalized unearned income is eliminated. Attempts to act by force are only aggravating and prolonging the current crisis and will lead those who use force and their accomplices to no good.

Digression 2:

The Axioms of Modern Economics

In order to make clear what conception¹ of controlling the productive forces of mankind H. Ford adhered to we must clearly define several theses regarding the modern system of production and distribution of products and services in the society.

Most of them are obvious because they constitute some of the objective qualities of the social and economic life of our age. *Yet regardless of that* the economic theories dominating in modern science are founded upon the assumption that different opinions hold true for the issues discussed and that the views stated below are supposedly false.

We shall not recall the times of Adam Smith and earlier. We shall leave alone Robinson Crusoe and Friday living on an imaginary island. We shall turn to normal everyday life of any modern society that has developed a technosphere and *that has become dependant on it*. One can make the following statements about its life and economy.

FIRST. With minor exceptions there are no products or services we consume that can be produced by someone on his or her own.

Production of any object or service starting with the conception of its design and up to delivering it to the customer requires collective labor both directly aimed at producing the object or service and indirectly connected with its production (manufacture and maintenance of technical equipment, ensuring necessary conditions that accompany production, for example heating on the premises etc.)

In other words, collective labor of many people, sometimes passed on from generation to generation, is the basis of the welfare of

¹ There is two words in English meaning two similar things: *concept* and *conception*. They are:

Concept – *n.* general notion; abstract idea.

Conception – *n.* 1 conceiving or being conceived. 2 idea, plan. 3 understanding (*has no conception*).

(“The Oxford Dictionary of Current English”; revised second edition. Oxford University Press, 1996.)

In the present work we use the second word due to it’s **third** meaning – understanding. Since any conception of living is primarily the *understanding* not just an *abstract idea*.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

society on the whole. And it's the basis of the welfare of social groups and individuals within it. And any kind of personal labor that forms a part of such collective work is a combination of directly productive labor and management labor. *The last is aimed at coordinating activity of members of a single collective, as well coordinating activity of many collectives.*

SECOND. If we proceed along the line of manufacturing a product in the opposite direction (start with the finished product, going then back to the stage of manufacturing semi-finished goods, components, technical equipment and, finally, to obtaining raw materials and energy) we shall see that the manufacturing process appears to be something like a branching tree. In this tree every «branch» is managed by administratively independent directorates of different enterprises.

These directorates even if their staff consists of a single member control activities by means of directives addressed to their specific area of «jurisdiction». These activities are:

- Controlling certain stages of the manufacturing process (telling people what should be done and who must do it);
- Controlling products exchange within the manufacturing process (telling how work must be passed on from one man to another).

The reason people started trading in all times and in all countries was their inability for different reasons to control the exchange of products efficiently using the addressed directive method.¹

THIRD. Therefore *the market of intermediate and «investment» products², which services the sphere of production and has a more*

¹ Because it was actually or legally impossible to violate the actual property or administrative rights of others or because directive addressed control was disrupted due to impediments to efficient information exchange in large administrative structures («liked by the tsar, but despised by the dog-keeper») and in remote «branches» where local directorates become actually more powerful than the central one («God is high in the sky, and the tsar is likely far»).

² «Investment product» is a term, which denotes means of production, permanent structures, etc. adopted in Western economic science.

Digression 2: The Axioms of Modern Economics

or less open pricing, is a kind of «glue». It «glues» together different fractions of the manufacturing process, which are under addressed directive control of different directorates (because they are owned by different physical or juridical persons), into an integral manufacturing process. When the market can no longer act as this kind of «glue» the complicated manufacturing processes, which employ a great many directorates and staffs subordinate to them, break up into fragments for which there is no demand. *As they are not self-sufficient systems in terms of production and consumption* they begin to degrade until they disappear completely in the course of time.

FOURTH. It is not only the market that plays the role of such «glue», which integrates many *private enterprises (microeconomy)* into a macroeconomy. This role is also performed by culture on the whole: most of all by language culture¹, and by the system of standards² maintained in the society in particular.

FIVE. Sales of products and services to *ultimate consumers (individuals, households, non-production social organizations, state institutions and so on)* are ensured not only by a demand for the products, which are necessary to satisfy the needs of customers. It is also ensured by the paying capacity of potential consumers. As well as by the trends and their paying capacity one anticipates.

SIX. Financial circulation is a phenomenon that merely accompanies the exchange of intermediate products within the manufacturing process and consumption of products by ultimate consumers. It is a process, which controls production and consumption. The effect that financial circulation has on production and consumption, i.e. on whether the market is able to act as the «glue» or not, depends on the policy defined by the individuals who control the society's finances.

¹ It is said in the Bible that construction of the tower of Babylon (no matter what the real project was like) stopped because the participants of the project lost their common language culture.

² A nut with the thread in inches cannot be screwed on a bolt with the thread in metric units, etc.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Namely: the government (issue of money, policy on taxes and subsidies), the bank sector (issue of money, setting loan interest rates and the volume of loans), insurance companies (volume of insurance and price on risks), etc.

SEVEN. Production and consumption form an integral system of the society. This system develops itself in the course of history. Its skeleton is formed by manufacturing processes. And it then acquires the flesh of a system of human relations determined by morals (ideological relations and those resulting from ideology — informal legal tradition, the legally codified one, financial ones, etc.)

EIGHT. The welfare of society and its future is secured *SUBJECTIVELY* by means of this system as a whole. This system, based on technology, *exists and changes OBJECTIVELY*. In order to apply this system efficiently one must do the following:

- Define targets that are to be completed by means of this system;
- Organize and adjust the system and its elements to the end of:
 - completing objectives defined,
 - suppressing processes that lead to completing objectives that are rejected,
 - adapting it to new problems and objectives that emerge (including pre-emptive measures);
- Tailor the work of every *colleague* (and not an individual worker) so that it conforms to the objectives defined and to the scheme according to which this integral multiindustrial system of production and consumption was adjusted.

NINE. It follows that: **There are economic theories that refuse to consider economic issues in terms of *the systemic integrity of multiindustrial production and consumption in a modern society*. Instead of focusing on the problem of controlling self-regulation of this multiindustrial production and consumption system they keep studying its components separately. Such theories avoid facing the question of the systemic integrity formed by its components which is superior to any one of them taken separately and of establishing control over self-regulation of this systemic**

Digression 2: The Axioms of Modern Economics

integrity. In the modern world these theories are nothing but humbug and swindle.

This humbug and swindle in the culture of our age is performed by mafia corporations of professionals. Very often it is not the matter of mistakes actually made by economists and sociologists¹ — members of the Academy, its corresponding members, doctors, professors, candidates of science, assistant professors as well as scientists and lecturers of a lower rank. It is the matter of their parasitic self-seeking avarice and malicious *venality* (*readiness to provide «scientific» and «theoretic» grounds for any propaganda if it is paid for, readiness to teach students and schoolchildren anything ordered by their «customers» passing it off for reliable knowledge*).

TEN. The globalization of the biblical, enslaving, usurious kind involves the downfall of modern civilization and the people's falling into savagery alike the screenplays of American «futuristic» nightmare films. A globalization alternative to it is not possible without solving the problem of establishing a mechanism to control self-regulation of the global production and consumption system to the end of ensuring that all people share in human dignity.

These are the «*ten commandments*» which one must bear in mind when making an assessment of the entire economic science and press.

¹ Because from 1994 on “The Brief Course...” by the Internal Predictor of the USSR was published more than once. This work describes the theory of similarity of multiindustrial production and consumption systems which can provide the basis for solving the task of exercising control by means of self-regulating production and consumption in society, which can be performed both to a socially useful end or to a socially detrimental end.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

They are at the same time the *axioms* of modern economics, of the economics that has a right to exist and develop in our age.

Keeping them in mind let us go back to what Ford thought about organizing production and distributing products and services within the society.

4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America

Joseph Stalin defined the essence of the fundamental economic law of capitalism the following way:

«The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits» (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”, “Remarks on Economic Issues Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, Ch. 7. “The Basic Economic Laws of Modern Capitalism and of Socialism”¹).

Today it is hardly possible to call the population of the «golden billion» countries impoverished: it is stupefied by over-consumption due to the global redistribution of income from usury and debts that cannot be repaid performed by the supra-national bank corporation. Yet nowadays striving for the highest possible profit is still characteristic of the Euro-American type of capitalism.²

¹ J. Stalin's work “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” is quoted from a computer file therefore the quotations have no reference to pages but refer to chapters only.

² «Comparative analysis of the ways American and Japanese directors manage their businesses revealed that for American top-managers the primary goal is profitability of business. Their Japanese counterparts place their <developed> market share at the top. They place profit third from the bottom of a lengthy list». <this makes sense because profitability of business depends on developing and exploiting a certain share of market which remains stable over a long period of time> (V.Hryapov et al. «The economy of an enterprise», Minsk, 2000, p. 101).

Such vector of management, which businessmen and managers of the two countries have, adhered to over decades explains why American capitalism loses the position it has attained by the middle of the 20th century to Asian capitalism represented by Japanese capitalism.

Yet «Ford Motors» under the management of its founder was an exception from this rule, which characterizes Euro-American capitalism over the whole

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

And yet we find the following on the very first pages of the book “My Life and Work” by H. Ford:

«As things are now organized, I could, were I thinking only selfishly, ask for no change. If I merely want money the present system is all right; it gives money in plenty to me. But I am thinking of service. **The present system does not permit of the best service because it encourages every kind of waste — it keeps many men from getting the full return from service. And it is going nowhere. It is all a matter of better planning and adjustment.** (put in bold type by the authors)» (Introduction. “What Is the Idea?”).

This extract leads us to assume that H. Ford as businessman is not the type of businessman whose qualities served as the basis for defining the fundamental economic law of the Euro-American type of capitalism. It is so because Ford clearly condemns money-grubbing, i.e. getting a maximum profit from a business and *seizing it solely for one’s private needs (we shall speak about it later)*, proclaimed as a goal that every «normal» member of society seeks to achieve. Ford does not accept *the capitalism of his time as a system*. He also contrasts the self-seeking money-grubbing that reigns in that system with *the universal norm of social behavior*: acting to the BENEFIT of other people and society.

Yet *unlike the true Marxists — anti-capitalists —* Ford is not a revolutionary. He is seeking not to overthrow the social and economic order that has formed in the course of history but to reform it. And he is a *reformer who rejects violence as a means to achieve social progress*. He is a teacher. He had learned a great deal about organizing production and distribution of products within the society, about politics as a whole (including global politics¹) and interpreted

course of its history. In a footnote to Chapter 4.2 we have given a table illustrating the trends in product output and pricing on products *that were being improved every year*. One can see from this table that the management of «Ford Motors» did not pursue a momentary maximum profit but sought to increase sales, i.e. to develop the market, to expand its share on the market. It was the success in developing the market that provided for stable self-repayment based on sufficient profit. Ford explains this *functional dependence* several times in his book.

¹ Let us explain the terms used here:

- **global policy is the activity directed towards achieving goals regarding the whole of mankind and planet Earth.** Essentially it consists in

→ → →

4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America

what he had learned. And he had carefully written that knowledge down in his books¹ to enable others — who share his creative approach to life and to problems one must face in it — could use his

controlling a range of long-term tendencies which very often rules out any correspondence between current politics and existing tendencies. Defining global policy can of course be compared to a «grand chessboard» as Z. Brzezinski did in a book with the same name (Brzezinski Z. “The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives”. Basic Books) yet one would have to place all countries on this «board» including one’s own;

- **foreign policy is the activity directed towards achieving goals of the state’s ruling class beyond the state’s territory and jurisdiction;**
- **domestic policy is the activity directed towards achieving goals of the state’s ruling class within the state’s territory and jurisdiction.**

Ruling classes of the overwhelming majority of state-like formations that existed in history are not homogeneous. Therefore different subgroups within those classes may have different interests and may set different priorities between global, foreign and domestic policy. For this reason global policy, domestic and foreign policy of one and the same state can more or less disagree and hamper each other. One can read about how this may actually happen without having to deal with all the nonsense of political science in the novel by a Polish writer Boleslav Prus called “The Pharaoh” (printed 1895) which was published in Russia several times after 1991 (a review by Internal Predictor of the USSR can be accessed from the file 9608282rc*.doc from the Information base).

¹ The second book by H. Ford that became widely known is called “The International Jew”, first published also in 1922. It was published several times in Russian translation in the 1920’s in the USSR. Yet later it was withdrawn even from the «spetshrans» of central libraries, as the annotation to its 1993 edition says (published by the «Moskvityanin» publishing house, Moscow).

«Spetshran» is an abbreviation of «spetsialnoye hraneniye» («special custody»). In the USSR this denoted library stock that contained books published both abroad and in the USSR which were not classified but had no access to public libraries or were withdrawn from them. Access to the «spetshran» literature was granted only to authorized specialists and only in their professional field of knowledge. One was required to submit a written request and recommendation from the party committee of one’s place of work which had to be approved by superior party authorities and probably by the KGB.

The book “Today and Tomorrow” is less well-known. In this book Ford continues on the topic started in “My Life and Work”.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

knowledge and practical skills to the benefit of their contemporaries and descendants.

But before we go on quoting Ford's book "My Life and Work" we shall make a short digression into the realm of laws and rights (which are different things).

* * *

Digression 3:

Objective Rights and Subjective Laws

A right is an open opportunity of doing something while being safeguarded against a retribution for what has been done.

In the Russian world understanding the notions of «right» and «righteousness» are interconnected and the words that designate those notions are cognate. Therefore *right* is a reflection of *objective righteousness predefined by God*, so consequently a right is superior to a law passed by a government as a law can also represent an unrighteousness existing in the society. Only an ill-natured person can claim the words «right» and «law» to be synonymous. Such a person is seeking to make people confuse these two notions to the end of substituting *rights* with unrighteous laws.

It follows that if one accepts the terms of a theory where «Right» and «Law» are synonymous then one should distinguish between two categories of rights existing in social life:

- objective rights given to man and mankind from above. The main right superior to all other is the right of every man to act as God's deputy on Earth guided by his conscience and in concord with the message of the Revelations¹;

¹ Atheists have a right to believe that objective rights result from the man's genetic programs and from the laws of nature on the whole with the terms «genetic programs» and «the laws of nature on the whole» used in their broadest sense. In the context of this work what is important is that «objective rights» exist objectively. The debate on their source and variations in terminology are outside the context of this work.

The issues of religion and atheism are dealt with in other works by Internal Predictor of the USSR in detail: "Towards God's Ruling...", "Why does the

→ → →

4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America

- subjective «rights», established in social life by its participants themselves. They depend on their morals and are arbitrary, and can therefore be both righteous and unrighteous.

Consequently conflicts between objective and subjective rights may and do exist in the society. In following objective rights one acts in concord with God's Will. Those who introduce, interpret and execute subjective «rights» attempt to impede the implementation of God's Will by their arbitrary rules. In such a case Rights are superior to laws as reflected in an old Russian proverb: «The one who is righteous in the eyes of God cannot be accused by tsars». This philosophy is profoundly different from the canonical moral duplicity of the New Testament: «give to god what is god's and to Caesar what is Caesar's».¹

Besides any written law characteristic of the society in a specific period of history — *if viewed in terms of the theory of control* — falls into one of the three following information modules:

- algorithms² for normal control following a specific conception of social life and of life and activities of physical and juridical persons within this society;

Internal Predictor Urge People to Live in God's Kingdom Without Acknowledging the Last Covenant?", ««Master and Margaret»: a Hymn to Demonism? Or the Gospel of Devoted Faith", «Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences», etc.

¹ It is exactly this way of using capital and small letters that corresponds to the moral and ethic duplicity which is characteristic of the personality's psyche within the culture of the New Testament canon: «god» and «Caesar».

² Algorithm — garbled «al-Khowarismi», the name of a mathematician who lived in Central Asia in the Middle Ages. His name is used as a term for a succession of actions that allow to achieve certain goals. A description of such a set of actions is also called an algorithm. An algorithm consists of the following:

- the information which describes the way incoming information is transformed for every block of the algorithm and
- the actions (measures), which control the exchange of the information transformed within the algorithm between the blocks.

By algorithms we mean the aggregate of particular functionally specialized algorithms.

In the subculture based on the humanities the closest notion to the terms «algorithm» and «algorithms» is the term «scenario», more particularly — a multi-choice scenario.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

- algorithms for defending control that follows this conception against attempts to exercise control within this society following other conceptions that are *incompatible with the former one*;
- algorithms to make up for the deficiencies that are inherent to the conception supported by the algorithms of *normal control as such deficiencies give rise to social tension and conflicts*.

But the problem of distinguishing between conceptions and the problem of how different conceptions manifest themselves in different fragments of one and the same legislation common for the state as a whole is beyond the majority of members of parliament, sociologists and average people. This results in the deficiency of legislative algorithms in most countries. Such deficiency is of a two-fold nature:

- in Russia there is no definite conception. It is therefore unclear what laws and their articles reflect normal control within the chosen conception and what parts of legislation are a means of defense against implementation of conceptions incompatible to the dominating one. These are the very reasons why current Russian legislation is contradictory, ambiguous and sometimes no less than absurd;¹
- in Western countries there is a definite conception. Legislation is sophisticated in the part responsible for normal algorithms of control following the biblical doctrine (see Appendix) and in the part meant to mitigate deficiencies inherent to the biblical conception of society which is dominant in the West. Namely, it is the conception of a society financially strangled by Hebrew² corporate supranational usury.

¹ Even the analysts of radio «Freedom» note that the Duma members proceeding from their own understanding of practicability often initiate laws or pass laws which contradict to the Russian constitution and to laws passed earlier. But the madhouse on radio «Freedom» is not free enough to discuss the issues of different possible social life conceptions and which one of them is the best. Yet these are the questions that have to be asked in order to start getting over the conceptual uncertainty in social self-government and getting rid of folly.

² In Russian there are three words sounding differently that are used to show really different things. Two of them are translating on English as “Jew” and there is no word for the third. We (though in citations and in stable statements we will leave an original term) will use the next translation:

→ → →

4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America

Because there is *a need to overcome and compensate for their own deficiencies* Western legislation on business and financial activities resembles a labyrinth built in the like of «the tower of Babylon». One group of businessmen gets a right to hunt the income of other businessmen, employees and the state as a whole aided by lawyers and judges and prosecutors, without ever thinking about the consequences of the self-seeking approach encouraged among them as well as about who, when and by what means is going to disentangle all the complications. That is why Western legal practice is mostly shameless pettifogging to the end of «grubbing some money» on legal grounds or preventing others from snatching his or her own money. A horde of avaricious lawyers and «jurists» get their parasitic bread from this pettifoggery.

The second part of legislature that concerns defending control in compliance with the dominating conception against alternatives incompatible with it was introduced both in Russia and in the West in the period between 1917 and the 1950s when Stalin and his era were defamed in the USSR. After that the power passed into the hands of the new generation of Trotskyites, soulless bureaucrats and self-seeking career-makers. Under their rule the USSR lapsed into the period of «zastoi» (stagnation). The ideals of socialism were discredited in the opinion of Western intelligentsia, lost their popular support and no more threatened to eliminate the capitalism of Euro-American type.

Hebrew – shows national (or, correctly, pseudo-national) belonging of a person to the some system of “national” clans.

Jew – it is a word to name the Judaists, so it shows only the religion, not nationality (or pseudo-nationality as “Hebrew” do). There is no need to confuse these two terms. But also “Jew” can be not Judaist, but one who knowingly or unknowingly follows the Judaic conception of all-world domination (see the Supplement 1). So it approaches to the term “zid”.

Zid [zhid] – shows one’s belonging to the active parasites corporation inclined to parasitizing on work and labor of others.

The terms on Russian sounds roughly similar to these ones.

Why do we need to make such a differentiation? Since not each Hebrew is Judaist (and Jew), and not only Hebrews can be Jews. But too often one confuse these nationality and religion (and even the meaning of the word zid is often considered to be just Hebrew. Thus zids of other nationalities fade from the picture).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

In the USSR of Stalin's times the notorious article 58 represented this part of legislature. It set a custodial punishment for various counter-revolutionary and anti-Soviet activities. In the West the policy of defending normal control in compliance with the dominating conception against alternative conceptions was also present. The «witch hunt» in the USA in the age of «McCarthyism»¹ and «professional ban» for left-wing supporters in Germany in the 1970-s and early 1980-s could be named as examples of executing such a policy.

But if we speak about an era when the control of society along the biblical conception is being suppressed and a self-government acting to the benefit of God's kingdom is introduced *professional lawyers and especially legislators who never think about the conceptual background of legislation are the type producing the most detrimental effect*. They are more detrimental than the more or less law-abiding businessmen (including usurious bankers and stock exchange speculators) who adapt to any legislation in force. A businessman (viewed as a class) will adapt to any legislation that from his point of view merely sets the «rules of the game». If the common «rules of the game» are altered most businessmen who are interested in nothing but their business and never think about global problems of sociology will adapt to them provided their life is not endangered and they are not threatened by expropriation («nationalization») of their property and enterprises. **In our age a businessman does have a traditional unwritten right to forget about the conceptual background of legislation. Professional lawyers of our time have already forfeited such a right.**

* *
*

Having made this digression let us go back to Ford's book:

«I have no quarrel with the general attitude of scoffing at new ideas. It is better to be skeptical of all new ideas and to insist upon being shown rather than to rush around in a continuous brainstorm

¹ Called after senator Joseph McCarty (1908 — 1957). He held the post of Chairman of the senate commission of the United States Congress on government agencies' activities and of the regular commission on investigating «anti-American activities» (since 1953). He started a campaign on persecuting and violating the rights of those suspected in sympathizing communists and also those who opposed to the arms race and the «cold war».

4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America

after every new idea. Skepticism, if by that we mean cautiousness, is the balance wheel of civilization. Most of the present acute troubles of the world arise out of taking on new ideas without first carefully investigating to discover if they are good ideas. An idea is not necessarily good because it is old, or necessarily bad because it is new, but if an old idea works, then the weight of the evidence is all in its favor. Ideas are of themselves extraordinarily valuable, but an idea is just an idea. Almost any one can think up an idea. The thing that counts is developing it into a practical product.

I am now most interested in fully demonstrating that the ideas we have put into practice are capable of the largest application — that they have nothing peculiarly to do with motor cars or tractors but form something in the nature of a universal code. I am quite certain that it is the natural code and I want to demonstrate it so thoroughly that it will be accepted, not as a new idea, but as a natural code» (Introduction. “What Is the Idea?”).

This is a brief paragraph but very rich in meaning if one discerns in the terms «code» and «natural code» something different from the penal code, «gentleman’s code» of the criminal community and other crooks, «code of honor» of various corporations of individualists, «moral code» of a communist or a capitalist and the rest of written and unwritten legislation of a crowd-“elitist” society.

In fact in the above quotation Ford says that in his work he sincerely and in good conscience follows a code of objective human rights as far as he has managed to discover and to grasp them. And in his book he describes his vision of a normal algorithms of controlling production and distribution in society according to a conception alternative to the biblical one which dominates the Western civilization: the conception of buying everything up by means of mafia-like corporate supra-national usury. Yet Ford is not writing down his ideas in a rigid form of a law code titled «*On Economic and Financial Activity, Labor Relations and Social Security*» or a treatise on sociology whose structure corresponds to the lengthy list of big and small issues that are discussed. He is simply telling a story where economic, psychological, cultural and social issues are all intertwined as they are in real life. And every man is capable of understanding Ford’s story if he wishes to understand, if he is interested in these issues and if he is aware of their importance for ensuring both his own prosperity and the prosperity of other people (*excluding aggressive*

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

parasites from the ranks of the prosperous since parasites must not prosper).

Also Ford says that he firmly believes in the following.

He has discovered and tested the means to control production and distribution of products and to solve social problems connected with production and distribution, and those means would be recognized by the society as the norm.

After this norm is established *the system* that was successfully implemented in «Ford Motors» will become a natural way to do business and to take part in ventures headed by people who also adhere to this norms.

It is also important that these ethic and organizational norms of managing a business have proved their viability on the microeconomic level in a macroeconomy of the Biblical-Talmudic type which is based on domination of usury and stock exchange speculations organized by mafias and supported by all the might of state and its legal mechanism.¹

Now let us demonstrate Ford's views on *production and consumption which form the backbone of a technical civilization's life*. Ford says:

¹ This macroeconomy is hostile to a laborer both as a producer and as a consumer of products. H. Ford had no power over the US macroeconomy. Those who had power over it used it maliciously to set up «the great depression». Many businesses perished in it and many suffered heavy losses. «Ford Motors» was also among the victims: it was forced to close 25 of its 36 factories.

This was the effect of macroeconomic factors, not of some mistakes which the management of «Ford Motors» made in choosing and executing the strategy of business development.

On the other hand, the book “My Life and Work” by H. Ford was published 7 years before 1929 when the «great depression» broke out. Seven years is a long time enough for the society to think its contents over, to start changing its morals and ethics (including business ethics) and to make it impossible for the potential organizers of the «great depression» to fulfill their plans.

4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America

«The primary functions are agriculture, manufacture, and transportation¹. Community life is impossible without them <of the technology-based civilization, though life of a biological civilization based on different moral and ethic principles and beliefs is possible>. They hold the world together. Raising things, making things, and earning things are as primitive as human need and yet as modern as anything can be. They are of the essence of physical life. When they cease, community life ceases <of a technology-based civilization>» (Introduction. “What Is the Idea?”).

This paragraph makes it clear that Ford begins describing his social and economic views with stating that the multiindustrial system of production and consumption is systemically integral. Its performance determines whether the society as a whole or certain groups within it prosper or not. Consequently it determines the non-economic aspects of prosperity that depend on the economy.

Ford goes on:

«There is plenty of work to do. Business is merely work. Speculation in things already produced <as well as speculating with money, i.e. usury> — that is not business. It is just more or less respectable graft. But it cannot be legislated out of existence (put in bold type by the authors: this is a legalized way of stealing in most countries). Laws can do very little. Law never does anything constructive². It can never be more than a policeman, and so it is a waste of time to look to our state capitals or to Washington to do that which law was not designed to do. As long as we look to legislation to cure poverty or to abolish special privilege we are going to see poverty spread and special privilege grow. We have had enough of looking to Washington and we have had enough of legislators — not so much, however, in this as in other countries — promising laws to do that which laws cannot do.

When you get a whole country — as did ours — thinking that Washington is a sort of heaven and behind its clouds dwell

¹ It is necessary to add control of the micro- and macrolevels in their interaction to the functions named by H. Ford.

² It is really so if the legislators act within the framework of a flawed conception of organizing people’s life in society. For example, this is the case if the legislative, executive and judicial authorities are controlled by the Biblical doctrine of establishing the system of global slavery through financial means.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

omniscience and omnipotence, you are educating that country into a dependent state of mind which augurs ill for the future. Our help does not come from Washington, but from ourselves¹; our help may, however, go to Washington as a sort of central distribution point where all our efforts are coordinated for the general good. We may help the Government; the Government cannot help us.

(...)

The moral fundamental is man's right in his labor <and the products of labor>. This is variously stated. It is sometimes called "the right of property". It is sometimes masked in the command, "Thou shalt not steal". It is the other man's right in his property that makes stealing a crime. When a man has earned his bread, he has a right to that bread. If another steals it, he does more than steal bread; he invades a sacred HUMAN right (put in capitals by the authors).

If we cannot produce we cannot have — but some say if we produce it is only for the capitalists. Capitalists who become such because they provide better means of production are of the foundation of society. They have really nothing of their own². They merely manage property for the benefit of others. Capitalists who become such through trading in money are a temporarily necessary evil. They may not be evil at all if their money goes to production. If their money goes to complicating distribution — to raising barriers between the producer and the consumer — then they are evil capitalists and they will pass away when money is better

¹ It is true but it implies that the common people become familiar with conceptual power and make it righteous. This will inevitably lead to the state and government activity being transformed and in consequence — to passing of new laws and abolishing many previous ones.

² This sentence contains a falsehood stated by H. Ford: see the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR called "The Brief Course...", "On the Nature of Bank Activity and Welfare Growth" (among collected articles "The Intellectual Position", № 1, 1996). Usury as a system-forming economic factor, which occurs in the West and in post-Soviet Russia — is one of the means of executing slavery and therefore is always evil.

And with all this going on **all the regular «defenders of rights» make a silent «all-together» on this issue, as if they are all utter fools.**

If one analyzes all the nonsense that «defenders of rights» have said and written in the last decades their main point can be compressed into the following motto: «Away with statehood! Long live mafia slavery in civilized forms!»

4.3. Fordizm — the First Advent of Bolshevism to America

adjusted to work; and money will become better adjusted to work **when it is fully realized that through work and work alone may health, wealth, and happiness inevitably be secured** (put in bold type by the authors) (Introduction. “What Is the Idea?”).

And the above quotation makes it clear that the right to work naturally implies the right to the products of one’s labor. But because in the multiindustrial production and consumption system work is performed collectively the individual is entitled only to his own share of the work’s product. Besides, many products are discrete¹ and many even non-discrete products are consumed discretely by portions or collectively², therefore the right to receive the objects produced in most cases cannot be actualized in natural form.

This circumstance leads to the following question:

What is the best way to adjust money (which is in itself nothing), or rather money circulation, to labor and consumer relations between people in the systemic integrity of multiindustrial production and distribution of products? For it is exactly the efficiency of this systemic integrity that determines and predestines many things regarding the welfare of society and each of its members.

¹ A discrete product is the one which is calculated in whole numbers only, e.g. it is possible to have 102 cars, not 102.23 cars. When non-discrete products are calculated the quantities are measured by real numbers, i.e. they can be both whole and fractional. E.g., it is possible to have both 102 tons of wheat and 102.23 tons.

Discrete consumption by portions means that consumption is also calculated discretely being determined by the number of portions, though the portion itself can contain a fractional amount of certain products. E.g., in order to make one suit of a certain cut and size various amounts of different fabrics are to be consumed in the manufacturing process, and those amounts do not have to be whole numbers.

² If you have purchased alone a volleyball ground with all the necessary equipment driven by sheer love of physical training and seeking no profit from participating in the sport show-business you will not be able to enjoy the game of volleyball anyway because volleyball is a game for two teams by the way its rules are made.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Ford asks the same question only in a somewhat different wording because he discusses its different interconnected aspects in different parts of his text.

While analyzing the system of self-regulation of production and distribution that has formed in the USA and the West in the course of history in order to answer the many-sided question we pointed to above, Ford adheres to the systemic views he has put forward earlier. He puts it straight:

«I only want to know whether the greatest good is being rendered to the greatest number» (Ch. 12. “Money — Master or Servant?”).

And this is a clear and unambiguous display of supporting *bolshevism* which acts to the benefit of the *majority* («*bolshinstvo*» in *Russian*) of laborers who do not want anyone to parasite on their life and labor.

Digression 4:

The Moral and Ethic Results of Bourgeois Reforms in Russia

«I recall an incident in Siberia where I once lived in exile. It happened in spring, at the time of spring tide. About thirty people went to the river to catch the logs carried away by the raging great river. In the evening they came back to the village, but one of their companions was missing. I asked them where that man was and they answered indifferently that he «remained there». I asked again: «How is it so, he remained?» and they answered with the same indifference: «What's the point of asking, he must have drowned». And the next moment one of them started hurrying somewhere saying that he «had to water the mare». I reproached him for feeling more sorry for a beast than for a man. One of them answered backed up by all the others: **«What's the point of feeling sorry for them people? New people we can make any time, but a mare... it's not that easy to make a new mare»** (put in bold type by the authors: this moral attitude that is widespread among the simple people reveals the reasons for abuse of power after 1917). This might be a small and insignificant detail, which is nevertheless very characteristic. It seems to me that indifference towards people, towards personnel shared by some of our executives, their inability to value people is a remnant of that strange attitude of people towards other people <of that horrible attitude, to be more precise> which was demonstrated in the incident in distant Siberia that I had recollected a bit earlier.

WE MUST FINALLY UNDERSTAND THAT OF ALL THE VALUABLE CAPITAL IN THE WORLD PEOPLE, PERSONNEL ARE THE MOST VALUABLE AND THE MOST DECISIVE CAPITAL. WE MUST UNDERSTAND THAT IN OUR PRESENT SITUATION «PERSONNEL TURNS THE SCALE...» (put in capitals by the authors. A quotation from Stalin's address to graduates of military academies made on May 4, 1934).

And it is truly so: «Personnel turns the scale». Those who disagree with this statement made by the outstanding Bolshevik manager, man of state thinking and economist, Joseph Stalin, can find consolation in a different formula, which is of a slave-owning nature in its essence:

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

«Assets¹ are resources owned by company «A». And though the **EMPLOYEES** of this **COMPANY** are probably its **MOST VALUABLE RESOURCE** (put in capitals by the authors) they nevertheless (are/ are not) a resource subject to accounting. Underline the correct answer» (Robert N. Antoni, professor at Harvard university Business school, “Essentials of Accounting”).²

Though various equipment and technologies are indeed important, *in any sphere of maintenance of modern civilization it is not the money, equipment, technology and software, not the lifeless knowledge contained in books, not the infrastructures that do the work. It is the living people* who control the whole thing and contribute their productive labor (whether manual or intellectual).

At the same time the overwhelming majority of products and services **needed for an individual's, a family's, a nation's life in modern civilization** are of such a nature that they cannot be produced on one's own by anyone. Manufacturing them in good quality requires the coordinated effort of dozens of enterprises and agencies:

They must work «as a single person» who is something like a multitude of personalities existing simultaneously. This «person» should perform the elements of the common work (the manufacturing process) in different places with proper professional skills and industry.

¹ In the terminology of Western accounting *assets (in nominal financial expression) = liabilities (to third physical and juridical parties for taken loans, etc.) + owned capital.*

² The advocates of the «ideal» way of reforming Russia in the Western manner and of «human rights» as they are understood in the West have to see: when the course of accounting at Harvard university business school mentions in a kind of accidental way that a *company's staff is not subject to accounting* one gets the answer to the questions asked by the audience with slave-owning inclinations. Because slaves who are one of production means in a slave-owning society are inevitably subject to accounting. And if one looks into US files on accounting documents compiled in the times before the Civil War, especially in Southern states, one will see that it is really so. Yet even today there are *efforts to start accounting employees* that come from the subconscious, and it demonstrates very brightly the morals, psychology and the true position of most people in the society of US and the West on the whole.

The Moral and Ethic Results of Bourgeois Reforms in Russia

If this is not the case then any projects and ventures end up unrealizable (*at the maximum*) or *at the least* the quality of their products does not satisfy consumers and their participants themselves, depending on how far they were from this ideal. In some cases the project fails because one man out of the thousands of its participants has made a single mistake that passed unnoticed or if noticed uncorrected by other workers; or this one man could *knowingly do* his part of the common job *carelessly*.

Totally removing man from the system of production and turning to a fully automatic and robotic production will not solve this problem. On the contrary, it will aggravate it:

- **first**, any software controlling automatic equipment is written by teams of humans. Both their strengths and weaknesses leave an imprint on this software;
- **second**, one of the basic qualities of most automatic applications is that it is impossible for people to control accuracy of its operation and to correct its mistakes *at the pace at which automatically controlled processes (especially fast ones) proceed*¹.

Owing to the above-mentioned qualities of the modern society's production basis **in any period of time at any enterprise it is the relations between superiors and inferiors and between workers of similar status, which determine whether it will achieve success or fail.**

Therefore when executives share such notorious prejudices in their relations with subordinates as «I'm the boss — you're the fool»,

¹ Let us illustrate this with an example. As early as the 1960's, the earliest stage of developing automatic and computer equipment, an accident happened during the pre-start check of a ballistic intercontinental missile that was about to be tested on the Baykonur space-launching center. The accident occurred due to a mistake in the automatic control system design, which caused an accidental ignition of the second stage engine. Burning fuel went through the first stage fuel tanks and it led to the missile's exploding at the launching site. One single mistake made in a collective activity, which consisted in designing the automatic control system, caused the death of 91 people (including Commander-in-chief of Strategic missile troops Artillery marshal M. Nedelin) who had been working on the launching site and in its vicinity.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

«personnel must do what they are told and mind their own business», etc. and use the clichés «you're the boss — I'm the fool», «I shall do anything you say without any pangs of conscience» when addressing their superiors this is most detrimental to any team work.

If this psychological and ethic climate is maintained among staff members by the executives whose behavior is more befitting to a «pukhun» (leader in a criminal community») or «barin» (Russian landlord) and by other factors of social importance the enterprise is doomed to exist in abject misery. A hierarchy of real fools and «smart» rascals pretending to be fools is formed at the enterprise breeding incompetence and establishing a gap between the post and the qualities the holder of this post has. This happens on every level of controlling the manufacturing processes and controlling the collective. The same goes for the economy as a system formed by many enterprises managed on the principles described in the previous paragraph.¹

Unfortunately, in the course of the post-1991 reforms in the countries of the former USSR top executives on the whole (with minor exceptions known to few people) treated the collectives they headed with permissiveness and carelessness. CEOs and top managers of most enterprises misused their authority, suppressed and dismissed those who opposed their aggressive parasitism and self-seekingly made money. Considering themselves and their relatives to be the society's «cream of the cream» and the true proprietors of those enterprises — the first generation of capitalists, they redistributed Soviet **NATIONAL** property (according to the legislation in force) and **COOPERATIVE** property of the **KOLKHOZES** (collective farms) to their own benefit.

Virtually everywhere CEOs and top-managers treated employees as if they were working cattle without a single human right. **In the collectives that could not withstand this outburst of «barstvo» (the high-brow way Russian land-owners treated serfs) and permissiveness displayed by the mafia of CEOs and top managers** such attitude gave rise to many people's unwillingness to work *honestly and conscientiously*.²

¹ In the Western culture this style of social self-government is described in the «black humor» of the «Murphy laws».

² Working conscientiously means to get professional training, to come forward with *socially useful initiatives* directed towards improving products, technologies, work organization, to help other staff members (including

The Moral and Ethic Results of Bourgeois Reforms in Russia

Actually in many collectives employees silently hate¹ or simply despise and ignore the entire management because they know them to be profoundly vicious people who have been *systematically and impudently* misusing their authority *with impunity* over many years.

This psychological and ethic atmosphere that reigns in many (perhaps in the majority of) collectives is the most prominent result of the post-Stalin «otpepel» (“democratic” thaw), «zastoi» (stagnation) and «democratic reforms» in Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union.

It follows that establishing a psychological and ethic atmosphere that would motivate individuals and collectives at enterprises to work conscientiously is the chief problem one needs to solve at the majority of enterprises. Solving it will enable enterprises to work to the benefit of society and thereby enable Russia to get over the social and political crisis.

This problem needs to be solved because in the **current psychological and ethic climate any personal professionalism no matter how high it is and what sphere it belongs to is rendered futile by the absence of voluntary conscientious support from one’s associates.**

This holds true for anyone’s professionalism: ranging from a janitor’s or a dish-washer’s professionalism to professionalism of truly outstanding men of science, culture and of the state’s head.

Yet all recent discussions on labor ethics pass by the issue of psychological and ethic motivation of *conscientious labor in collectives*. The reasons for it are known: venality of sociologists, economists, political observers and analysts who speak on these issues in the mass media. They are more comfortable nattering about «investments» and

executives) in things that are not stipulated in job descriptions in their common work.

¹Mass media reported even such outrageous incidents as workers who have been made so miserable by their administration that they attempted to assassinate the corrupt directors most of whom are by the way former members of the CPSU.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

«securing investors' trust» — this matter does not offend anyone and imposes no commitments.

But without solving the problem of *re-establishing an ethic motivation to conscientious labor in COLLECTIVES* one cannot build any kind of society: neither a capitalist, nor a communist one. If collectives ARE psychologically and ethically motivated to conscientious labor there is no problem of investments: if foreign investors refuse to fund the transformation of Russia with their bucks and euros they will shortly after that have to fight for every kopeck in order to fund their own appearance on the Russian market.

At least those who sincerely support communism are more or less aware of the necessity to reinstate the ethic motivation to labor. The majority of those who support Russia's return onto the capitalist way of development expect to solve all problems of politics and organizing production and distribution by the following means:

- bribery — paying a salary big enough to the people recognized as «highly useful» by the bosses of the social system or to those whom many people and entire spheres of social activity depend on (these people comprise the privileged, artificially “elitized” social minority and to some extent the so-called «middle class» whose income to a significant extent consists of unearned parasitic income);
- economic constraint to labor — those disloyal and easily replaced are under the threat of losing their jobs and their pay is kept at the minimum level (they form the majority that is almost totally dependent on the government and on the financial and economic authority of the usurious bank mafia, top managers and the stratum of businessmen whose enterprises cannot do without hired personnel)'
- repressions against the members of society who have been *prompted to become criminals by the system itself* because of the following reasons:
 - the culture supported by the system has restrained and perverted personal development of most people, therefore many people's mentality is very far from the mentality of a successful personality. Having proved noncompetitive in making a legal career they enter the criminal path;
 - people can find no other way to protect themselves from the crowd-“elitist” hierarchy's oppression;

The Moral and Ethic Results of Bourgeois Reforms in Russia

➤ *the structure of the Western type society which conceals heterogeneous slavery* has no place for a human being. A successful (integral) personality¹ is therefore always a criminal in

¹ One can read about the psychic types and about what becoming truly a human means in greater detail in the following works by Internal Predictor of the USSR: “Dead Water” in post-1998 editions, “«From Human Likeness Towards Being a Human»” (first published under the heading of «From Matriarchy Towards Being a Human...», “Come and Aid Me in My Disbelief...”, “Principles of Personnel Policy”, “Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences”. Here we shall provide only a brief comment.

The information which provides the grounds for a human being’s behavior could be divided into following categories:

- basic instincts and unconditioned reflexes, as well as their cultural veneers;
- cultural traditions that are above instincts;
- his or her own limited understanding;
- «intuition on the whole» — things emerging from the subconscious level of an individual’s psyche, coming from collective psyche, external delusions and from being possessed as this term was interpreted by the Holy inquisition;
- God’s guidance on the basis of the previously named things except for external delusions and possessions that are direct intrusions into another person’s psyche against the will of its bearer.

These are things, which are possibly or actually contained in every individual’s psyche. But among them there can be a certain component, which dominates over other in the individual’s behavior. If the first one dominates, then the individual has a psyche of the animal type. By the way his behavior is organized he is an animal resembling a human (such were the members of any national society in the past). If the second dominates the individual has a psyche of the zombie type. He is a bio-robot programmed by culture (such are the majority of Hebrews and most average people in the West move towards reaching this level. The problem of possible over-population is supposed to be solved by family planning programs, legalized sexual perversions and imposing the culture of «safe sex»). The third and the fourth are typical of personalities with the demonic psychic type (they are the so-called «world backstage»: masters of biblical cults, leaders of mondialism, eurasianism, superior scientologists, blunt Satanists, etc.)

And only the fifth corresponds to the human psychic type and is a norm for a human being (Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Stalin all worked towards realization of this norm). Here the individual’s life is no more a game without meaning or a game for pleasure’s sake. This game acquires the meaning of implementing Superior Will maintaining the easiness of childhood busy with joyful game.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

respect to the system's founding principles as it was the case of how societies treated Buddha, Christ, Muhammad and many others.

Yet these very principles are laid as foundations of management by marauding administrations of many enterprises. Such managers are ethically and professionally capable only of getting rich by misusing authority, plundering and squandering what has been created by previous generations, and are not capable of providing for a qualitative development and expansion of the enterprises they are heading.

This way, supporters of reinstating capitalism in Russia display their utmost stupidity. At the beginning of the 21st century they are unable to see the truth that was clearly stated and published by H. Ford in the first two decades of the 20th century — *after the bitter experience of the social calamities caused by class antagonisms not resolved in due time.*

Notwithstanding what Ford said as early as the beginning of the 20th century there are still many fools among the Russian «businessmen» at the beginning of the 21st century who would like to live in a weird kind of society. This society consists *on the one hand* of «businessmen» having indisputable merits and *on the other hand* of employees who have no such merits and therefore suffer an «inferiority complex». They are sincerely delighted in their serving the «businessmen» and tolerate all their foolish and humiliating freaks without a murmur because... they are grateful to the «businessmen» who have hired them — «inferior people» — out of mercy, perhaps even at a loss.

Yet society of real people is different from these absurd visions and their like.

The protest against the efforts of «tough» «businessmen» (*in the most common sense of the word*) to bring down the rest of the people to the level of working cattle is predestined from Above (atheists would say — is in the nature of man). There are many ways in which the protest against “elitism” that humiliates and oppresses people has been manifested in the course of history. Some pretend to be an obedient servant while secretly waiting for an opportunity to stab the «benefactor» in the back, others

The Moral and Ethic Results of Bourgeois Reforms in Russia

wield a conceptual power in full awareness following the principle: *«Wise men are not afraid of «mighty» rulers and do not need the «prince's» gift. Their prophetic tongue speaks truth in freedom and follows God's Will...»*¹

Thus actual crowd-“elitism” given rise by demonic «businessmen» (in the broadest sense of the word) who have «indisputable» merits *systemically* gives rise to diverse crimes viewed as such in regard to the “elitist” scheme of social order. Crowd-“elitism” systemically reacts to the crime it itself generates by establishing secret and special services. Some of their staff members also turn out to be the advocates of «business» and also start «playing tough» with other «businessmen» corporations and with the working people dependant on them. Therefore it is characteristic of crowd-“elitism” to accumulate in the course of time protest tensions that have been generated by “elitism” itself. And consequently adhering to the crazy ideals of crowd-“elitism” dooms any social system to failure. It is an attempt to squeeze this social system into the framework of the impracticable ideal in order to humor the ambitions of «businessmen» and their clans that have once achieved success on the first stage of the coming-to-be of their «firms» (in the broadest sense of the word).

The only way to resolve (release) the inward tension in a crowd-“elitist” society is to discard the crazy ideals of “elitism” and to transform the crowd-“elitist” society into humanity by means of purposeful alteration of the people’s morals and world understanding. This is the essence of bolshevism, which is the process of transition from the historically formed crowd-“elitism” to the multinational humanity of future Earth.

In this connection the following fact is of interest. All our efforts to find books by H. Ford in the original in the Internet have failed as well as the attempt to find those books in printed variant in the USA though there is no direct ban on publishing and selling them in the USA. Yet neither were Stalin’s works openly banned in the times of the «zastoi-sunk» USSR or in the period of democratic outburst in liberal Russia. This silent ban aimed at sinking the works by H. Ford and J.V. Stalin into oblivion

¹ Quoting from A.S.Pushkin.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

has been imposed in those very countries where they have lived and worked for the welfare of society. This fact unites the work of these two outstanding personalities for the sake of the mankind's future in spite of what the people who have banned them originally intended.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor to the Welfare of Laborers

In accordance to what has been said in the previous chapter H. Ford who is widely known as a businessman and industrialist is besides that an economist and sociologist. Moreover he is a more consistent scientist than the supposedly professional academicians as he starts analyzing labor relations within the system of multiindustrial production and consumption in the society by proclaiming an *ethic* principle:

The human right to work and to partake of the product of the work he took part in determines what objectives should be assigned on the microlevel of the multiindustrial system of production and consumption in order to ensure its systemic integrity.

H. Ford says:

«There is no reason why a man who is willing to work should not be able to work and to receive the full value of his work. There is equally no reason why a man who can but will not work should not receive the full value of his services to the community. He should most certainly be permitted to take away from the community an equivalent of what he contributes to it. If he contributes nothing he should take away nothing. He should have the freedom of starvation. We are not getting anywhere when we insist that every man ought to have more than he deserves to have — just because some do get more than they deserve to have.

(...)

It is very easy, unless one keeps a plan thoroughly in mind, to get burdened with money¹ and then, in an effort to make more

¹ This is one of the moments in H. Ford's book when he says that income can be superfluous in respect to sensible needs. In practice this statement applies both to family and personal consumption of products and services and to the production sphere. H. Ford pays more attention to production. In the case of personal and family consumption, which is superfluous in respect to natural healthy lifestyle, income often cannot be spent usefully. Instead, it encourages the person or family, especially the generations of descendants, towards degradation. The evil of impoverishment is evident to the majority of people. The evil brought by superfluous income is less evident, and many find it painful to discuss this issue.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

money, to forget all about selling to the people what they want. Business on a money-making basis is most insecure. It is a touch-and-go affair, moving irregularly and rarely over a term of years amounting to much. It is the function of business to produce for consumption and not for money or speculation. Producing for consumption implies that the quality of the article produced will be high and that the price will be low — that the article be one which serves the people and not merely the producer. If the money feature is twisted out of its proper perspective, then the production will be twisted to serve the producer.

The producer <including entrepreneurs> depends for his prosperity upon serving the people. He may get by for a while serving himself, but if he does, it will be purely accidental, and when the people wake up to the fact that they are not being served, the end of that producer is in sight» (Introduction. “What Is the Idea?”).

If one might draw a generalization in regard to the whole of society it might be as follows: «as soon as people figure out that the system does not serve their welfare its *collapse will be at hand*» (*at hand on the historic time-scale, of course*). Moreover so if the people have already made up a vision of the system they will substitute the anti-national one with which has already happened in Russia.¹

Ford devotes the entire Chapter 8 to the ethic principles of production and consumption organization, *principles of the kind which would make the average man feel that the system works to his benefit*. Because the average man can sense this all the people will understand those principles as the educational level increases and culture develops. People will keep following them knowingly and purposefully for the sake of their personal welfare, the welfare of their descendants and the common welfare of all the other people.

«It is not usual to speak of an employee as a partner, and yet what else is he? Whenever a man finds the management of a business too much for his own time or strength, he calls in PARTNER (put in capitals by the authors) to share the

¹ A clear explanation for particularly dumb bourgeois and politicians who support the bourgeois «democracy», including Russian ones: you can lose your “elite” status very much sooner than the generation you belong to reaches old age and passes away.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

management with him. Why, then, if a man finds the production part of a business too much for his own two hands should he deny the title of «partner» to those who come in and help him produce? Every business that employs more than one man is a kind of PARTNERSHIP (put in capitals by the authors). The moment a man calls for assistance in his business — even though the assistant be but a boy — that moment he has taken a partner. He may himself be sole owner of the resources of the business and sole director of its operations, but only while he remains sole manager and sole producer can he claim complete independence. No man is independent as long as he has to depend on another man to help him. It is a reciprocal relation — the boss is the partner of his worker, the worker is PARTNER (put in capitals by the authors) of his boss. And such being the case, it is useless for one group or the other to assume that it is the one indispensable unit. Both are indispensable. The one can become unduly assertive only at the expense of the other — and eventually at its own expense as well» (Ch. 8. “Wages”).

This paragraph leaves no doubt that Ford does not tolerate the «master-and-servant» type of relationship between employer and employees that is actually more befitting a slave-owner.

And now let us quote from the book by Joseph Stalin “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” where Stalin writes about the new ethic reality emerging within the Soviet society:

«The economic basis of this antithesis is the exploitation of the country by the town, the expropriation of the peasantry and the ruin of the majority of the rural population by the whole course of development of industry, trade and credit under capitalism. Hence, the antithesis between town and country under capitalism must be regarded as an antagonism of interests. This it was that gave rise to the hostile attitude of the country towards the town and towards “townfolk” in general.

Undoubtedly, with the abolition of capitalism and the exploiting system in our country, and with the consolidation of the socialist system, the antagonism of interests between town and country, between industry and agriculture, was also bound to disappear. And that is what happened. The immense assistance rendered by the socialist town, by our working class, to our peasantry in eliminating the landlords and kulaks strengthened the foundation for the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, while the

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

systematic supply of first-class tractors and other machines to the peasantry and its collective farms converted the alliance between the working class and the peasantry into friendship between them. Of course, the workers and the collective-farm peasantry do represent two classes differing from one another in status. But this difference does not weaken their friendship in any way. On the contrary, their interests lie along one common line, that of strengthening the socialist system and attaining the victory of communism. It is not surprising, therefore, that not a trace remains of the former distrust, not to speak of the former hatred, of the country for the town.» (“Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, Part 4. “The Issue of Closing the Gap between Town and Village, between Mental and Manual Labor and of Eliminating the Differences Between Them”).

The above quotation demonstrates that what Ford thought to be an ideal the American society must aspire to (now this is also an ideal for the Russian society) was a reality for the Soviet society of the late 1940-s — early 1950-s¹ in many if not all the collectives.

The relations between executives and average employees described by Stalin are so strikingly different from the ethic results of bourgeois reforms in modern Russia that capitalist parasites will claim them to be a fantasy of Stalin’s having nothing in common with reality. But saying this they forget that they have been screaming about Stalin the tyrant «exploiting the people’s enthusiasm» without ever asking themselves what was the source of that enthusiasm. And the point is that its source was the psychological and ethic motivation to labor conscientiously in a collective that existed in the society on the whole. This motivation existed because staff and executives were not enemies bound by the common chain of production relations but «friends and companions, members of a united manufacturing team whose vital concern is the welfare and expansion of their enterprise. The hostility between them has vanished without a trace».

To use a better word there was no *trace* of this hostility yet the its *seeds* remained intact in the society’s noosphere. After Stalin was assassinated state policy was altered by party, government and financial

¹ I.e. thirty years after H. Ford’s book was first published.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

executives bent on introducing “elitism”, and these noospherical seeds grew into the reality of nowadays, full of class antagonisms and tensions.

Comradeship should serve as *the basis of work organization* as work is inevitably and objectively of collective nature at most modern enterprises. This principle also provides grounds for the payroll policy:

«There is nothing to running a business by custom — to saying: “I pay the going rate of wages.” The same man would not so easily say: “I have nothing better or cheaper to sell than any one has.” No manufacturer in his right mind would contend that buying only the cheapest materials is the way to make certain of manufacturing the best article. Then why do we hear so much talk about the “liquidation of labor” and the benefits that will flow to the country from cutting wages — which means only the cutting of buying power and the curtailing of the home market? What good is industry if it be so unskillfully managed as not to return a living to everyone concerned? No question is more important than that of wages — most of the people of the country live on wages. The scale of their living — the rate of their wages — determines the prosperity of the country» (Ch. 8. “Wages”).

He elaborates on these statements a few paragraphs later:

«It ought to be the employer’s ambition, as leader, to pay better wages than any similar line of business, and it ought to be the workman’s ambition to make this possible (put in bold type by the authors). Of course there are men in all shops who seem to believe that if they do their best¹, it will be only for the employer’s benefit — and not at all for their own. It is a pity that such a feeling should exist. But it does exist and perhaps it has some justification. If an employer urges men to do their best, and the men learn after a while that their best does not bring any reward, then they naturally drop back into “getting by.” But if they see the fruits of hard work in their pay envelope — proof that harder work means higher pay — then also they begin to learn that they are a part of the business, and that its success depends on them and their success depends on it.

“What ought the employer to pay?” — “What ought the employee to receive? These are but minor questions. The basic

¹ In Marxism «overproduction» in financial values corresponds to «*surplus value*» appropriated by the capitalist.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

question is “What can the business stand?” Certainly no business can stand outgo that exceeds its income. When you pump water out of a well at a faster rate than the water flows in, the well goes dry. And when the well runs dry, those who depend on it go thirsty. And if, perchance, they imagine they can pump one well dry and then jump to some other well, it is only a matter of time when all the wells will be dry. There is now a widespread demand for more justly divided rewards, but it must be recognized that there are limits to rewards. The business itself sets the limits. You cannot distribute \$150,000 out of a business that brings in only \$100,000. The business limits the wages, but does anything limit the business? The business limits itself by following bad precedents.

If men, instead of saying “the employer ought to do thus-and-so,” would say, “the business ought to be so stimulated and managed that it can do thus-and-so,” <yet this requires workers and businessmen to be Bolsheviks in their morals and ethics>, they would get somewhere. Because only the business can pay wages. Certainly the employer cannot, unless the business warrants. But if that business does warrant higher wages and the employer refuses, what is to be done?¹ As a rule a business means the livelihood of too many men, to be tampered with <i.e. careless in regard to these people>. It is criminal to assassinate a business to which large numbers of men have given their labors and to which they have learned to look as their field of usefulness and their source of livelihood. Killing the business by a strike or a lockout does not help. The employer can gain nothing by looking over the employees and asking himself, “How little can I get them to take?”² Nor the

¹ Becoming proficient in conceptual power and working purposefully towards establishing the Soviet power. Since it is the way statehood can exist and the laboring majority can execute power on the part of all people.

² Under the condition of constant increase in prices which acts as a macroeconomic factor the same question can be asked the following way: «How long will this cattle bear without a murmur an administration that does not raise wages and does not struggle to use the full power of the state for eliminating the main reasons of price growth — bank usury and stock exchange speculations?»

This question remains topical throughout all the years of Russian reforms. As directors and businessmen refuse to ask that question and to answer it articulately it becomes clear that they — simply as people, no matter what they are professionally — are shit, with minor exceptions.

→ → →

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

employee by glaring back and asking, “How much can I force him to give?” Eventually both will have to turn to the business and ask, “How can this industry be made safe and profitable, so that it will be able to provide a sure and comfortable living for all of us?”¹”

But by no means all employers or all employees will think straight. The habit of acting shortsightedly is a hard one to break. What can be done? Nothing. **No rules or laws will effect the changes. But enlightened self-interest will. It takes a little while for enlightenment to spread** (put in bold type by the authors). But spread it must, for the concern in which both employer and employees work to the same end of service is bound to forge ahead in business.(...)

In another quotation from the book H. Ford makes a far more definite statement on this issue:

«Cutting wages is the easiest and most slovenly way to handle the situation, not to speak of its being an inhuman way. It is, in effect, throwing upon labor the incompetence of the managers of the business» (Ch. 9. “Why Not Always Have Good Business?”).

He continues on this topic in Ch. 10. “How cheaply can things be made?”:

«It is not good management to take profits out of the workers or the buyers; make management produce the profits. Don't cheapen the product; don't cheapen the wage; don't overcharge the public. Put brains into the method, and more brains, and still more brains — do things better than ever before; and by this means all parties to business are served and benefited. And all of this can always be done».

In other words by lowering wages the administration (and statesmen who create macroeconomic prerequisites for it by their policy) acknowledge their own inconsistency both as managers and as honest people.

¹ Trade unions were H. Ford's aversion because their talkative leaders were unable to take part in this dialogue having no knowledge of products, technologies and production organization. H. Ford is essentially right on this point: when staff and administration treat each other as comrades and respect their common cause trade union bosses seeking the role of negotiators turn out to be unnecessary. In all other cases trade union bosses in their majority are just another corporation of parasites who are sometimes used by backstage forces to deal with employees who seem disagreeable to them and ... *with businessmen by forcing their staff to go on strikes and make demands that are known to be unrealizable.*

That is why trade unions are a weird kind of «school of communism» (an aphorism by V. Lenin imprinted on every page of trade union cards in the USSR).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

It ought to be clear, however, that the high wage begins down in the shop¹. If it is not created there it cannot get into pay envelopes. There will never be a system invented which will do away with the necessity of <productive> work. Nature has seen to that. Idle hands and minds were never intended for any one of us. **Work is our sanity <above all of moral and psychic health>, our self-respect, our salvation. So far from being a curse, work is the greatest blessing. Exact social justice flows only out of honest work** (put in bold type by the authors: though it would be more precise to say «conscientious labor»). **The man who contributes much should take away much². Therefore no element of charity <and actually financing parasitism and sloth> is present in the paying of wages. The kind of workman who gives the business the best that is in him is the best kind of workman a business can have. And he cannot be expected to do this indefinitely without proper recognition of his contribution. The man who comes to the day's job feeling that no matter how much he may give, it will not yield him enough of a return to keep him beyond want, is not in shape to do his day's work. He is anxious and worried, and it all reacts to the detriment of his work** (put in bold type by the authors: this is exactly what all post-Stalin reformers achieved on the territory of the former USSR).

But if a man feels that **his day's work is not only supplying his basic need, but is also giving him a margin of comfort and enabling him to give his boys and girls their opportunity and his wife some pleasure in life, then his job looks good to him and he is free to give it of his best** (put in bold type by the authors)³. This is a good thing for him and a good thing for the

¹ H. Ford speaks on this issue unambiguously in Chapter 5, "Getting into Production":

«... for of course it is not the employer who pays wages. He only handles the money. **It is the product that pays the wages and it is the management that arranges the production so that the product may pay the wages**» (put in bold type by the authors).

² This is similar to the principle of the first stage of communism if Marxist terminology is to be used: «take from each person according to his ability, give to each person according to his contribution».

³ This feeling gave rise to enthusiasm in work. We have all been taught since 1985 by «humanist democratizers» that Stalin the tyrant and despot exploited this enthusiasm in the most atrocious way. And he has left this

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

business. The man who does not get a certain satisfaction out of his day's work is losing the best part of his pay» (Ch. 8. "Wages").

We shall stop quoting here because in order to make clear the point of our further discussion (discourse) several issues of managing an enterprise and its employees must be clarified.

* * *

Digression 5:

Directly Productive and Auxiliary Labor, Managerial Labor, Remuneration of Labor

Earlier we have quoted the following words of H. Ford in a footnote:

«It is the product that pays the wages and it is the management that arranges the production so that the product may pay the wages».

In the modern world product is in most cases the result of the work of an integral microeconomic system — means of production, the infrastructure of the enterprise and its workers. If one considers only the factors of profit¹ and number of employees the ratio of «profit per employee» is what determines the employees' wages on the whole. Yet because the collective is heterogeneous in terms of professions, responsibilities and authority the enterprise's head must face the following triad of questions:

- 1. Whom to pay?**
- 2. What to pay for?**
- 3. How much should one pay?**

In order to answer those three questions and ensure management efficiency one must have a clear understanding of what every worker's professional skills and *responsibilities* are (*within the framework of organizational structure*), as well as how his or her professional skills

enthusiasm to his successors, and they have gradually stifled it in the years that passed since Stalin's murder.

¹ The difference between income from the enterprise's sales of its products and its expenditure on raw materials, component parts and services provided by outside enterprises that are consumed in the production proper.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

contribute to the collective's productive activity on the whole (the latter may or may not be covered in job descriptions).

If one grades professions without going into much detail one would get the following three categories:

- Workers directly engaged in the manufacturing process are factory personnel;
- Workers engaged in support and maintenance are support personnel (janitors, general-duties men, repair and servicing personnel) that also includes what is generally referred to in Russia as «technical personnel» of various divisions of the enterprise (purchase, accounting, security and others);
- Workers engaged in managing work of other members of the collective and the work of structural divisions each performing a dedicated function are management personnel.

Representatives of these three categories do not have equal opportunities of participating in the manufacturing process and of developing it thereby ensuring the «profit per employee» ratio growth that to a certain extent characterizes the enterprise's efficiency and its facility to pay wages and salaries to employees and dividends to shareholders.

Besides, in the framework of most modern manufacturing processes there are workers in all the three categories who are busy with performing their professional duties throughout the whole working day. But there are workers whose professional skill the enterprise cannot do without but the manufacturing process is of such kind that work can be assigned them only for a part of workday or only on certain days.

Because the nature of production and technology dictates the way production and collective work are organized, piecework principle in remuneration of production and auxiliary personnel labor is an irrelevant remnant of independent amateurism, of individual cottage craft. When the *collective provides the systemic integrity of an enterprise*, piecework means the following:

- squabbles within the collective (open and covert) around who gets access to paying and non-paying work;
- constant threat of piecework men violating manufacturing procedures in order to get a higher output which leads to increasing expenditure on technical control service;

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

-
- encouraging repairmen and maintenance personnel to commit acts of sabotage to the end of artificially raising their importance and, correspondingly, their payments;
 - concealing new and better methods of work and hampering their application within the collective by piecework men of highest qualification to the end of maintaining their monopoly, which is one of the largest obstacles on the way of technological progress and of production quality growth;
 - facing the *insoluble* problem of justifying output norms *while workers conceal their true abilities* to the end of getting high wages from exceeding established norms.

Just these few mentioned ways of piecework's destructive influence on the enterprise's functioning are more than enough for a smart manager (or businessman) to start purposefully eliminating it at the enterprise he controls and in its functionally specialized structural units. But piecework is an enduring phenomenon, and in most cases if it is present at an enterprise it is evidence of a badly managed collective.

When the collective provides for the systemic integrity of an enterprise, taking into account the division of staff into productive, auxiliary (including technical and servicing personnel), managerial personnel according to the nature of their work, the salary-bonus system of remuneration of labor turns out to satisfy the requirement of efficient control better.

This system includes:

- Basic salary — it is absolutely guaranteed. This money is paid for:
 - having one or several professions that are needed by the enterprise;
 - the level of qualification in each of the professions;
 - being ready to conscientiously carry out the orders of superior executives and support their activities on the basis of professional skills and knowledge.

However everything a salary is paid for is not actual work, not the products of labor but only a potential. That this potential is used is the responsibility not of the people who have this potential but on executives, on the entire hierarch of the enterprise's management and the management of surrounding macroeconomic systems. **This is the**

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

objective effect of the collective nature of labor in the systemic integrity of most enterprises.

- Bonus is guaranteed by way of statistics, i.e. its amount can range from zero to the equivalent of several salaries and depends on many factors and indices of the enterprise's work, the work of its units and each staff member. These factors are:
 - total volume of free profit and the way its comes in throughout the financial year;
 - assessment by superior executives the staff member's personal contribution to the collective's work during the time period which is remunerated (a month, a quarter, a year);
 - how important this staff member is for the enterprise, judging from his past work and future perspective (this part of the bonus is usually formalized as personal increment in salary granted for long-service, qualification, possessing several professions, speaking foreign languages, ability to solve problems in extraordinary circumstances, etc.);
 - lump sum payments for special purposes in connection with personal and family life of staff members (depending on what payments of this kind are allowed by the country's legislature);
 - loans granted by the enterprise to its employees or remittance of previously granted loans in full or partially.¹

The salary-bonus system of remuneration of labor operating at an enterprise for several years is characterized by the ratio *«income received by way of salary» / «income received by way of various bonuses and personal increments»*, as well as by the ratio connected with the previous one *«income received by way of salary» / «total income including various bonuses»*.

If the salary takes up a low share in the total income volume (especially if the guaranteed salary exceeds the «living wage» acknowledged by the society only by a small amount or is smaller than the «living wage»), this is a sign of covert slavery flourishing

¹ In a normal macroeconomy such loans must bear no interest or be granted on preferential terms, i.e. the sum to be returned to the enterprise must not exceed (and sometimes be even less) than the amount of loaned money.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

at the enterprise and therefore flourishing in the society which endures such enterprises and such businessmen.

If the share of bonus payments in staff members' income is large and their salaries are small an employee's welfare is secured by his ultimate loyalty to executives. It is only their opinion which determines whether he will get non-guaranteed bonus payments or not and what their size will be. When large share of bonus payments in total income becomes a system-forming factor it leads to creating and maintaining a system where staff members are personally dependent on executives and administration on the whole. Personnel are deprived of rights¹ resembling serfs who live in the modern society of science and industry.

Another extreme occurs when bonus payments account only for a small part of staff members' income. This prevents them from being financially encouraged to put effort in getting higher qualifications, mastering several professions, improving manufacturing processes and work organization on their own accord. They are not interested in doing that because promotion to superior posts accompanied by rise in salary is determined for most staff members by natural biological and demographic factors. It cannot keep up with the pace at which new circumstances appear in a man's life (birth of children, a need to get better housing in a shorter time, etc.). And the employee might have a chance to resolve these new issues if he got bonus payment for certain achievements in work exceeding the «standard requirements» which the administration demands of a man taking up this post and which are remunerated by the salary set for this post.

Let us also make special note here that we are speaking about the salary-bonus system of labor remuneration, not about *pay by the hour or*

¹ However Russian defenders of rights also keep silent on these problems as if being utterly dumb. Unlike these people H. Ford saw clearly how this issue relates to a human being's freedom:

«If you expect a man to give his time and energy, fix his wages so that he will have no financial worries. It pays. Our profits, after paying good wages and a bonus—which bonus used to run around ten millions a year before we changed the system—show that paying good wages <i.e. the main part of payments, the salary> is the most profitable way of doing business» (Ch. 8. "Wages").

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

pay by the hour and bonus system. The two systems are essentially different though in some circumstances (for example, working on the conveyor belt) this difference is unclear. Yet there the difference between the systems exists. Pay by the hour remuneration system is based on paying for the time an employee spends at his place of work *assuming that the employee is fully busy with work during this time.* If the employee wishes to reduce the time he spends at his place of work as compared to the established norm to an extent permitted by the administration his pay will be reduced proportionally.

The salary-bonus system permits (but does not compel the administration to do it) that some categories of staff members can stay at their workplaces for a shorter time that is compulsory for the rest of staff if they keep up with the schedule of work assigned by executives and submit work in due time and quality. In such a case a shorter working time per working day after accomplishing the assigned task does not result in reduction in pay. On the contrary it is itself a kind of a bonus that many will prefer to a money increment.

Actually the salary-bonus system can be a better motivation towards the collective's conscientious labor than the pay by the hour and bonus system or pay by the hour system, and it is far better than piecework payment. Because there are categories of employees whose volume of professional work is limited by the nature of manufacturing process and its rhythm (hourly, weekly, etc.) it will bring nothing but harm to the enterprises systemic integrity if they are forced to stay at their workplaces during the entire working day. The point is that they will have to imitate labor activity while staying at their workplaces. And imitating labor activity corrupts the imitators themselves, corrupts their associates who do work, gives rise to rows when some people accuse others of pretending to work while they actually work. It undermines the administration's authority because when an employee has to pretend to work having no real work to do the utmost folly of its executives of all ranks and its inability to organize a coordinated and efficient activity of the collective becomes evident.

And team contract can be effective only within the salary-bonus system of labor remuneration. Such a contract assigns work to a team which is a small integral collective where work is distributed and coordinated between the members in an informal way, on the basis of personal comradeship, mutual aid and respect.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

Normally the salary-bonus system of labor remuneration should include the entire staff of an enterprise. But the way it is applied to staff members engaged in management activity should be different from the way it is applied to production personnel and support personnel:

- within this system production and support personnel is paid for conscientiously following the orders of executives and coming forward with initiatives beneficial for the common cause (of a team, shop, department, the entire collective) primarily within the boundaries of their main and complementary professions and the posts they occupy;
- management personnel is paid primarily for ensuring a certain production output¹ calculated per one subordinate and for increasing

¹ Production output can be calculated both in natural values and by production costs. H. Ford say the following on this subject:

«A department <i.e. operating departments> gets its standing on its rate of production. The rate of production and the cost of production are distinct elements. The foremen and superintendents would only be wasting time were they to keep a check on the costs in their departments. There are certain costs—such as the rate of wages, the overhead, the price of materials, and the like, which they could not in any way control, so they do not bother about them. What they can control is the rate of production in their own departments. The rating of a department is gained by dividing the number of parts <i.e. manufactured accounting units of departments' production> produced by the number of hands working. Every foreman checks his own department daily—he carries the figures always with him. The superintendent has a tabulation of all the scores; if there is something wrong in a department the output score shows it at once, the superintendent makes inquiries and the foreman looks alive. A considerable part of the incentive to better methods is directly traceable to this simple rule-of-thumb method of rating production (put in bold type by the authors). The foreman need not be a cost accountant—he is no better a foreman for being one. His charges are the machines and the human beings in his department. When they are working at their best he has performed his service. The rate of his production is his guide. There is no reason for him to scatter his energies over collateral subjects.

This rating system simply forces a foreman to forget personalities — to forget everything other than the work in hand. If he should select the people he likes instead of the people who can best do the work, his department record will quickly show up that fact» (Ch. 6. “Machines and Men”).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

this index¹, as well as for achieving economy in comparison with basic levels of consumption in subordinate collectives. Such economy can include saving on raw materials, component parts, energy, agents, tooling, working capacity resource of equipment etc. (according to the concrete functional specialization of the collectives he or she heads). Naturally it must be done *while quality and safety standards are adhered to and improved.*

A collective works in modern production. To control any collective activity means *to distribute an individual personal responsibility for quality and timeliness of performing different fragments of the common work among staff members and making these fragments liable to an objective check according to «done — not done» index (in compliance with the standard).*

In accordance with these specific features of modern production and its control which are of an objective nature what should be remunerated is a man's ability to be responsible, to conscientiously perform actual assigned work and to come forward with initiatives while being responsible for the fragments of work assigned and for coordinating work on the whole. Additionally all the staff members of an enterprise should clearly see that the salary is paid for performing the functions of one's post at a minimum standard and that bonuses are paid for conscientiously deviating from the minimum standard by exceeding it in the course of daily work in a collective with an atmosphere of comradeship and friendliness.

Modern production is of such a nature that controlling it requires to use the salary-bonus system of labor remuneration. But it can

¹ Besides, superior executives should be responsible for employment assistance within the bounds of the enterprise including organizing and financing retraining for employees dismissed from the units of the enterprise and ensuring that their financial status does not deteriorate.

And the macroeconomic system organization should be likely responsible for employment assistance at other enterprises also ensuring that the financial status of employees dismissed from regional enterprises does not deteriorate if it is possible.

These two factors of the micro- and macrolevels are one of the way by which the priorities of the society's economy manifest themselves: whether the priority is satisfying the needs of people or serving various morally unhealthy clans of oligarchs and their spongers.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

stimulate labor efficiently only if it is accompanied by a high standard of mutual trust and comradeship among subordinates and executives which exists in the collective and is proven by experience and if subordinates and executives are equally interested that they succeed in their common cause.

When this fact is understood the answer to the question on what the ratio of minimum and maximum income among an enterprise's staff should be becomes clear. In every historic era, in every society there is an optimum «*maximum income*» / «*minimum income*» ratio within a collective which changes in the course of time. The «optimum» ratio of «*maximum income*» / «*minimum income*» involves a wage rates scale which encourages employees to improve their qualification and to acquire several professions. This should make the enterprise more efficient in production and ensure an increase in the «*profit per employee*» index.

If the ratio «*available maximum*» / «*income actually received by staff*» is small this means many employees regard making additional efforts for improving qualification and acquiring several professions as redundant troubles which do not improve their well-being and result in nothing but uselessly spent time and strength.

Besides, historic circumstances can lead to a lack of highly qualified professionals in certain trades (*a lack compared to the demand*). This allows people who have mastered these professions (which differ for every historic era) to demand exclusively high salaries for taking part in the society's working unity. In the historic reality when labor resources are distributed among industries by means of free market regulation such opportunity is realized in exclusively high salaries of certain professional corporations. Their salaries sometimes exceed the amount, which provides for consumption in a morally healthy life-style (and paying for services which neutralize the damage to health caused by hazardous industry). In some cases the state's social order supports the system of exclusively high salaries first of all in the management sphere and other «clean» activities. It is done through granting privileges in access to basic and professional education to certain social minorities and preventing the majority from getting such education.

This system is characterized by the majority's ignorance which prevents production from improving its efficiency by denying any chance

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of developing new technologies and improving business organization. But besides that this macroeconomic factor curtails the options for encouraging conscientious labor in a collective (i.e. on the microeconomic level). Let us explain how this happens. The ratio of «*income of highest-paid group of employees*» / «*minimum or average income*» is large due to some groups of professionals being paid exclusively high salaries which results both from macroeconomic and non-economic factors. Also the income of the highest-paid part of the collective exceeds the level sufficient for an employee and his family to live a morally healthy life in the opinion of those whose income is about average (especially if average or below the average income is barely enough for satisfying the needs of a man and his family). Then the members of collective who have the highest income are regarded by the rest of staff as parasites who live on unearned income, i.e. from somebody else's labor, reaping the fruits of work done by the rest of the collective.

This is just the same attitude that employees normally have towards capitalists (the owners of the enterprise) if they take no real part in the collective's work. If they are merely parasites receiving their share of the enterprise's income, and often a considerable one. And legislature of most countries permits it by tolerating private property of collectively used means of production and not obliging the proprietor to work by himself.

Therefore assigning levels of income among staff, i.e. arranging the wage rates scale, is a task having no single solution effective for any circumstances. Under normal macroeconomic conditions any salary should guarantee that a person's needs can be provided for, including the ability to start a family life and use one's income to take part in the family's further development. This circumstance determines the minimum, which it is practically necessary to pay.

The issue of maximum remuneration is a more complicated one as on the one hand the chance to reach a higher level on the wage rates scale must be an incentive to work in the collective efficiently, and on the other hand the income of highest-paid staff members (as well as the owners of the enterprise) should not be regarded as unearned income by the collective.

In other words the optimum ratio of high-paid and lower-paid workers' income at any enterprise is determined by the level of technology and

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

organization that it has reached, its future progress, equivalent indices of competitors, as well as by moral and ethic qualities of the collective and the society on the whole.

The role of an efficient incentive, which the salary-bonus system of labor remuneration plays, can be undermined or even totally invalidated by the three following circumstances. **First**, exclusively high salaries and bonuses. They are regarded by the collective as parasitism on the labor of others, which a certain “elite” of the enterprise indulges in. **Second**, when payment of bonuses does not result from conscientious labor actually making them a guaranteed part of income. **Third**, paying bonuses for labor achievement of some people to other people, chiefly to their superiors and their hangers-on.

The problem of distributing staff within the wage rates scale should be regularly given a new solution depending on the enterprise’s technical and technological development, the relationship between employees of different categories and the attitude that the «gold fund» workers of the enterprise (managers, specialists and workers important in the future perspective) have towards the business. These issues belong to coordinating the enterprise’s financial and personnel policy and lie beyond the scope of this work.

* * *

Having made this digression let us go back to the book by H. Ford:

«For the day’s work is a great thing — a very great thing! It is at the very foundation of the world; it is the basis of our self-respect. **And the employer ought constantly to put in a harder day’s work than any of his men** (put in bold type by the authors)¹. **The**

¹ This is a kind of «party maximum» for the managerial sphere. («Party maximum» was the limit of income for ALL-UNION COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS) members. Experts and executives received a smaller salary in comparison to non-party people holding equivalent posts. In the first years of the Soviet regime this maximum protected the party as a means of social self-government from crooks and go-getters. It was later abolished as though it was unnecessary.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

employer who is seriously trying to do his duty in the world must be a hard worker (put in bold type by the authors). He cannot say, "I have so many thousand men working for me." <only a slave-owner dares to say so> The fact of the matter is that so many thousand men have him working for them — and the better they work the busier they keep him disposing of their products. (Separate paragraph is provided by the authors)¹

Wages and salaries are in fixed amounts, and this must be so, in order to have a basis to figure on. Wages and salaries are a sort of profit-sharing fixed in advance, **but it often happens that when the business of the year is closed, it is discovered that more can be paid. And then more ought to be paid. When we are all in the business working together, we all ought to have some share in the profits — by way of a good wage, or salary, or added compensation** (put in bold type by the authors). And that is beginning now quite generally to be recognized.

There is now a definite demand that the human side of business be elevated to a position of equal importance with the

Besides if one works more than one's associates (in this case employees) one needs more time to recover his strength. One therefore has neither strength nor time to spend on sprees and the minimum income which enough to satisfy healthy the needs of one's own and one's family is not higher than that of an employee who works less and who has time to spend some money on show business and recreation.

¹ This statement by H. Ford makes clear how broad the gap is between his idea and the idea advocated by mass media while planned economy of the USSR and Russia was being destroyed. Mass media said that if a businessman works for himself he works for society. H. Ford sees it the other way round: **if a businessman works for society he receives a right to have a share in the product of collective labor**. The condition that Russia is in after a decade of reforms carried out under the motto «by working for himself the businessman works for society!» shows that this motto is nonsense and that H. Ford was right.

Reforms should be carried out not by E. Gaidar's theories or according to recommendations from the economic school of *venality and corrupt morals* headed by «Chicago rabbi» (Milton Fridman, Nobel prize winner, born 1912) and other «armchair intellectuals» of their kind. Since they do not feel any kind of interindustry balance. Reforms should conform to the moral and ethic principles of bolshevism which were stated by different people, H. Ford being one of them.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

material side. And that is going to come about (put in bold type by the authors). It is just a question whether it is going to be brought about wisely — in a way that will conserve the material side which now sustains us, or unwisely and in such a way as shall take from us all the benefit of the work of the past years. Business represents our national livelihood, it reflects our economic progress¹, and gives us our place among other nations. We do not want to jeopardize that. What we want is a better recognition of the human element in business. **And surely it can be achieved without dislocation, without loss to any one, indeed with an increase of benefit to every human being. And the secret of it all is in recognition of human partnership** (put in bold type by the authors). Until each man is absolutely sufficient unto himself, needing the services of no oilier human being in any capacity whatever, we shall never get beyond the need of partnership.

Such are the fundamental truths of wages. They are partnership distributions <and the second aspect of this issue consists in the price level on products directly consumed by people that have formed in the macroeconomic system>.

The wage carries all the worker's obligations outside the shop; it carries all that is necessary in the way of service and management inside the shop. The day's productive work is the most valuable mine of wealth that has ever been opened. Certainly it ought to bear not less than all the worker's outside obligations. And certainly it ought to be made to take care of the worker's sunset days when labor is no longer possible to him — and should be no longer necessary. And if it is made to do even these, industry will have to be adjusted to a schedule of production, distribution, and reward, which will stop the leaks into the pockets of men who do not assist in production. **In order to create a system which shall be as independent of the good-will of benevolent employers as of the ill-will of selfish ones** (put in bold type by the authors)², we shall have to find a basis in the actual facts of life itself.

¹ Not only of economic, scientific and technical progress but also of moral and ethic progress or *regression*. *The latter was the case in the post-Stalin USSR and provided moral and ethic grounds for the attempt to restore capitalism which began in 1985.*

² In other words, good will of people who understand this necessity should result in establishing a system of organizing social life and the life of its every

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

(...)

If only the man himself were concerned, the cost of his maintenance and the profit he ought to have would be a simple matter. But he is not just an individual. He is a citizen, contributing to the welfare of the nation. He is a householder. He is perhaps a father with children who must be reared to usefulness on what he is able to earn. We must reckon with all these facts. How are you going to figure the contribution of the home to the day's work? You pay the man for his work, but how much does that work owe to his home? How much to his position as a citizen? How much to his position as a father? The man does the work in the shop, but his wife does the *work* in the home. The shop must pay them both. On what system of figuring is the home going to find its place on the cost sheets of the day's work? *Is* the man's own livelihood to be regarded as the "cost"? And is his ability to have a home and family the "profit"? Is the profit on a day's work to be computed on a cash basis only, measured by the amount a man has left over after his own and his family's wants are all supplied? Or are all these relationships to be considered strictly under head of cost, and the profit to be computed entirely outside of them? That is, after having supported himself and family, clothed them, housed them, educated them, given them the privileges incident to their standard of living, ought there to be provision made for still something more in the way of savings profit? And are all properly chargeable to the day's work? **I think they are** (put in bold type by the authors). Otherwise, we have the hideous prospect of little children and their mothers being forced out to work¹.

member that it is expressed in. But this leads us to the problems of conceptual power in society — creating a conception of social life and organizing the control of its multiindustrial production and consumption system.

¹ H. Ford implies that the family is a seed that the society grows from in subsequent generations. In accordance with the role family has the married woman first of all keeps the house, gives birth to children and brings them up. This is what her social role consists in and no one can substitute her in that role due to the biologic features of the species called «Homo sapiens». She has a right to be busy with something else only after she conscientiously fulfils what is destined to her. The man has a different mission in a family which is also determined by the biology of our species: he must ensure that the woman fulfils her internal family mission by taking part in social activities. This means that the remunerations he receives for performing socially useful work is not his personal income but the income of the family he lives in.

→ → →

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

(...)

County-wide high wages <in comparison with the given price of products which are consumed by people> level spell country-wide prosperity, provided, however, the higher wages are paid for higher production.

(...)

In this first plan the standards insisted upon were not petty — although sometimes they may have been administered in a petty fashion. We had about fifty investigators in the Social Department; the standard of common sense among them was very high indeed, but it is impossible to assemble fifty men equally endowed with common sense. They erred at times — one always hears about the errors. It was expected that in order to receive the bonus married men should live with and take proper care of their families. **We had to break up the evil custom among many of the foreign workers of taking in boarders — of regarding their homes as something to make money out of rather than as a place to live in. Boys under eighteen received a bonus if they supported the next of kin. Single men who lived wholesomely shared** (put in bold type by the authors: in essence H. Ford financed the moral and healthy way of living). The best evidence that the plan was essentially beneficial is the record. When the plan went into effect, 60 per cent. of the workers immediately qualified to share; at the end of six months 78 per cent. were sharing, and at the end of one year 87 per cent. Within a year and one half only a fraction of one per cent failed to share» (Ch. 8. “Wages”).

In other words, Ford introduced an 8-hour working day and secured payment by the hour at his plants and railway. He kept perfecting his business drawing on this organizational scheme and paid out bonuses to the whole staff out of the profits gained from those improvements. His system of bonus payments consisted in financially encouraging (remunerating) conscientious work and beneficial initiative. And this system was aimed at ensuring the collective’s welfare and satisfying the

Therefore the problem of the woman’s economic independence from the man and «feminism» of other kinds that have recently emerged are one of the many ways that internal family life deviates from its essence — reproduction of new generations and making an *integral personality* out of every new-born child.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

society's demand for the manufactured products, not on satisfying the insatiable greed of investors who constitute the minority in the society.

H. Ford says the following on that subject:

«Our profit, because of the rapidity of the turnover in the business and the great volume of sales, has, no matter what the price at which the product was sold, always been large. We have had a small profit per article but a large aggregate profit. The profit is not constant. After cutting the prices <this was Ford's social and economic strategy¹>, the profits for a time run low, but then the inevitable economies begin to get in their work and the profits go high again. **But they are not distributed as dividends. I have always insisted on the payment of small dividends and the company <i.e. «Ford Motors»> has today no stockholders who wanted a different policy². I regard business profits above a small percentage as belonging more to the business than to the stockholders.**

The stockholders, to my way of thinking, ought to be only those who are active in the business and who will regard the company as an instrument of service rather than as a machine for making money. If large profits are made — and working to serve forces them to be large — then they should be in part turned back into the business so that it may be still better fitted to serve, and in part passed on to the purchaser (put in bold type by the authors). During one year our profits were so much larger than we expected them to be that we voluntarily returned fifty dollars to each purchaser of a car. We felt that unwittingly we had overcharged the purchaser by that much. My price policy and hence my financial policy came up in a suit brought against the company several years ago to compel the payment of larger dividends. On the witness stand I gave the policy then in force and which is still in force. It is this:

In the first place, I hold that it is better to sell a large number of cars at a reasonably small margin than to sell fewer cars at a large margin of profit. I hold this because it enables a large number of people to buy and enjoy the use of a car and because it gives a larger number of men employment at good wages. Those are aims I

¹ See the table on trends in car prices given in one of the footnotes of Chapter 4.2.

² This is the way H. Ford prevent «investors» («middle class») from getting unearned income.

4.4 The Ethics of Bolshevism: CONSCIENTIOUS Labor

...

have in life. But I would not be counted a success; I would be, in fact, a flat failure if I could not accomplish that and at the same time make a fair amount of profit for myself and the men associated with me in business.

(...)

Profits belong in three places: they belong to the business — to keep it steady, progressive, and sound. They belong to the men who helped produce them. And they belong also, in part, to the public. A successful business is profitable to all three of these interests — planner, producer, and purchaser.

People whose profits are excessive when measured by any sound standard should be the first to cut prices. But they never are. They pass all their extra costs down the line until the whole burden is borne by the consumer; and besides doing that, they charge the consumer a percentage on the increased charges. Their whole business philosophy is: «Get while the getting is good». They are the speculators, the exploiters, the no-good element that is always injuring legitimate business. There is nothing to be expected from them. They have no vision. They cannot see beyond their own cash registers.

These people can talk more easily about a 10 or 20 per cent. cut in wages than they can about a 10 or 20 per cent cut in profits. **But a business man, surveying the whole community in all its interests and wishing to serve that community, ought to be able to make his contribution to stability** (put in bold type by the authors)» (Ch. 11. “Money and Goods”).

Now let us again turn to J. Stalin. Having come out with his understanding of the fundamental economic law of the historically real capitalism (the understanding we quoted in the beginning of Chapter 4.3), a few paragraphs further in the text of “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” Stalin gives the definition of the fundamental economic law of socialism:

«Is there a basic economic law of socialism? Yes, there is. What are the essential features and requirements of this law? The essential features and requirements of the basic law of socialism might be formulated roughly in this way: **the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques.**

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Consequently: instead of maximum profits — maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of society; instead of development of production with breaks in continuity from boom to crisis and from crisis to boom — unbroken expansion of production; instead of periodic breaks in technical development, accompanied by destruction of the productive forces of society — an unbroken process of perfecting production on the basis of higher techniques» (put in bold type by the authors) (“The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, Chapter 7. “The Basic Economic Laws of Modern Capitalism and of Socialism”).

If one compares what Ford said about the goals of production in the society, about the purpose (function) and distribution of profit at an enterprise with Stalin’s definition of the fundamental economic laws of socialism one can see that Ford’s words fit into Stalin’s definition of the fundamental economic law of socialism very well. Therefore one needs to be very resourceful in justifying falsehoods if one seeks to negate the following conclusion:

Ford and Stalin were honest and conscientious laborers. They promoted the common cause of bolshevism (of which they might have had a slightly different understanding) in different countries, in different historic circumstances, but to the benefit of all workers (laborers) who earn their bread.

Yet before we carry on (proceed) to the explanation Stalin provided for the fundamental economic law of socialism and the means to bring it to life (implement it) we need to make yet one more digression.

Digression 6:
Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

(In brief)

Let us start with making clear that all statements about some countries entering the «post-industrial» stage or being very near to entering it are nothing more than ravings of a madman or an attempt to impose this delirious view upon people in order to make «milking» them easier.

All the so-called «industrial» and «post-industrial» societies cannot do without products and services produced *by means of industry, i.e. through a functioning multiindustrial system of production and consumption in its integrity*. It is true that some countries have shoved out enterprises most unfriendly to the environment or most labor-intensive and now specialize in high technology, legal squabbles of all sorts, financial and stock-exchange speculations and putting up shows. This fact does not alter the core of the matter: they are still dependent on the technosphere.¹

The authors of textbooks on political economy which students studied in the Soviet-era universities kept babbling about «the law of value», «the law of regular and balanced development of economy» without grasping the essence of the practical economy existing in the society and thereby evading the object region of political economy as a science. The content of post-Soviet textbooks on political economy is not much more credible.

¹ There is a very smart joke that demonstrates this dependence and gives an example of the insanity of «post-industrialists» who are stuck in virtual reality:

A cruise liner is going sank, the storm smashes all the life-boats left against the shipboard, help from the outside world is getting late. The crew has used every means of saving the ship but in vain. The captain is reported that there is still the last chance of saving: there is a «high-tech» expert among the passengers! He is found and brought to the captain's bridge. He comes and has the following conversation with the captain:

— *Do you have an Internet connection?*

— *We do.*

— *How much longer can we hold?*

— *Half an hour...*

— *O.K. We still have time to put the ship for auction and to sell it. It is not our problem afterwards. Load the browser...*

Note: a browser is a computer program intended for surfing the Internet.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

They are also meaningless and absurd when judged from the positions set forth in Digression 2: “The Axioms of Modern Economics”.

While the authors of those textbooks and lecturers on social sciences in schools and at universities babbled about economy many readers had *no custom and ability of thinking independently*. The consequence of these two factors combined is that quotations from “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” which we are going to consider in the next chapter 4.5 would seem unclear to many. They would seem unclear simply because they have no concrete knowledge of metrologically consistent terms which could describe the microeconomic and macroeconomic relations termed by Stalin as «the law of value», «the fundamental law of socialism», «the law of regular and balanced development of economy», etc.

These terms are a part of the sort of professional «slang» which was used by top party and government officials in the USSR of the Stalin era. Each of them covers a broad area of interconnected cultural and economic phenomena. That is why for the majority of our contemporaries who have no coherent understanding of the production and distribution processes in the society or have a twisted knowledge of them the following digression must be made in order to elaborate on the ideas stated quite briefly by Stalin in his work “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” which is in fact his address to all sane and well-meaning people.

There is none other «will» left after Stalin.¹

The following digression deals with inter-branch proportions, defining objectives for production and distribution, market mechanism, addressed directive control and planning.

The systemic integrity of any multiindustrial production having a historically formed set of technologies applied within the system can be characterized by the following three basic features:

- ***In order to get the final product consumed by people and social institutions outside the production sphere (the state, public***

¹ Everything that has been claimed to be such are fakes of a more or less villainous nature and their content cannot be compared to this nationally published work addressed to future generations.

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

associations, etc.) one needs to produce *intermediate (raw materials, semi-finished goods, components, etc.) and auxiliary products (means of production, i.e. «investment goods»)* consumed *within the production sphere.*

Therefore full capacity of most branches of industry (usually termed «gross capacity») that includes both intermediate and final products is higher than the capacity of any such branch taken by itself when measured against its final product only. In other words the efficiency factor of a multiindustrial system of production and consumption is always less than one (*or less than 100 % in a different representation*) because of the necessity to manufacture intermediate and auxiliary products.

- **Production of a certain range¹ of final products requires a definite ratio of the full (gross) capacities of all the industries constituting such multiindustrial system of production and consumption.**

For example, in order to manufacture one car one needs materials in amounts determined by the car's design, technologies, production's organization and general standard: this much of steel; this much of non-ferrous metals; this much of rubber and plastic; this much of glass; this much of transportation services, etc. All these goods and services are mostly delivered to the motor-car construction industry by other branches. Consequently the full (gross) capacity of, say, metallurgy, is the total volume of goods it delivers to other branches plus metal used for its own needs plus metal sold as the final product to consumers for everyday needs. The same approach should be applied to define production requirements and the full (gross) capacity of all other industries.

- **Expanding the range of final products to a definite set value requires an increase of full (gross) production capacity throughout the whole of the production system in a definite proportion between different industries determined by the desired expansion of the range of final products.**

¹ Henceforth production (consumption) range is understood as product nomenclature + production (consumption) volume for every item of nomenclature.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

In order to clarify this statement let us carry on with the previous example. In order to expand production of cars by a certain amount one needs to expand production in all the supplying industries by the appropriate amount. In order to expand production in a single supplying industry one needs to expand production in industries that are suppliers of that industry and so on.

Besides, an increase in the number of operated cars will in time cause a growing need for fuel, lubricating oil and hydraulic liquids, for expanding the motorway network, parking lot and servicing infrastructure. And those will in their turn require to increase production capacity of industries besides the suppliers of the automobile branch.

Consequently expansion of automobile production and the secondary needs for petrochemicals, a better motorway infrastructure and servicing, etc. stimulated by this expansion require to produce the means of production necessary for the increase of output as well as for the renewal of equipment, technology, organization and management and for expanding all the industries involved.

And the fact is that production of means of production («investment products») for these industries in some cases must precede the growth of the automotive industry's capacity though in other cases it may accompany this growth or follow it with a certain delay in time.

The above statements hold true for increasing the production output of any industry, the automotive industry simply taken as an explanatory example.

Besides, when *certain technologies and business organization* are adhered to proportions between different industries' capacities are accompanied by certain rigid proportions of professional training and employment. It follows that:

Mobility of the systemic integrity of a macroeconomic system in terms of being capable of a structural reorganization and switching from one product to other products is to a large extent determined by whether the population's general cultural background enables people to leave

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

their current professions and acquire new skills in a short period of time.¹

The proportions of the exchange in intermediate products between industries, which is involved in the process of manufacturing a certain range of final products, are described in interindustry balance equations. These formulas are heavily relied on by theories of macroeconomic planning and control worldwide and such theories have got practical proof of their workability.²

¹ The disaster at the Chernobyl nuclear power-plant in many respects resulted from the Soviet top academic “elite” being incapable of such a change in activity.

In 1957, 29 years prior to the Chernobyl disaster, I. Yefremov in his science-fiction novel “The Andromeda Nebula” warned people that civilized life on the planet could be destroyed if power engineering were developed on the basis of nuclear disintegration and radioactive pollutants of environment produced by such power-plants were accumulated.

But the «outstanding scientists» of the USSR turned out to be too dumb to follow this warning, to find and commercialize a different technology of power production that would be friendly to the biosphere. They clung to their past professionalism which was the source of income and future career refusing to learn other socially useful activities. They continued and continue still to force the government to finance the work they once learnt to do without thinking about who, when and how is going to clean the radioactive «shit» which they leave everywhere and which spreads all over our planet.

The new alternative power engineering is created by craftsmen of the common people who have managed to renounce the existing views of physical theories.

² These balance models are called «inputs — output» in the professional slang of economists. This name suggests that final product output is determined by how inputs (investments) are distributed between industries. V. Leontyev (1906 — 1999), a Russian emigrant of the post-revolution wave, was awarded the Nobel prize in economics for developing balance models and methods of macroeconomic regulation.

The Gosplan of the USSR based its work on essentially similar balance models. Mind you, the Gosplan operated when V. Leontyev has not yet published his first work on this subject. But the workers of the Gosplan got no Nobel prize, and the «public opinion» gives the privilege of creating balance models to V. Leontyev despite that Gosplan’s work is simply impossible without them.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

In terms of mathematics interindustry balance equations are a system of linear equations¹ (i.e. unknown quantities are included into the equations raised to the first power only). In this system the unknown quantities are the gross (full) capacities of industries, and the absolute terms of equations are the desired range of final products (i.e. the industries' net output). The factors of the unknown quantities in every equation are called the factor costs and are the product volume of every industry of the set considered necessary to produce one registering unit of the industry described by the considered equation of the system (in the example of motorcar production considered above the factors of costs are the quantity of steel per car², quantity of glass per car etc.)

Interindustry balance equations can be considered in two forms. First, they can be based on natural calculation of capacities and costs factors in terms of output quantity according to the nomenclature of products and industries on which the balance model is based. Second, they can be based on calculation in value terms also in accordance with the nomenclature of products and industries on which the balance model is based. All these issues are fully covered in literature on the subject.

The following proportions are meant under microeconomic proportions. They are the ratios of full capacities of the different industries, which constitute this multiindustrial production and consumption system, and the ratios of these industries' net outputs to their full (gross) capacities, as well as the proportions of the population's professionalism and employment.

Thus, the issue of biased referees is relevant not only in sports competitions like the commercial show called «The 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt-Lake City» ...

¹ Everyone used to solve such systems of two or three equations in high school using the method of calculating determinants or successive substitution. Those who got a higher technical or mathematical education after high school know that this is a well-developed branch of mathematics called «linear algebra» allowing to describe and solve many practical problems in different activities of the society.

² In factors of costs quantities of consumed products always include the loss caused by manufacturing processes and by violations of technological procedures which occur in real production.

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

A structural reconstruction of macroeconomy is an alteration of these proportions and the absolute values of the production capacities in the entire lot of industries. A structural reconstruction can proceed on the basis of a plan having a clearly set out objective. It also can proceed under the pressure of circumstances, so to say, spontaneously. *Though when looking into the matter more deeply one might find that the pressure of circumstances induced by the social and economic «element» turns out to be a process planned and controlled by backstage groups. This option has been predominant during the last few centuries.*

Let us now turn from the issue of production to the issue of how products and services are consumed in the society. Consumption turns out to be characterized by its own proportions, which are determined by the two following factors. On the one hand, they are determined by the way needs emerge as such within the society (i.e. regardless of any limitations in satisfying them), and on the other hand, by the limitations imposed on how fully those needs may be satisfied by the system of distributing¹ manufactured products.

All the needs of people and social institutions fall into two categories:

- biologically allowable needs **conditional on the demography**. They comply with the healthy life-style maintained in succession of generations by the population and biocenoses of the regions where the products intended for satisfying those needs are produced and consumed. These needs are determined by the biological nature of the Homo Sapiens species, by the population's cultural background, age and sexual structure;
- **degraded parasitic needs**. Satisfying them is directly or indirectly detrimental to those engaged in production, to consumers, contemporaries and descendants. It also disrupts the biocenoses

¹ Most people understand that there is a system of production in society. Yet many people refuse to regard the market as one of the instruments used by the system of distributing products and services in the society. They insist that «distribution» is only something typical of army barracks: you get a pair of state-owned pants having a standard cut once a year and sign where it says «signature».

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

located in the regions where the products are manufactured and consumed. These needs are *primarily* determined by perverted and defective morals and are *maintained* through those perversion and defects reflecting in cultural tradition and succession of generations.

Though some products may change one category for the another *depending on the standards of production and consumption*, **most products of the modern civilization are unambiguously placed into one of the categories.** The category is determined objectively due to the possibility of revealing the cause-effect relations between the product's kind and the consequences its production and consumption have.¹ Only incorrect attribution of a certain product to one of the described categories is subjective (including mistakes caused by incorrectly determined standards of production and consumption). Yet life will make us face the consequences of those errors exactly because all needs and products are objectively divided into two mentioned categories.

Satisfying needs is the aim not only of production, but also of *distribution of products in the society*. We must elaborate on this phrase or it will be taken for an obvious and true commonplace, yet is essentially devoid of meaning due to its abstract nature.

If the society is in any way engaged in multiindustrial production and is in any way distributing products to be consumed by physical and juridical persons who need them (both in the production and consumption spheres) it follows that the *means of assembling*² the multitude of microeconomy into the multiindustrial production and consumption

¹ Children not only of alcoholics but also of those who have a «culture» of drinking are mostly handicapped. Synthetic coloring agents, stabilizers, builders etc., which are used in lipsticks result in women having liver illnesses, as well as men who kiss them (according to some figures more than half of lipstick produced is eaten by men while kissing women). Synthetic fabrics and supporting insets in bras led to a burst of breast cancer diseases. Production unfriendly to environment causes an increase in various diseases the employees and local population have in the region where such production is located. Pharmacology, food additives, preservatives, stabilizers and imitators of natural foodstuff are a topic in themselves. One could go on and on.

² The means of assembly are the system of credit and finances, the standards on production and consumption of products, the infrastructures (transport, means of transmitting information) that unite the fragments of the system into an integrity, current legislature and culture on the whole.

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

system are objectively set (tuned) to fulfilling certain definite goals — namely, the needs generated by the members of society (individually and collectively). It follows that:

«The market mechanism» is nothing but words (*whose meaning is absent in some minds*¹) which designate a more or less efficient algorithms of the means of assembling the multitude of microeconomy into the systemic integrity of macroeconomy.

Therefore, *the advocates of market self-regulation* should cast aside their prejudice and learn that the «market mechanism» by itself cannot and does not perform the task of defining targets regarding production and distribution of products in the society. What it does is adjusting production and consumption to the targets that have already been formed and which the market mechanism turned out to be adjusted to. *And such adjustment occurs regardless of whether the society (or some of its members) understands the nature and methods of adjusting the «market mechanism» to certain definite² goals or not.*

In any process of control (or self-control) that is initially intended for achieving a certain number of defined aims those *aims have different priority*³ and form a hierarchy where the most important aim comes first and the aim that could be rejected (declined, turned down) *if the complete number of aims cannot be reached* comes last. In this hierarchy termed as aims vector individual and group aims form a sequence contrary to the sequence in which they would be forcedly rejected under pressure of circumstances. One of the circumstances making it impossible to achieve the complete number of chosen (announced, stated) aims is their being mutually exclusive.⁴

¹ When E. Gaidar and his brothers in maliciousness and weakness of mind began their schizophrenic «market reforms» in Russia they did not understand the practical meaning of these words, in life as well as all those who listened to them spellbound. But those who understood something in the sense of life and destroying life maliciously used their absence of understanding.

² Control is impossible without determined set goals.

³ According to control theory and practice several aims of equal priority form one «group aim».

⁴ In other words the selected set of mutually exclusive aims requires that *the sheep are safe and the wolves are fed*, and this is not always possible.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

It is characteristic of the crowd-“elitist” society that it generates a number of mutually exclusive aims. This leads to the market mechanism’s being adjusted to certain definite ranges of production and distribution in social groups according to the aims that are placed at the top of the hierarchy of needs. The crowd-“elitist” society has an inherent systemic property — its ruling “elite” is responsible for a larger part of the degraded parasitic range of needs¹. Among other ways of abusing their power within society the “elite” make themselves superior to the rest of the society in paying capacity.² Because of this the «market mechanism» is objectively adjusted to satisfying the needs of the “elite” in the first place by means of *income and savings distribution*. As the degraded parasitic constituent prevails among those needs the demographically grounded needs of the rest of society (the majority of population) are satisfied due to such adjustment of market mechanism upon the residual principle³. Besides it is the “elite”’s way to «diminish» the rest of society in order to strengthen their “elitist” social position. To this end it encourages the common people to adhere to the degraded parasitic range of needs («it is easier to govern people who drink heavily» etc.)⁴ This way

¹ Insanely luxurious life, being a servant as profession, consumption race chasing fashion, demand for products manufactured by the highest standards and standards beyond common sense, holding excessive property of all kinds in comparison with actual vital needs of a person and a family that are grounded demographically, etc.

² Primarily owing to unearned income and exclusively high prices on their participation in social activities that exceed (sometimes several times) the amount necessary to pay for consumption in the demographically grounded range of needs.

³ One does not need to disprove this by giving the example of the USA where the population’s well-being is high, including those who lives on *all sorts of aids and benefits*. Actually the consumer well-being of the USA is proof to the above-made statements: the US population constitutes only 5 % of the Earth’s population yet the USA consume about 40 % of global energy production (located largely outside the USA) and account for more than a half of *registered* environment pollution.

In other words the global market mechanism is adjusted in such a way that the majority of the planet’s population is forced to sell the products of its labor for junk prices providing for consumer well-being of the minority.

⁴ This is a viewpoint attributed to empress Catherine II and is not a word for word quotation.

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

the majority of people and the society on the whole have even a smaller chance of satisfying the range of demographically grounded needs.

The market mechanism regulates the distribution of products within production sphere and beyond according to what is termed by political economy as «the law of value». This law says that average prices of commodities express the average labor inputs for their production in the society. Yet since in many activities «labor inputs» cannot be measured directly¹ the «law of value» turns out to be inconsistent in terms of metrology due to grounding price formation on «labor inputs» whose quantity it is impossible to measure. Nevertheless, if one accepts the fact that market prices exist for an objective reality, price ratios of different products (intermediate, auxiliary, final) define the yield and profitability of their manufacturing *under the technologies and business organization accepted by the manufacturers*.

If the system of macroeconomic regulation is absent or underdeveloped² businessmen react to prices being formed on the markets by expanding and starting production of some products and removing production of other products. Accordingly if one considers the processes of production and distribution of products in the society during sufficiently long time periods the so-called «law of value» does regulate the inter-industry proportions and the absolute activities of production in each of the industries.

The market mechanism is capable of regulating many things if not everything in a society's life. Yet the real freedom of private heterogeneous entrepreneurship under the fundamental economic law

¹ What are the labour inputs on finding and proving a new mathematical theorem? This is a question that will remain undecided. And one comes across such examples in the society's working life in abundance.

² I.e. when prices are formed freely preventing the state from fixing obligatory prices; when there are no quotas which limit or set a minimum obligatory level for certain kinds of production; when there is no well-developed state-owned sector whose production and price policy affect price-forming on all the markets of society; when usury is practiced freely including bank corporations usury; when stock exchange speculations are free inevitably paving the way for freedom of usury, etc.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of capitalism — «get more profit right now!» — makes all of us face the question about the nature and quality of this regulation.

* * *

During the epoch when macroeconomic regulation did not exist the «law of value» worked the following way. Bad harvest was a calamity: food is short, prices on food rise, curtailing the solvent demand in other industries and causing an outflow of workforce and ruin of producers. A rich harvest was equally a calamity: food is in affluence, prices fall to a level when producers of agricultural goods go broke. This leads to reduction of their share of solvent demand on other markets, a slump in production in other industries whose effort was on satisfying their needs. In historic reality it came to burning grain in furnaces simply to stop the price on it from falling. People utterly forgot about the past bad harvests and about the bad harvest that could yet come in future. A rush demand caused by real needs or by the whims of vogue leads to a rush raising of production capacity in the corresponding industries. Production capacities buildup requires time, and the rush demand could disappear while that time passes. Or the rush rising of production capacity could lead to the supply of the product on the market becoming superfluous in regard to the current needs of society or the solvent demand. This causes prices to fall below the level of production's self-repayment and to the ruin of entrepreneurs who have invested wrongly.

This kind of mess is «natural» for the historically real capitalism with *a free market that has formed on the basis of free private enterprise and free price formation in the sphere of production*. Yet this capitalism comes with a special annex of free usury and stock-exchange speculations which the supranational bank corporation is engaged in. This corporation is capable of arranging a financial crisis on purpose and with a pre-planned timing in any country it controls using it as one of the means to achieve goals of a non-financial nature. This was exactly how financial and economic crises in pre-revolutionary Russia were provoked, this was how the «great depression» of 1929 was arranged in the USA spreading throughout the whole capitalist world of the time.

This was what capitalism was like until the mid 20th century. Its market mechanism — **the free market** — **was viewed as a system of self-regulation of production and distribution (including self-**

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

regulation of inter-industry proportions) and taken at long historic time intervals. It can be characterized by the following features:

- suppressing the potential of guaranteed satisfaction of the demographically grounded needs of all laborers due to its adjustment to satisfaction of degraded parasitic needs as priority, and first and foremost — to satisfaction of *degraded parasitic needs of the ruling “elite” due to the way current incomes and savings were distributed within the society*;
- disrupting productive capacities due to the regulating process’s instability in regard to factors that are beyond the bounds of manufacturing processes and of real needs of people (influence of natural elements, financial and stock-exchange speculations and hysteria, fashion etc.);
- disrupting productive capacities due to «*overregulating*» — *redundantly strong reaction to quick changes in the solvent demand distribution among specialized markets of products and services caused by whatever reasons*;
- being almost completely incapable of reacting to avert an unwanted event in advance and predominantly reacting to events that have already taken place. Even if this does not lead to disrupting productive capacities it results in low efficiency of the production and distribution system measured against the criteria of speed of operation and volume of output and delivery.

The above-mentioned features are *inherent* to the free market as a system of self-regulation of production and distribution of products in the society and of self-regulation of productive capacities’ levels and inter-industry proportions.¹

¹ Yet the liberal defenders of market believe this very method of regulating inter-industry capacity proportions and the absolute production indices to be the norm. Those among them who are most well-meaning and silliest even nowadays want «the market mechanism» to regulate production and distribution in the society in such a way as to form a law-abiding social majority living in prosperity in the succession of generations. Such people pay no heed to the limited ability, which is objectively inherent to this mechanism, and to the way prices are formed in a crowd-“elitist” society.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Besides, after a certain production achieves a level of capacity allowing satisfying the demographically grounded needs assuredly and in a short time period, the demand will drop to a minimal level determined by how quickly previously satisfied needs come back. The market mechanism will block the structural reorganization of the multiindustrial production and consumption system yet it encourages artificial stimulation of demand by means of lowering the ergonomic and resource characteristics of production.

On the scale of the society in general this is a macroeconomy directed towards getting lots of people involved into a fuss (vanity) that is detrimental for everyone and not towards satisfying people's vital needs.

The people are forced to bog down in this vanity by the macroeconomic organization. Thus they waste their vigor and time on it without a chance to develop their personality. Such direction towards creating an artificial vane business has the following reasons:

- the market mechanism does not «know» how to dispose of labor resources that are released in the course of technological and organizational progress;
- professional politicians, people of culture see no other way of social development but to offer the people released from labor to ruin themselves and waste their spare time indulging in satisfying their passions and sensualities, mostly within the same range of degraded parasitic needs (booze, gambling and shows, «safe» and «non-conventional» sex etc.)

Therefore, the more freedom market gets in the society the further people are from fulfilling their human potential: at work a man is an appendage to his workplace and outside work he has either no strength left or he wastes his time for drowning himself in a sea of pleasures.

In the feudal era and in the earlier times of blunt slavery social life was placed within a pattern of classes and castes preventing money from acquiring that almost absolute power within society it has assumed in the capitalist era, especially in the «wild» capitalism of free market. In the pre-capitalist era this circumstance concealed and partially curbed the flawed nature the system of free market regulation of production and

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

distribution of products had in the *society where inhuman psychology, ethics and morals are dominant.*

* * *

But in the capitalist era it became evident to many that this system of production and distribution was flawed. That is why starting from the middle of the 19th century various measures were taken in different societies toward curbing its antihuman nature. These measures had and continue to have a broad range.

Among these measures are efforts to introduce the following:

- progressive income tax;
- progressive prices and charges — more like penalties — on consumption exceeding *the limits set in legislature*;
- tax benefits for businessmen who spend their profits on funding charity foundations and programs of public consequence;
- quotas determined by the State and agreements of producers concerning production volumes and delivery times of their products to the markets which have been divided between these producers;
- governmental subsidies for the producers and consumers of certain products.

These measures and some other including those of a non-financial or economic nature to some extent suppress solvent demand and funding of production within the degraded parasitic range and allow to maintain the socially necessary volume of production in the demographically grounded range of needs in industries where with such production volume prices fall to a level when non-subsidized production becomes unprofitable or when consumption without subsidies is not possible on the prices allowing for the production's self-repayment.

Measures of this kind can also to some extent level out the consequences of «overregulation» ensuring a more stable operation of industries and product distribution system. This kind of stability makes the life of many average people happier and predictable for themselves which partially mitigates personal and class antagonism in the society and adds some peace and order to social life.

These measures are not founded upon a conscious differentiation between the demographically grounded and the degraded parasitic range of needs. Because of that they bring no change into the nature of the

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

inhuman civilization (judged by the psychic types that are dominant in it). They preserve flawed morals directing vices onto a course that poses no danger for the social system's present stability thereby increasing chances of its potential future downfall.

There are many ways the society reacts to the flawed nature of the free-market regulation of production and consumption. The range of such reactions is crowned by the effort *to introduce a system of production and consumption on a planned basis which conforms to really vital needs of all laborers* and denies civil rights to unrepentant (persisting) parasites and those who oppose to organizing public life upon declaring the principle of conscientious labor to the benefit of all other laborers. In the course of history such social and economic order has been termed «socialism».¹

¹ In the historically real socialism of the 20th century many things were carried to the point of absurdity on purpose. The crowd-“elitism” changed his disguise and substituted the ideal of human righteous community (the so-called socialism) by the reality of barracks for slaves. But this is a special aspect of the issue of socialism.

The reality of slavery based on barracks-like discipline and executed under cover of socialist slogans has only one point where it is related to socialism proper, i.e. to arranging socialist production and distribution of products in accordance with the vital interests of all laborers. **It is possible only in a situation where there is neither theory nor theoretically non-formalized practice of controlling the multiindustrial production and consumption system on the planned basis. No theory and practice, which every member of society has an access to and which are understood by its politically active part.**

If we are to speak in historically specific terms an attempt to build socialism on the basis of Marxism no matter what country it is made in the freedom of a socialist society is doomed to be substituted with barracks for slaves. One of the reasons is that Marxist political economy is based on imaginary categories that have nothing to do with real life and therefore cannot be practically measured in economic activity. Therefore Marxist political economy cannot be integrated with a system of accounting, financial and economic statistics, and so planned control of economy in a socialist society can be as efficient as the society is free from Marxism.

On the other hand the substitution of declared socialism by the practice of barracks for slaves can be performed the more effectively the lower the educational standard of the society's majority is. The well-meaning crowd which cannot interpret life independently indulges in a blind faith in socialist leaders. These leaders “*elitize*” (make an elite out of themselves) and start

→ → →

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

Yet in order to grasp what the very possibility of making a practically consistent plan is objectively caused by we must turn again to the structure of vital needs generated by the society. Because planning deals with satisfying current and future needs then if it is impossible to determine and predict the dynamics of needs in future it is impossible to make plans and run the economy on a planned basis. Therefore the issue of stable predictability of needs is the key issue when running the economy on a planned basis is concerned.

Vital needs are the demographically grounded needs. They can be predicted decades in advance; and their being predictable decades in advance makes it possible to control them centuries in advance. Their predictability springs from the fact that by **analyzing what the needs depend on they can be distributed between the three following groups:**

- needs where the volume of production required to satisfy them is proportionate to the number of population in groups formed on the basis of sex and age characteristics (these are — food, clothes, kindergartens, school, universities, jobs, etc.);
- needs where the volume of production required to satisfy them is proportionate to the number of families corresponding to how the general number of families is distributed between types of families (single, childless couples, couples having many children; families where more than two generations live together under one roof; those living in town apartments; those living in private houses with allotments etc. — these group of needs includes mainly housing and most home appliances);
- needs in infrastructure which are determined by the population's way of life in the region and the aims of state institution's activity (these are transport infrastructure, energy supply, information exchange,

misusing their power, become parasites which is exactly what provides the grounds for creating the barracks-for-slaves system. Within this system any element of socialism is suppressed by the «socialist» oligarchy which seeks to break away from the limitations imposed on it by the society's true achievements in building socialism and to convert to overtly legalized crowd-«elitism». This exactly is the way «perestroika» was started in the USSR leading to emergence of the oligarchy capitalism of the Yeltsin era.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

education and health service, army bases and combat training facilities etc.)

Because the demographically grounded needs of each group are predictable the economy can be adjusted and prepared in advance to the end of their full and assured stable satisfaction from generation to generation.

In this case society's technological and organizational progress, and most of all its ethic progress contribute to stability of the multiindustrial system of production and consumption operating on a planned basis given that *the state (viewed as a system of professional control of social life)* executes a policy beneficial to the whole of society.

Yet an *irreversible* implementation of this scheme of operation in the economy and state control system will require quite a long time period. At best it will take up one generation's active lifetime if this is a *thinking* generation, living in good conscience and developing their morality and ethics according to a world understanding that follows their conscience.

A plan in general, a plan as such, consists of the following:

- a set of defined objectives and indices that are subject to objective control and that define each of the objectives and can reveal deviations in the process of implementation if such occur;¹
- a complex of actions (a scenario, perhaps a multi-choice one) which consist in utilizing various resources (discovered and defined) and means to complete the objectives chosen (there may be a certain order of succession due to different levels of priority of the objectives and the limited nature of available resources and means).

This definition is also applicable to plans of social and economic development. This is a very useful definition that explains what the *plan is in essence*. This definition makes clear that:

- a plan of **economic and social development** is a set of objectives for production and product distribution and a scenario according to which the multiindustrial production and consumption system is *controlled (control always has objectives because it is impossible without distinctly defined objectives)*;

¹ In other words the indices must be measurable (in kilometers, tons, standards, etc.) or registerable by «done — not done».

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

- and **the market mechanism** is one of the possible means by which the multiindustrial production and consumption system can be self-regulated. This means can be adjusted (*if one knows how to do it*) to completing certain objectives of production and distribution that have been recognized and set.

In other words when speaking generally some plans (scenarios) of the social and economic nature can include applying market mechanism for completing the chosen objectives, and other plans (scenarios) of the social and economic nature can exclude or ban self-regulation of multiindustrial production and consumption either completely or partially in some of its aspects.¹

For Russia at the beginning of the 21st century (first of all) and other states of the former USSR this means that the cult opposition (since 1985 and until now²) of the so-called «planned economy» and «market economy» which have been considered to be two mutually excluding alternatives *results from the superficial attitude, ignorance and folly of «economists» and parrot-like «analytic» journalists» who have made such statements before and continue making them now.*

All this time intelligent people who are aware of the problem's essence have held a different opinion.³ For example A. Epstein in his article “More dangerous than an enemy”⁴ published in the “Economicheskaya gazeta” (№ 41 (210), October 1998) quotes an interview with Saburo Okita, one of the «founding fathers» of the Japanese «economical miracle», given shortly before his death to professor A. Dinkevich:

«One often hears that the transition to market mechanism proclaimed there (in the former USSR and Eastern Europe —

¹ The reasons market mechanism is completely excluded or blocked partially can be different: ranging from sheer lack of skill to control its adjustment to force of circumstances or deliberate choice of other means to complete the objectives set in the plan.

² February 2002

³ But their views, which were essentially true, did not have a cult status either in the USSR or abroad. They are not the subject of studies and discussions at universities, and judging by the published works it is not these views that set the subject for the studies of official economics.

⁴ A fool is more dangerous than an enemy.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

A.E.) is convincing proof for the market-oriented economy being superior to the centrally planned one. I think it is a mistake... The problem lies in CONNECTING, CO-ORDINATING, COMBINING THE PRINCIPLE OF THE TWO SYSTEMS IN A SINGLE MECHANISM.¹ (put in capitals by A.A.), finding a way of combining market mechanisms and government planning and regulation».

In order to apply the last sentence of the quotation to the global economy of mankind one needs to change it the following way:

To connect, co-ordinate, combine the principles of these two systems in a common algorithms of social self-government, to find a effective method of combining market mechanisms, national and global planning and regulation *to the end of providing every person with a chance of living a life a human being is worthy of* (deserves).²

Planning of economic development is performed after interindustry proportions and links are discovered, this has been mentioned before. Because it requires to develop productive capacities in compliance with pre-set figures of final product output in each of the industries (in other words it requires having pre-defined objectives and is impossible without the process of setting targets) theoretic and practical planning and control on a planned basis at the very start face the problem of determining needs and the consequences of their satisfaction. In the course of time as one gets a richer experience one inevitable comes to an understanding that all of the needs society has must be divided into demographically grounded ones and degraded parasitic ones.

The needs, which have been discovered and included in the plan, must be divided between the two classes every time a new project plan is being drawn for the upcoming period. The way this issue is dealt with determines where the plan's control indices come from and what they are.

Earlier we pointed out that the many-sided issue of defining targets in its most aspects lies outside the mechanism of market self-regulation. Yet for same reasons it lies outside the methodology of mathematic modeling

¹ It would be more precise to say «in a single algorithms of social self-control».

² This condition stipulated by the phrase in italics is necessary because globalization can have different aims but this problem must be practically solved for any variant of globalization to become possible.

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

and plan optimization, as well as outside the methodology of implementing plans of economic and social development.

One and the same methods (algorithms) of making and optimizing plans, as well as identical control structures and procedures in certain cases can be used for achieving mutually exclusive objectives included in different plans. This is what those prejudiced against planned economy should be aware of.

Yet the problem formulated by S. Okito can be solved if the issue of dividing demographically grounded and degraded parasitic needs is solved. Let us remind you how this problem has been worded: *to find and effective way of combining market mechanisms and state planning and regulation in a common algorithms of social self-control*. This is so because if the contrary plan is pursued the system of plan-based control will face sabotage at best and at worst — deliberate counter-action.

The point is that generally **controlling the multiindustrial production and consumption system on the basis of a plan** involves the following: *defining targets*; distributing investments between industries and regions *in compliance with the targets*, as well as timing their provision and volume; addressed directive control of state-owned enterprises; working out and granting government contracts to private enterprises, defining policy on taxes, credits, insurance and subsidies connected with government contracts, implementing this policy while fulfilling the plan, etc.

If these heterogeneous means turn out to be in the hands of people, who advocate different conceptions of social order and economy and act at will, according to their moral principles the problem posed by S. Okito would become insoluble.

We must make special emphasis on the need to work out a policy on subsidies, credit and insurance for *every planning period*. Tariffs on service provided by the so-called «natural monopolies», other rates and prices (including loan interest rate) and rental payments are the basis of price-formation that sets the minimal costs of manufacture for products of all industries. The theory of similarity of production and consumption

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

systems¹ unites those rates and prices in a group called «price list basis». All the other market prices are formed more or less freely by means of balancing active solvent demand and supply if the multiindustrial production and consumption system functions steadily.

Every price has a share which corresponds to tax payments and return of loans and insurance credit. Besides some producers are subsidized because otherwise production would be devastatingly unprofitable or it would be impossible to retain its volume. All these payments that are reflected in price along with the «price list basis» and subsidies to consumers of certain products form a sort of «*financial press*» which could enable one (if one knows how to adjust it properly) to force the market mechanism of production and consumption system's self-regulation to give out (deliver) the desired range of production and consumption of final products.

At the same time one should also know that all parameters, which determine the adjustment of «financial press» on delivering a definite range of production, are expressed in equations of interindustry balance. They are heterogeneous items of those equations expressed in value terms and form the price of any products taken into account in the interindustry balance.

If the planned range of production and consumption of products is grounded on demography and includes the products necessary for implementing the state policy different plan targets are defined for every planning period, different both in planned nomenclature and production and consumption volume.

In this connection one should keep in mind that when the society's nominal paying capacity is always limited and no emission² occurs a broader range of consumers can be reached only through expanding production which leads to decline in prices as otherwise sales would be hampered by an unacceptable price.³

¹ Described in the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR "The Brief Course..." and "Dead Water" in editions starting from the 1998 edition.

² In this connection one should say directly that the main factor generating nominal price growth, which forcedly leads to the inflationary emission, is interest on loans.

³ Increasing income in order to ensure sales of certain products in a crowd-"elitist" society can lead to an increase in nominal prices on other products and not to ensuring sales of desired products regardless of their usefulness. For

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

Within the integrity of the multiindustrial production and consumption system prices function as a means of limiting the consumers' number after a certain level of production and supply on specialized markets has been attained. Therefore if production volume is sufficient for satisfying the needs of all people then there is no need in price as a means to limit consumption. Price can then be equal to zero if it is not impeded by other factors. In other words **when demographically grounded needs are fully and assuredly satisfied — the perspective is zero price.**¹

While such ideal operation of the multiindustrial production and consumption system is being attained prices on some socially necessary products may fall below the level which production is profitable at. This happens because production covers the vital needs of society more fully. In his case it may be feasible (in the long-term historic perspective) to retain the socially necessary volume of production by means of grants and subsidies that are collected from other industries in tax form. This means that profitability factors are redistributed between enterprises, industries and regions.

example, high standards of education and health care cannot be provided by means of increasing nominal income of large groups of population because on a self-regulated market such increase in income will result in price growth on products of mass everyday demand.

Therefore paid high standard health care and education on the basis of free self-regulated market is always the privilege enjoyed by the richest social strata whose representatives are more or less parasitic on the life of others. But in the planned economy of the USSR by the middle of 1950-s high standard (judging by world standards of the time) education and health care was practically available for the majority of the country's population. This became possible due to targeted subsidies of socially useful activities that could not be developed on the self-repaying principle.

¹ In other words the price-list on final products within the demographically grounded range is the financial expression of the error vector for society's self-control because ideal control is characterized by zero values of control errors and its deviations are characterized by non-zero values of control errors.

That such interpretation of the price-list's role in modeling the processes of controlling production and consumption is a consistent one has been proved in the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR "The Brief Course..." and *«Dead Water»* in editions starting from the 1998 edition.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

It follows that in regard to the systemic integrity of multiindustrial production directed towards satisfying the vital needs of all laborers more and more fully the overall profitability of the system taken at historically long time intervals is more important than high profitability of some enterprises when other industries are hampered in their development due to the law of value's being unchecked. The law of value is far from operating in compliance with a list of demographically grounded needs given in order of priority.¹

Making this system profitable at historically long time intervals requires every short-term plan to be made up as a stage included into a long-term succession of plans (or one cannot be sure of the plan's practical consistency). Developing a succession of practically consistent plans is possible only if the system of planning is aimed at the demographically grounded range of needs and operates within the bounds of a demographic policy that is in concord with the biosphere.

It follows from the two above-mentioned circumstances² that the tax policy, policy on subsidies, policy on credit and insurance must be worked out and coordinated for every planning period. They should be directed towards forcing the market mechanism by means of the «financial press» to deliver the planned range of production and consumption under the changing circumstances which the production system operates in.

¹ This way a structural transformation of economy was undertaken in the USSR between 1920 and the 1950-s though it contradicted the law of value. In this period the system of general and higher special education was created which was world's best for that time.

But as soon as this *superior profitability* which exists in the systemic integrity of economy was forgotten (after the reforms were started in the 1990-s), was no more felt and maintained everything became a mess in science, education, health care, army, industry and regions.

² The first one is changes in the planned range of production which occur due to changes in demographic grounding, changes in the tasks of state policy and changes in prices and price ratios caused by the society's needs being satisfied.

The second one is development of the production and consumption system treated as a technological and organizational integrity proper. This leads to changes in the system's own characteristics including profitability characteristics for production in industries and in supporting infrastructures.

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

Consumption is to be included into the plan because free price-formation in a society where inhuman psychic types are dominant is such that even if the necessary production level for the socially necessary products is attained their consumption could be blocked. Blocking can be caused by prices that needs to be high for production to be profitable or by the paying capacity being redistributed between the specialized markets, as well as by deliberately buying products up and destroying them to the end of speculating on the rise in prices.

This approach of organizing production and consumption involves applying the theory of control¹ and suggests that production and consumption of products within the *demographically grounded* range is the «useful signal» of the multiindustrial production and consumption system. On the contrary, production and consumption within the degraded parasitic range is «internal noise» and outside interference which are present in the system but are to be suppressed and excluded by means of self-control thereby allowing for an increase in power and quality of the «useful signal».

The clue to solving the problem posed by S. Okito consists in building a workable methodology of such planning and of *state control necessary to carry out those plans*. Yet the problem is insoluble if demographically grounded and degraded parasitic needs are not divided and if they are not differentiated in the country's political practice.

Besides that there is also another crucial question that has to be answered to solve the above-mentioned problem.

How should the state and the society define the notion of «plan»?

— A target set unattainably high which the multiindustrial production and consumption system must reach at the breaking point of its ability?

— A target known to be achievable which sets a level of control indices; the production and consumption system must not operate at a level lower than those indices, yet exceeding them is not only desirable, it

¹ The *Sufficiently common theory of control* is described in the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR: “Dead Water” (all editions) and in a separate edition «The sufficiently common theory of control» (study aids for the lecture course given to students of the Applied mathematics and control processes faculty at St. Petersburg state university between 1997 and 1999), published in St. Petersburg in 2000.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

is must be *guaranteed* by the freedom and creativity in science, business and management?

The second answer to the question proves to be the practically consistent one.¹

Besides conforming to the vital needs of society, the planned range of production and consumption must be known to be achievable. Exceeding the planned values of indices when it is socially useful must be guaranteed by business and control organization in all industries and regions.

Basically this is provides full coverage of the *industrial civilization's political economy* extremely summarized. This subject must be understood at least in such general way and it should be seen in real life. But conventional sociology and economy have a custom of keeping silence on such issues as the mutually excluding nature of objectives of production and distribution of products in society, on the methodology of planning and on planned adjustment of the self-regulating market mechanism. This happens because professional clerks (economists, accountants, bank financiers, stock exchange brokers) as well as the rest of the crowd are not supposed to know that they are all controlled in a robot-like manner in a very simple way. *Since early childhood their views and professional skills are being formed to suit the goals of the masters and bosses of the system but they are not consistent in practice.*

We have dealt with these problems very briefly in this work but we have tackled their essence. More details are provided in the «Brief course» by the IP of the USSR. As known from experience of promoting the Conception of Social Security, many people think it unnecessary to read it and become familiar with it. We think though that it is obligatory that all

¹ Which means that one of the crucial errors made by the Soviet society was in its systemic treatment of a «plan» as an unattainably high target. The result was twisting state reports, which led to absence of resources and means to carry out the plans that were developed. This made the plans unrealizable from the very start as all the efforts to fulfill them inevitably led to violating inter-industry proportions. This approach was retained throughout many five-year plans and the situation inevitably became worse and worse.

Yet this is only one crucial error out of many.

Digression 6: Political Economy of the Industrial Civilization

supporters of the Conception of Social Security must study it because we live in a civilization where everyone is dependant on the system of production and distribution of products. Therefore no one *has a moral right to speak on economic issues* until he has formed at least a most general idea of the following things.

- what are the interindustry balances of product and financial exchange;
- how they are connected with each other;
- how the processes within an industry are described by the instruments of mathematical statistics and the probability theory;
- how these description of the processes within an industry are connected with the accounting system;
- what the instruments of adjusting the market mechanism to self-regulating production and distribution are;
- how these instruments are reflected in the interindustry balance;
- how the objectives of production and distribution typical of the society are reflected in the interindustry balance;
- how should the planning system be built so that it would generate a succession of planned balances corresponding to completing morally healthy objectives of production and distribution of products;
- how should the policy on taxes, subsidies, credit and insurance change while the succession of planned balances is being realized so that the real indices of production and consumption would be better than the planned targets and that the chosen objectives would be completed.

And the main thing is to understand:

- why should defining targets within the planning system be demographically grounded within the course of the global policy;
- how are the demographically grounded and the degraded parasitic ranges of needs determined in practice;
- what needs are attributed to each class today.

One must know, understand and feel this even if one is not going to make a career and take up the post of the state's leader, prime-

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

minister or the minister of economy. One must know this so that the «great» schemers¹ and liars could not fool people any more.

In order to make it easier to master this knowledge and to help people break free from the prejudice of pseudo-economic myths we have published “The Brief Course...”

Now on the basis of the information provided in this digression we could move on to discussing Ford’s and Stalin’s views on normal economy of society.

¹ “Great Schemer” was a nickname of Ostap Bender – the main hero of the previous mentioned novel by I. Ilf and E. Petrov “12 chairs” (known in the West as “Diamonds to sit on”). (*The translation of this nickname may be made in another way in the English variant*).

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

Having provided a definition of the fundamental economic law of socialism at the end of Chapter 4.4 Stalin explains it further and differentiates objectives and the means of accomplishing them.

«It is said that the law of the balanced, proportionate development of the national economy is the basic economic law of socialism. That is not true. Balanced development of the national economy, and hence, economic planning, which is a more or less faithful reflection of this law, can yield nothing by themselves, if it is not known for what purpose economic development is planned, or if that purpose is not clear <we have dealt with the task of defining targets in Digression 6>. The law of balanced development of the national economy can yield the desired result <i.e. attaining and maintaining the necessary level of industries' capacities and the proportions between industries> only if there is a purpose for the sake of which economic development is planned. This purpose the law of balanced development of the national economy cannot itself provide <because the proportions between various industries and the absolute capacities are themselves defined by the targets set within this task>. Still less can economic planning provide it <as defining targets does not lie within the bounds of proportions between industries and the methodology of planning>. This purpose is inherent in the basic economic law of socialism, in the shape of its requirements, as expounded above. Consequently, the law of balanced development of the national economy can operate to its full scope only if its operation rests on the basic economic law of socialism.

As to economic planning, it can achieve positive results only if two conditions are observed: a) if it correctly reflects the requirements of the law of balanced <i.e. proportionate> development of the national economy <i.e. if the methodology of planning adequately models the proportions and relations between industries providing for predictability of the consequences of decision-making on economic policy> and b) if it conforms in every way to the requirements of the basic economic law of socialism <which means that the planned targets of social and economic development are set in accordance with the demographic setting and that the planning system is aimed at securing satisfaction of *the morally healthy (vital)* needs of everyone>» (“Economic Problems

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, ch. 7. “The Basic Economic Laws of Modern Capitalism and of Socialism”).

Yet the above-quoted extract (if divested of our explanatory comments put in <angular brackets>) to many would seem empty (meaningless) babble of a top party hierarch ignorant of practical issues and having nothing to do with economic reality of the Soviet society.

Many abide by this point of view justifying their stance by recalling the economic reality of the late «zastoi» and «perestroika» USSR. This was a time when there was shortage of most products ranging from foodstuff to furniture, housing and cars (that were yet considered to be among luxuries optional for a family household) and overstocking (glut) in some categories of products, such as an abundance of carpeting and cut-glass ware that existed at a time. Supplies of some products to the trading network experienced regular failures, among them even such basics as salt, soap, tooth-paste, sugar and sausage (which was at times available only in Moscow, Leningrad, republic capitals and closed «classified towns» («spetsgorodki»). Along with that there existed the «raspredeliteli» (distribution centers only for Soviet “elite”), where the Soviet “elite”, consisting of party, government, academic and other «nomenclature», got all the products they needed according to their individual rank no matter how poorly the public trading network was supplied. And those are just a few facts characteristic of that reality.

It could seem that this experience of life in the USSR confirms that Stalin’s statements on the fundamental economic law of socialism and its implementation on the basis of planned control of economy are most surely nothing but preposterous meaningless babble; that real life has proved that planned economy is not viable if it is to serve the interests of the majority of people.

Yet if one correlates the extract quoted from “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R” with Digression 6 it becomes clear beyond doubt that on the contrary the history of the post-1953 USSR including the mess the country got into in the times of «zastoi» and «perestroika» *proves that Joseph Stalin gave the right definition of the economic laws of socialism yet after his assassination the strategy of social and economic development was worked out and implemented in the way that severely violated both the fundamental economic law of socialism and the law of regular and balanced development of economy.*

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

In order to exemplify this statement we shall make another digression.

* * *

Digression 7: *The Post-Stalin USSR was an Anti-Socialist State*

As for the fundamental economic law of socialism, which defines the goals of production and distribution of products in a society, there was no strict differentiation and division between the degraded parasitic and the demographically grounded range of needs neither in the general political economy of socialism nor in the applied theories of controlling economy on a planned basis.

In the Stalin period it can be explained by solving the tasks of the country's social and economic development on the basis of Marxism which the Russian culture accepted but had no time to comprehend in correlation with the actual life situation. The intellectual potential was spent in struggles within the party, technological and organizational aspects of restructuring national economy in the 1920-s — 1930-s. Then all every effort was directed to win the Great Patriotic War (World War II as it is called in the formed USSR) and to carry out the economical restoration and re-equipment of military forces (when missiles and nuclear weapon were introduced) that followed. But after the restoration period was over and "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R" was published the complete failure and futility of social and economic sciences in the USSR can be explained only by the degraded parasitic morality of the scientists themselves. The more vicious in morals — the more corrupt and obliging and higher in the social hierarchy, but at the same time the more stupid and less efficient in defining and solving the problems of actual life and social development.

As a result of such indifference of science and politicians towards the two incompatible ranges of needs alcohol and tobacco products were taking the leading places in the revenues of the USSR budget. And by the mid-1980-s each rouble gained from sales of alcohol was attended by 3 — 5 roubles (in different assessment) of direct or indirect damage registerable by bookkeeping. It was caused by faults, factory accidents, absenteeism, spoilage, hooliganism and more serious crimes and results of people's actions under the influence of alcohol. There is also damage that

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

evades bookkeeping and includes health damage to the new generations given birth by drinking parents and cultural damage caused by absence of proper education and by genetic potential's degrading under the influence of alcohol.

The same can be said about the production and usage of tobacco products and, especially today, of different dopes.

As a result the USSR — Russia in post-Stalin period fell, falls and in the nearest future will fall behind the requirements of time *in mass solving* of moral, scientific, technological and organizational problems of its development which define its international position and the attitude the local “elites” and common people of other regions of the Earth share towards it.

It's also no use speaking about the satisfaction of people's needs by means of development and improvement of production on the basis of high technologies. The old enterprises were working for decades without upgrading their technological base and the new ones were constructed according to projects, which provided for the use of old technologies and morally outdated equipment. Above all «dolgostroy» (long-term building) flourished caused by the violation of proportions between the planned amount of works and the productive capacity of the construction industry.

It means that in the post-Stalin period it was not only the fundamental economic law of socialism that was violated but the law of planned proportional development was systematically violated as well. In our opinion the most striking example of violating proportions resulting from falsely defined targets i.e. from violating the fundamental economic law of socialism, — are the forays of «virgin soil reclamation» and the development of the USSR Armed Forces.

The first virgin soil crop exceeded all expectations. It was reaped ... and mainly rotted because the infrastructures of accommodation, storage, grain processing and transport had not been created in advance. Moreover during the first forays on the virgin soil an agrotechnics, that did not agree with the natural conditions of Kazakhstan steppe, was employed and in some regions up to half a meter of fertile soil was carried away by weathering. It will take the soils thousands or at least hundreds of years to recover from this damage.

The personal blame for this sabotage, this biosphere environmental crime lies completely on Nikita Khrushchev, the members of the Central Committee of Communist Party, the deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviki is a Socialist Economy

USSR of those years, the State Planning Committee, the corresponding departments of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and the Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences.

This could have not happen if it had been done according to common sense, the fundamental economic law of socialism and the law of planned proportional development of national economy.

In this case the roads and accommodation would have been built first of all. The agricultural production would have been limited by the amount necessary to feed the new-coming population. In several years aeromechanics would have been modified to agree with natural conditions of the region. And then on this basis the problem of food self-sufficiency of the USSR would have been solved in the regular succession of generations and in constant care for the sustenance of the soils' fertility¹.

One does not need to be a genius to work out in advance a plan for reclamation of virgin soils very much like this sequence of successive and mutually coordinated actions. It was necessary simply not to regard a plan as some sort of a record to beat, not to make much of abstract numbers in order to blow up a propaganda boom, but to concentrate on what in particular should be done, in what succession and by whom, what resources are necessary for it and what metrologically consistent indices give ground that one may proceed to the next stage of a complex plan.

Another expression of the "elite" policy of constraining population to the degraded parasitic range of needs are «khrushchevki» (standard blocks

¹ The scientific, theoretical and partially practical basis for the approach to the problem solution did already exist. It was founded by a Russian scientist Vassily Vassilievich Dokuchaev (1846 — 1903) whose works were not put into practice during the pre-Revolutionary years. In his work "Our Steppes: Their Past and Present" (1892) he formulated a plan to fight the draughts in the black earth region of the European part of Russia. After the Great Patriotic War in the USSR on the basis and in development of his works under Stalin's personal support a state program for the improvement of natural conditions of steppe and forest zone was launched. It was designed to create shelter belts for snow-retention, artificial ponds, etc that were supposed to change the regional water balance and, as a result, of the natural conditions on general. After the Stalin removal the program was partly dropped and partly turned into a project of partial derivation of northern rivers to the south. Nevertheless what had been realized in the years of Stalin bolshevism significantly reduce the damage from the hot winds in the agriculture of the European steppe area.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of flats built during the times of Khrushchev). Their «architecture» psychologically depresses an individual and their overcrowded conditions (or «compactness and «combined lay-out» of everything and all, if to use the slang of those times). Their small size and number of rooms destroyed the extended family. Thus the «khrushchevki» epoch caused an irretrievable damage to formation of individuals in several generations, because nothing can substitute an everyday communication of a small child with his grandparents¹.

If to dwell further on the problem of individual formation let us recollect a well-known phrase «architecture is music in stone». And in the same way as musical background (radio, audio-records) influences human psyche and activity, architectural background also has this kind of influence. In textbooks on ancient history, which everybody (in the USSR) studied by in the 1960 — 1970s, it was told how an enemy army burst into the Athens acropolis. *When the warriors beheld the statue of Pallas Athena standing in front of them on the pedestal they were stunned and retreated without committing any plunder.* This is an example of the influence of architecture which is if not ideal yet closer to an ideal than that of modern cities. And when we try to investigate the reasons of youth riots like the one in the center of Moscow on June 9, 2002 when Russia lost the football match to Japan it should be kept in mind that the majority of the participants of that hell-bender grew up against the «architectural» (if it can be called such) background of «khrushchevki» — «vivarium»².

One can often hear that «khrushchevki» caused rapid growth of housing construction, that people moved from communal flats and cellars, that the housing problem³ in towns was being solved. But these are two different and hardly interconnected questions: the first is a question of

¹ Another architectural expression of a degrading parasitic way of life is a lodgment or a household which is too large for the family to manage on their own during their free time. As a result a necessity arises to engage a servant or this responsibility rests on the “poor relatives” or dependent acquaintances. It corrupts the morality of the children in the family and of society in general.

² Vivarium is a place where small laboratory animals (mice, rats) are kept. A kind of cabinet divided into multiple cells.

³ Which was created artificially because unqualified working force migrated to towns from the country. In the 1960 — 1970-s this on the one hand depleted the agriculture and on the other hand prevented town industry from undergoing technical re-equipment in due time.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviki is a Socialist Economy

architectural forms and styles and the second is a question of building materials, technologies and constructions. Nothing, except an anti-national neo-Trotskyite political course, prevented from applying more productive building technologies in combination with a life-asserting architectural style instead of *the unnatural style of «khrushchevki»* — «*vivarium*».

Besides, in order to raise the statistics on «housing construction» the doors in «khrushchevki» were installed not on the borders between a room and a corridor (or a kitchen and a corridor) according to the rectangular outline of rooms, but within a meter from this border towards the corridor. A passage to the kitchen through a niche in the dining room in some «khrushchevki» can be explained by the same desire to fake report statistics. This niche appeared as a result of eliminating the wall between the dining room and the corridor that led to the kitchen passing the bathroom. Because of such architectural perversions each room or a kitchen acquired up to two additional square meters, which could not be used but were included into reports on housing construction. These meters were also charged according to tariffs on usable area and were taken into account in case of an application for improvement of living conditions.

The same happened with the staircases. Lifting a piano to the fifth floor became an theme for jokes of that epoch. However the reality was that millions of elderly people could not descend those staircases and that the deceased had to be turned over in order to be carried down because the coffin could not fit into the narrow space of stair flights. It will take several generations to overcome the consequences of that period.

Besides, «khrushchevki» were tightly connected with the notorious «six hundred square meters»¹ land allotments, which were sometimes a hundred kilometers away from the town *place of habitation* (it deserves no other name). The result is:

«“*Khrushchevki*” + “*six hundred square meters*”» = «*destroyed biocenoses + waste of land resources, transport and industrial capacities*» in contrast to the option of building family cottages with

¹ “Six hundred square meters” — a family garden out of the city and a very little house there.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

attached plots of land in towns and developing production which does not engage many people in small towns and in the country-side.

The development of the USSR's Armed Forces in the post-Stalin period was also an act of sabotage. For the military forces in peaceful time to warrant the country's ability to defend and to develop successfully the number of soldiers or seamen should correspond to the number of officers and the quantity of *high-quality* equipment in accordance with the specific branch of arms and the military doctrine. In order to maintain all of this in fighting efficiency an infrastructure of bases (accommodation for soldiers, officers and their families, shooting-ranges, etc) and training facilities should be developed. Because some armaments become morally and physically obsolete and are taken off the register national economy should develop a complex of *modernization, reconstruction and utilization industries*¹.

Violation of structural proportions of the military forces towards increasing the quantity of armaments and manpower proper which are not backed up by due development of infrastructures of basing, training, reconstruction, modernization and utilization is *justified in one and only case*: if the war is known to start in the nearest future. In this war the quantity of armaments and manpower excessive in comparison to the proportions of peacetime will secure a quick victory resulting from a massive strike on the offence or on the defense. Or it will be destroyed during the first stage of a stabilized warfare.

But if the military forces of a state are growing during more than 30 years (1953 — 1985) according to proportions of a wartime period — it is an issue of a separate research.

In our opinion during the period between the summer of 1953 when Nikita Khrushchev came to power and the death of Leonid Brezhnev in

¹ Normally they should service not only the military forces, but also other industries, the country's infrastructure and family life.

It is wasteful to produce stainless steel razor blades or glass and throw them away unutilized. The vast junkyards contain all kinds of stuff and therefore are ecologically harmful. Yet while the junkyards are localized and their places are known, a lot of dangerous stuff is simply thrown away into the biosphere wherever it is possible without control and specification of its level of danger due to carelessness and irresponsibility.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

1982 all the information on real processes of global policy given to the leaders of the USSR was intentionally perverted by consultants in science (The Institute on the USA and Canada) and intelligence, which happened due to the all-around influence of second-generation Trotskyites. Drinking (both Khrushchev and Brezhnev) and smoking (Brezhnev) were with few exceptions an integral part of the party and state leaders' life-style. They perverted and depressed the psychological state of politicians and prepared a «fertile field» for them to be suggested all kinds of false ideas about the intentions and actual policy of the USA, NATO and the processes of global policy in general.

As for the states, which were enemies of the USSR in the «cold war» of 1946 — 1985, a lot of their politicians were initiated masons who acted according to the masonry's global political scenario. Those who were not masons were fooled by science and intelligence of their countries, which were infiltrated by masons. Marxist Trotskyism initially included a branch of masonry; therefore everything in the global policy was under control of the representatives of biblical conception.

Under such circumstances the proportions of the military forces of the USSR redundantly deformed in relation to infrastructure of basing and provision convinced everyone who was not admitted to the global scenarios that the country was preparing to start a war and all that noise about a peaceful co-existence of two systems was intended to put Western politicians and society off their guard.

Moreover, there were methodological errors in the work of State Planning Committee of the USSR and of the Union Republics and bodies of government supervising their economies, and so good intentions could not be realized because inappropriate means were used.

Thus, although such branch of knowledge as «economic cybernetics» did appear in Soviet science, those economic «**cabernet**¹-ics» were engaged mainly in small talk and in adjusting quotations from western researches to Marx-Lenin ideology and to publications of the regular Congress of Communist Party instead of scientific and creative research work.

¹ A sort of grapes and of red dry vine produced out of it.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

As a result «economic cybernetics» did not solve the problem of defining targets and did not define the price list to be the financial and economic expression of the error vector of the society's self-control. It did not consider the problem of the system's internal «noise» and the external noise on the level of micro- and macroeconomy, means of their suppression and excluding from the processes of control and self-control. It did not reveal the problems of coordinating the addressed directive (structural) control and the market self-regulating system (non-structural control) in a general process of controlling the realization of plans. No theory of control can be a consistent basis for the practice of control unless it has definite answers to such questions as: what is a vector of control objective? what is the objective expression of control error vector? what can be used as means of control? which parameters should be independent in the process of control? It concerns both Soviet and foreign cybernetics.

For this and other reasons State Planning Committee of the USSR was doomed to practice defective and vicious methods of modeling social and economic development and of plan optimization.

In order to demonstrate what idiotic notions about the functioning of a multiindustrial production and consumption system the State Planning Committee indulged in and what ideas Soviet economic science cultivated let us consider a quotation from the work “The Planned Equilibrium: installation, maintenance, efficiency” (by V.D. Belkin and V.V. Ivanter, «Economica» Publishing house, Moscow, 1983, p. 209):

«The question is how to estimate the product a part of which was produced over the desired solvent demand? It can be done using the equilibrium prices¹. As it was demonstrated (...) the

¹ Equilibrium prices ensure the planned profitability of branches under the condition that they implement the planned range of full capacities and of final output. They are the known values in the system of equilibrium price equations, which are included into the system of inter-industry balance equations. The variables in these equations are the proportions of «surplus value» in the product price (wages, taxes, rents, amount of credit and insurance balance, etc in the gross output per unit). The indices are the same as in the indices of direct expenses in the inter-branch balance equations. The matrix of an equilibrium prices equation system is a transposed matrix of an inter-branch balance equation system (i.e. the indices in the columns of one matrix are equal to the indices in the corresponding columns of the other). For more information see

→ → →

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

prices for the goods, the production of which is redundant in relation to the solvent demand, should be lower than the production prices. The redundant production means redundant expenditure in labor, material and natural resources, damages for the entire society and the recession of economic efficiency of national economy».

The last phrase is the expression of a private-owner, capitalist mode of thinking, which does not comprehend the structural integrity of a multiindustrial production and consumption inside a society and which a single businessman directs towards deriving of maximum of profit right now and always.

This world understanding is incapable of defining targets and evaluating efficiency in the activity of a super concern state. The logic of the last phrase from the given quotation leaves only one step to make towards suggesting to destroy the product, which is redundant in relation to the solvent demand at prices that do not cover the expenses on its production. Private-property economy gives us a scope of such examples: it is well known that corn was drowned in sea or used as fuel for electric power-stations in order to raise prices while the population of whole regions in other countries was starving.

There is a need in a different approach to the efficiency of national economy. The latter is a structural integrity designed for guaranteed satisfaction of the daily living needs of the entire population in the succession of generations, but not of the degraded parasitic needs of a small “elite” group. However we do not even put a question of interrelation between a turnout exceeding the solvent demand and a demographically grounded need in a book dedicated to the planned equilibrium in a state whose goal is to build «communism» when everything will be free of charge and free-for-all.

Yet if one proceeds from the principle that production in a society is performed for the sake of satisfying vital needs, then in a normally functioning production system product quality should correspond to these needs and to the standards in which they are expressed. A price in such system first of all is a means to limit the number of consumers. It deprives the insolvent part of the possibility to obtain or use some product.

specialized literature and the work by Internal Predictor of the USSR “The Brief Course...”

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Correspondingly production exceeding the expected (planned) solvent demand on *the demographically grounded range of needs* an advanced result in carrying out the plan and is socially useful for it will permit to satisfy the vital needs of more people within the planned period. Therefore the prices on this product should be lowered in due time to ensure its sales, and the «losses» of the manufacturers should be covered by subsidies. Otherwise former prices ensuring the profitability of production should be retained, while the potential consumers should be offered target subsidies.

Here is the opinion of H. Ford on the question:

«We are not much concerned with the statistics and the theories of the economists on the recurring cycles of prosperity and depression. They call the periods when prices are high “prosperous.” A really prosperous period is not to be judged on the prices that manufacturers are quoting for articles.

We are not concerned with combinations of words. If the prices of goods are above the incomes of the people, then get the prices down to the incomes (put in bold type by the authors). Ordinarily, business is conceived as starting with a manufacturing process and ending with a consumer. If that consumer does not want to buy what the manufacturer has to sell him and has not the money to buy it, then the manufacturer blames the consumer and says that business is bad, and thus, hitching the cart before the horse, lie goes on his way lamenting. Isn’t that nonsense?» (Ch. 9. “Why Not Always Have Good Business?”).

This helps to understand that H. Ford understood the aim and manner of a normal functioning of a multiindustrial production and consumption system better than the collaborators and directors of State Planning Committee 60 years after “My Life and Work” by H. Ford has been published¹. The fault of State Planning Committee and economic

¹ This is a substantiation of the objection addressed to A. Livshits in section 4.2 that H. Ford’s business (and not «commercial» meaning «buy — sell but for a higher price») talent in Stalin’s times was more befitting to a Director of State Planning Committee than to a prisoner in a **detention camp**.

In Stalin’s times people with such world understanding could become prisoners only through the efforts of open and disguised Trotskyites carrying out the policy of depleting trained personnel of the Bolshevik state. While in post-Stalin times the crowds of those like A. Aganbegyan, A. Livshits and E. Gaidar trammled the effort to build socialism, which was morally

→ → →

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviki is a Socialist Economy

«science» of the USSR is aggravated by the fact that unlike H. Ford they had several decades of working-out the plans of which they were to make sense. But social climbers and bureaucrats are hopeless.

As for the question raised by the authors of “The Planned Equilibrium” it demands a substantial answer:

The exceeding of a planned range of production by a real output will inevitably lead to the reduction of prices on the product on the demographically determined specter of needs. And in this case the fiscal-subsidizing policy of a *super concern state, such as the USSR*, should provide under the normal functioning for the solvency balance of the branches of economy. **This — is a normal regime of functioning of a multiindustrial production and consumption system of a morally healthy humanly developing society.**

If the product exceeds the proper demographically determined needs of the state it should find its outlet on the world market (its quality should suffice) or it should be given to the destitute countries as a gratuitous or other kind of help in the course of the goals of state’s global policy¹.

However the economic science of the USSR did not understand the **exceptional position of a socialist political system as an owner of the whole credit and finance system and an exclusive operator of the «financial press» which gives birth to law of value (i.e. a price current base of nominal prices and price correlation)**. This science put it in the way that the state — is one of many private owners of this system, which can use it until its activities are paid off under the set prices and price correlation.

unacceptable for them. They climbed their scientific and political ladders treading down those few with such outlook in a competitive struggle.

¹ In order not to make it uselessly spent a state should have an articulate — historically long-term — strategy of global policy. Global policy is a strict term. If home policy is a system of measures in carrying out the goals of a ruling class within the jurisdiction of its state, foreign policy is a system of measures in carrying out the goals of a ruling class outside the jurisdiction of the state, then global policy is a system of measures in carrying out the goals in relation to the whole mankind, the whole global civilization within as well as outside its jurisdiction.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Such position would be correct in relation to any private-capitalist political system where the owner of the credit and finance systems and operator of a financial running knot is a usurious corporation independent of state¹.

Such branch of sociological science that could be called «juridical cybernetics» also did not appear in the USSR. This science could have analyzed and developed legislature as a system of social self-government algorithms in the course of a definite conception of global policy.

Certainly, many of the mentioned and not mentioned, but known from the life of the post-Stalin USSR, facts are vices unconsciously, automatically inherited from the epoch of J.V. Stalin and earlier times.

However in the years of Stalinism they are forgivable for they were objectively determined by the fact that the socialist revolution took place in the country where 85 % of population were completely illiterate. The first educated generation of the Soviet nation grew up during the pre-war years. They mastered science (including Marxism which was imposed on them) and culture belonging to the previous ruling “elite”. They inherited the science and culture, which were already formed and retained all their vices. It was therefore inevitable that the predominant part of population was not free in its world understanding from the power of the vicious and obviously false ideas, which they duly put into practice.

But at the end of 1952 “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” was published in which J.V. Stalin pointed out many of the problems mentioned by us directly or in connection with other issues. And when the «ottepel» started nothing — except corruption, obsequiousness and malignancy of scientists, «Soviet» intelligentsia in general, limiting them in their choice of objects for research and restraining in obtaining

¹ Meyer Rothschild expressed its attitude towards the political system: «Allow me to control the country’s money and I don’t care who writes its laws».

As far as the laws word the conception of society’s self-control the freedom of usury suits the corporation in any state juridical forms: whether it is capitalism on the basis of freedom of free enterprise and the right of private property over the means of production or «socialism» with a moderate loan interest and the predominance of state and cooperative-kolkhoz property over the means of production — it is all the same.

A morally healthy society’s reaction on such parasitic autocratic claims should be insuperable.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

morally acceptable results — nothing prevented them from investigating and solving the problem formulated by S. Okito in the interview quoted in Digression 6.

Many years that passed after 1953 — the years of a different morality of scientists and politicians — allowed to get free from the mistakes and abuses characteristic of Stalin period and to develop all the good that was given a start and new power in the result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, building of socialism and victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941— 1945.

However malignant scientists and politicians (*under the connivance of the rest of population*) carried to the point of absurdity everything that was good, perverted and violated it while developing everything bad. Logically there came the perestroika and the situation we have today as the in-between results of the then launched reforms.

All this shows that in the fragments quoted from “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” by J.V. Stalin are no empty talking. In a brief work it is simply impossible to explain all the particulars and details¹. Stalin determines only those problems and sets up those the goals that he finds essential to be solved by the entire population to ensure further successful development of the USSR as a multinational society in which everyone can master his genetic potential of development and become an individual.

Let us now return to the main issue of this part.

* *
 *
 *

¹ It would be foul to demand him alone to write a treatise on the theory and practice of planning and controlling national economy on the planned basis while simultaneously evolving several mathematical theories and at the same time being the head of state. The Academy of Sciences of the USSR and academies of the republics as well as university science were the institutions intended for the detailed development of versatile problems in the interests of the society.

But they proved their lack of efficiency and failure in the field of social studies both in the time of Stalin and during the following years. Many still lack it today.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

It is well known that J.V. Stalin is an advocate of socialism and planned economy, yet many people tend to forget that he supports not a *planned economy* «generally speaking», but a **planned economy definitely aimed at complete satisfaction of vital needs of all people in the society. The fact that the guaranteed satisfaction of morally healthy needs is meant is implied by the very *Idea of socialism and social justice in its evolution in each particular historical epoch*.**

Let us now turn to the viewpoints of H. Ford. Earlier we have quoted his opinion on the central flaw of the system of private-capital enterprise as a system of production and distribution of products in the society:

«The present system does not permit of the best service because it encourages every kind of waste — it keeps many men from getting the full return from service. And it is going nowhere. It is all a matter of better planning and adjustment».

Thus it can be understood that H. Ford and J.V. Stalin share the following opinion:

National economy (and in the historical perspective — world economy) should be planned, socialist in its essence and it should guarantee *in succession of generations* the satisfaction of vital needs of laborers conscientiously participating in the economic activity, i.e. of the majority of society.

Suspicion may arise that this opinion, which belongs to the private owner — a capitalist H. Ford — is an incidental, unmotivated slip of the tongue or some ambiguity torn out of context¹. That we use it with reference to Ford's authority to provide grounds for the necessity of planned basis in economy on micro- and macro-levels and a socialist character of production-consumption social interrelations. Let us therefore turn to other parts of Ford's work where the issue of necessity of planning in economy on micro- and macro-levels and of relations between the capital and the businessman and the rest of society is the major topic:

«By poverty I mean the lack of reasonably sufficient food, housing, and clothing for an individual or a family. There will have to be differences in the grades of sustenance <this — is a rejection of a barrack-equalizing pseudo-socialism>. Poverty can be done away with only by plenty, and we have now gone far enough along

¹ Though it isn't so: look the beginning of ch. 4.3.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviki is a Socialist Economy

in the science of production to be able to see, as a natural development, the day when production and distribution will be so scientific that all may have according to ability and industry.

The underlying causes of poverty, as I can see them, are essentially due to the **bad adjustment** between production and distribution, in both industry and agriculture — **between the source of power and its application** (put in bold type by the authors)¹. The wastes due to lack of adjustment are stupendous. All of these wastes must fall before intelligent leadership consecrated to service. **So long as leadership thinks more of money than it does of service, the wastes will continue. Waste is prevented by far-sighted not by short-sighted men. Short-sighted men think first of money. They cannot see waste. They think of service as altruistic <i.e. unprofitable a priori> instead of as the most practical thing in the world.** (put in bold type by the authors)²» (Ch. 13. “Why Be Poor?”).

«Although there is never a time when everyone has too much of this world’s goods — when everyone is too comfortable or too happy — there come periods when we have the astounding spectacle of a world hungry for goods and an industrial machine hungry for work and the two — the demand and the means of satisfying it — held apart by a money barrier <caused by many ways by the usury of banks and stock-market speculations>. Both manufacturing and employment are in-and-out affairs. Instead of a

¹ This — is a key point to solving the problem if one knows the theory of similarity of multiindustrial production systems and understands how a long-term demographically grounded planning should be realized. **The range of production is determined in each historical period by:**

- the volume of energy (biogeneous and technogeneous) put into production and consumption;
- the coefficients of efficiency of *technological and organizational processes comprising the production process*;
- the dominant social morality expressed in the distribution of accessible energetic potential between the branches of multiindustrial production and consumption system, including the distribution between the branches producing the means of production (which is the guarantee of the production’s complicity to the social needs in future) and the branches producing the end-product.

² The words ‘revenues’ and ‘expenditures’ are obviously used in a broader sense than the financial gains and losses in the accountant’s balance at the end of quarter.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

steady progression we go ahead by fits and starts — now going too fast, now stopping altogether. When a great many people want to buy, there is said to be a shortage of goods. When nobody wants to buy, there is said to be an overproduction of goods. **I know that we have always had a shortage of goods, but I do not believe we have ever had an overproduction** (put in bold type by the authors). We may have, at a particular time, too much of the wrong kind of goods. That is not overproduction — that is merely headless production. He may also have great stocks of goods at too high prices. That is not overproduction — it is either bad manufacturing or bad financing <i.e. an attempt to gain excess profit by forcing up prices>. Is business good or bad according to the dictates of fate? Must we accept the conditions as inevitable? Business is good or bad as we make it so. The only reason for growing crops, for mining, or for manufacturing, is **that people may eat, keep warm, have clothing to wear, and articles to use. There is no other possible reason, yet that reason is forced into the background and instead we have operations carried on, not to the end of service <i.e. other people>, but to the end of making money <for oneself>** (put in bold type by the authors)¹ — and this because we have evolved a system of money that instead of being a convenient medium of exchange, is at times a barrier to exchange². Of this more later.

We suffer frequent periods of so-called bad luck only because we manage so badly. If we had a vast crop failure, I can imagine the country going hungry, but I cannot conceive how it is that we tolerate hunger and poverty, when they grow solely out of bad management, and especially out of the bad management that is im-

¹ Here H. Ford means actually the demographic dependence of morally healthy needs of people and opposes them to the perverted degraded parasitic needs. The significance of division of all needs into two classes (demographically grounded and degraded parasitic) was discussed in Digression 6.

However Ford does not distinguish the two alternative classes and therefore is not precise in terms.

² Its reasons are discussed in Digression 6 that dealt with the characteristics of «market mechanism» as a regulator of the inter-industry proportions in production and distribution according to the principle of the priority of satisfying degraded parasitic needs. The latter is produced by the crowd-“elitist” society in which the non-humane types of psychology and the corresponding types of morality and ethics dominate.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

plicit in an unreasoned financial structure¹. Of course the war upset affairs in this country. It upset the whole world. There would have been no war had management been better. But the war alone is not to blame. The war showed up a great number of the defects of the financial system <i.e. laid open the failure of hopes for the self-regulation of production and consumption by a free market in connection with the actual living needs>, but more than anything else it showed how insecure is business supported only by a money foundation. I do not know whether bad business is the result of bad financial methods or whether the wrong motive in business created bad financial methods², but I do know that, while it would be wholly undesirable to try to overturn the present financial system, it is wholly desirable to reshape business on the basis of service. Then a better financial system will have to come. The present system will drop out because it will have no reason for being. The process will have to be a gradual one.

The start toward the stabilization of his own affairs may be made by any one. One cannot achieve perfect results *acting* alone, but as the example begins to sink in there will be followers³, and this in the course of time we can hope to put inflated business and its fellow,

¹ This is completely true about the modern Russian system formed by the efforts of reformers during the period of Boris Yeltsin's presidency.

² The answer to this question is a key to solving all social and economic problems. Yet in the quoted book H. Ford did not go into the question at large. In his other work — "The International Jew" — he also could not give a reliable analysis of it because he did not know many facts of the world history, which determined incomprehension of its general course in the past and the possible development in the future.

³ However the businessmen in the USA did not follow it. There is not much hope than Russian businessmen in their majority will follow this example by their own comprehension and good will — but only under the pressure of objective independent circumstances amounting to the threat to their own lives and the lives of their heirs.

In his conversation with H. Wells on 25th July, 1934 J.V. Stalin named a reason for this quite definitely:

«You, Mr. Wells, seem to proceed from the supposition that all people are good. As for myself I do not forget that there are many evil people. I do not believe in the goodness of bourgeoisie (...).»

Long ago Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius expressed himself similarly on the same question: «It is insanity to think that evil people do not make evil».

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

depressed business, into a class with small-pox — that is, into the class of preventable diseases. It is perfectly possible, with the reorganization of business and finance that is bound to come about, to take the ill effect of seasons, if not the seasons, out of industry, and also the periodic depressions» (Ch. 9. “Why Not Always Have Good Business?”).

Those were the thoughts of H. Ford about the problems caused by the absence of planning basis and they might have been regarded as simple complaints which do not oblige and do not exhort to do anything. But it is not so considering the general context of his book where in chapter 7 he makes direct statements on the objectively formed necessity to include planning basis into the economy of society:

«There are far too many assumptions about what human nature ought to be and not enough research into what it is. Take the assumption that creative work can be undertaken only in the realm of vision. **We speak of creative “artists” in music, painting, and the other arts. We seemingly limit the creative functions to productions that may be hung on gallery walls, or played in concert halls, or otherwise displayed where idle and fastidious people gather to admire each other’s culture** (put in bold type by the authors)¹. But if a man wants a field for vital creative work, let him come where he is dealing with higher laws than those of sound, or line, or color; let him come where he may deal with the laws of personality. We want artists in industrial relationship. We want masters in industrial method — both from the standpoint of the producer and the product. We want those who can mould the political, social, industrial, and moral mass into a sound and shapely whole. **We have limited the creative faculty too much and have used it for too trivial ends** (put in bold type by the authors)².

We want men who can create the working design for all that is right and good and desirable in our life. Good intentions plus well-thought-out working designs can be put into practice and can be made to succeed. It is possible to

¹ It is, actually, a killing description of a culturally developed “elite” whose income is mainly unearned and comes from abusing the possibility to claim exclusively high payment due to the free market regulation of a labor market in a crowd-“elitist” society. It proves Marcus Aurelius’ point.

² Named by H. Ford above: mutual admiration the idle and choosy higher society’s own high level of culture.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

increase the well-being of the workingman — not by having him do less work, but by aiding him to do more. If the world will give its attention and interest and energy to the making of plans that will profit the other fellow as he is, then such plans can be established on a practical working basis. Such plans will endure — and they will be far the most profitable both in human and financial values (isolated in a separate paragraph and put in bold type by the authors).

What this generation needs is a deep faith, a profound conviction in the practicability of righteousness, justice, and humanity in industry. If we cannot have these qualities, then we were better off without industry. Indeed, if we cannot get those qualities, the days of industry are numbered. But we can get them. We are getting them (isolated in a separate paragraph and put in bold type by the authors) (Ch. 7. “The Terror of the Machine”).¹

¹ H. Ford then continues:

«If a man cannot earn his keep without the aid of machinery, is it benefiting him to withhold that machinery because attendance upon it may be monotonous? And let him starve? Or is it better to put him in the way of a good living? Is a man the happier for starving? If he is the happier for using a machine to less than its capacity, is he happier for producing less than he might and consequently getting less than his share of the world's goods in exchange?»

I have not been able to discover that repetitive labor injures a man in any way. I have been told by parlor experts that repetitive labor is soul- as well as body-destroying, but that has not been the result of our investigations. There was one case of a man who all day long did little but step on a treadle release. He thought that the motion was making him one-sided; the medical examination did not show that he had been affected but, of course, he was changed to another job that used a different set of muscles. In a few weeks he asked for his old job again. It would seem reasonable to imagine that going through the same set of motions daily for eight hours would produce an abnormal body, but we have never had a case of it. We shift men whenever they ask to be shifted and we should like regularly to change them—that would be entirely feasible if only the men would have it that way. They do not like changes which they do not themselves suggest».

It is his answer to the calumnious accusations put forward against him in the article «Fordizm» from the “Big Soviet Encyclopedia” and quoted in part 3:

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

«At the same time Fordizm intensified labor to an unprecedented extent, made it dull and mechanical. Fordizm counts on turning workers into robots and requires an extreme nervous and physical exertion. Compulsory pace of work set by the assembly line made it necessary to substitute piece-work payment by payment by the hour. The word «Fordizm» like «Tailorizm» before it became synonymous to exploitation of workers characteristic of the monopoly stage of capitalism which is bent on increasing profits of capitalist monopolies...

Ford praised his system as the one catering for the workers making special emphasis on wages at his factories being higher than the average wage in the industry. However higher wages are connected with higher working pace, quick wear of workforce, the task to attract more and more new workers to substitute those put out of action».

H. Ford adds also:

«In 1914, when the first plan went into effect, we had 14,000 employees and it had been necessary to hire at the rate of about 53,000 a year in order to keep a constant force of 14,000. In 1915 we had to hire only 6,508 men and the majority of these new men were taken on because of the growth of the business. With the old turnover of labor and our present force we should have to hire at the rate of nearly 200,000 men a year — which would be pretty nearly an impossible propositions». (Ch. 8. “Wages”).

It means that with the reorganization of production and the introduction of «Fordizm» employee turnover in one year decreased at least in ten times. It proves that working conditions on «Ford Motors» were better and the wear of labor force was less than at other enterprises.

Industrial labor, especially on the assembly line or in the hot-shops and chemical labs, is certainly not easy in spite of all its organization and payment principles. The latter in many ways depend, for example, on the level of culture in a society and the personnel's education. At the beginning of the 20th century when «Ford Motors» was created the educational and cultural level of the employees left much to be desired. Illiteracy was a common thing in the USA. (In this aspect Ford writes that under the structure of «Ford Motors» there were created a system of general education and a teenage training system thanks to which a lot of young people became highly skilled workers and decent people). In other words, under different social and cultural conditions the principles of Fordizm would have been different and the labor more humane.

However for those who principally refuses to live in a civilization dependant on the technosphere and the collective nature of technological and control processes, — *unless they do not skulk from the work under the pretext of criticizing the existing mode of life,* — should be designed a direct program of transition from today's extremely unhealthy way of life to the biological civilization which activity does not need manufacturing and, therefore, technological processes and manifold means of integrating multiple

→ → →

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

Ford was mistaken in his evaluation of the perspectives: the days of industry are not over. But he was right in his apprehension that in the historically developed by that time (it was only 1922) form industry does not have a right for existence. He was right: the global biosphere and environment crisis, an unquestionable attribute of the life of mankind in the last quarter of the 20th century and in the foreseeable perspective of the 21st century, is a result of predominance of those methods of managing which Ford foresaw, condemned and warned against offering his alternative.

Yet the problem of alternative principles of managing organization *on the basis of demographically grounded target definition and of planning in long-term successions* is connected with the question how a problem of freedom of man is comprehended within a society. Depending on the answer to this question a private-capitalist enterprise and «free market» system will pass to this alternative according to its own free will or it will happen inevitably under the influence of extra-social (biosphere-ecological crisis and people's physical and psychological degradation) and intra-social conditions (social and political activity, uncompromising initiative of the more progressive part of society).

In one of his interviews Stalin commented upon the rights and freedom of man:

«I can hardly imagine what «personal freedom» an unemployed may have, he who walks hungry and cannot find an application of his labor. The real freedom exists only where exploitation is destroyed, ***where there is no oppression of people by other people***, where there is no unemployment and hunger, where a man does not live in fear of losing his job, his house, his bread next day¹. Only in such society real and not official, personal or any other

microeconomy into a single multiindustrial production and consumption system of macroeconomy.

¹ The fact that J.V. Stalin was right in his characteristic of «freedom» under the conditions of bourgeois «democracy» and market liberalism, *could be seen at first hand by the millions of citizens of the former USSR after the reformations of 1991.*

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

freedom is possible¹» (from a conversation with the chairman of a news-paper union Roy Howard, March 1, 1936).

It has been mentioned that the high level of individual social protection including the guarantees of *economic* rights (which are essentially *creative and consumer's rights*) and freedoms calls for control. I.e. it calls for a demographically grounded definition of targets and efficient regulation of product exchange, in a multiindustrial production and consumption system from which the society obtains the majority of consumed goods.

11 years later (in the year of H. Ford's death) Stalin has a discussion with another foreign interviewer concerning the problem of necessity to regulate production and distribution in national economy in order to get free from the vicious circle of economic depressions and social disorder resulting from the latter.

«J.V. Stalin asks: And what about the businessmen? Are they willing to be controlled and limited?

Stassen answers that they usually object to it.

J.V. Stalin observes that they will surely object» (from a conversation with some Stassen, April 7, 1947).

Stassen's answer actually proved that Stalin was right in rejecting H. Wells' statement of bourgeoisie's kindness. In the other aspect a question of necessity of governmental regulation of private enterprise is a question of private and state ownership over means of production and a question of relationship between the state and any individual of the society and especially the businessman.

What is the essence of the right of ownership over means of production? What is the difference between private and public ownership over means of production? — These questions belong to that multitude of questions to which traditional political economy (including its Marxist version in general and socialist version in particular) does not give articulate, systematic and practically viable answers. Let us therefore clarify them.

¹ «When there is an economical freedom — there is a freedom of creative work». – Vladimir Putin, March 13, 2002, during his conference with the editorial board of “Izvestia” on the occasion of its encaenia. (It was founded in 1917 by the Petrograd Committee of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies right after the February Revolution, was the mouthpiece of the Soviet power).

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

The right of ownership is one of many rights acknowledged by very different societies. It is realized by ownership subjects in relation to property, i.e. to objects of ownership. It is realized through proclamations as well as through implications. And proclamations can be suppressed by the actions of implications attending to these proclamations. An example to it is a violation of the Biblical commandment «Do not steal» by the prescription (also biblical) to the Hebrew of international usury executed on the racial corporation basis: «steal and the main thing — make everybody think that this stealing is allowed by God himself and to you alone» (see Supplement 1).

In well-meaning concepts of social organization people cannot be objects of ownership neither in proclamation (slave-owning, feudalism, serfdom) nor in dissembling (private-owning capitalism with the strangling not of usury or of personal «copyright» on the objects of «intellectual» property).

Of all the ownership rights an exclusive role belongs *to the right of ownership on the means of production*, because much depends on it directly or indirectly in the legislative regulation of economic life of society.

The essence of the notion of «the right of ownership on the means of production» is revealed exclusively as the right to control production and distribution of product either directly or through a delegate.

The essence of the notion of right on such objects of ownership as earth and its bowels, waters and other natural resources is revealed only as a right to organize human labor using these resources and also as a right to limit access to its non-productive use (e.g. for leisure, etc).

Right (in the meaning of personal right as a social institution) and value are categories residing in a social organization, not nature. Under the circumstances of purchase of such rights it is a result of human labor in the past, present or a possible result in future that is always paid. «Natural resources and comforts» *do not objectively have any value*. Their payment is a nominal solvency limitation of possibility to use them and a creation of funds to pay the labor contributing to the natural reproduction of these resources.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

The notions of private and public ownership are connected with the social division of professionalism and its reproduction with the succession of generations in the social labor consolidation. Their essence is revealed through the process of formation of administrative personnel.

A property is private if the staff operating the means of production does not have an opportunity to **immediately** remove from administration those who did not justify their confidence and to employ or propose someone from their own circle as a new administrator.

A property is public if the administrators who have ceased to be trusted, did not cope with the duty of improving administration quality can be **immediately** removed from their posts through the initiative of the operating personnel. *This is based on of the condition: a closed social group an entrance to which is restricted to the representatives of other social groups cannot be a social basis for an administrative body.*

It is impossible to introduce public property *in its administrative essence* by a law because:

- if a dominating opinion is that what is *public de jure* is ownerless de facto, then the latter would become private personal or corporate.
- moreover, legal introduction of public property is possible only under a definite level of development of culture, morality and world understanding of a society, *at least of its politically active part.*

The right to remove an administrator — *which is indispensable from public ownership* — may be socially useful only if the personnel are conscious that the only reason for this is an administrator's inability to exercise his duties on the necessary level of quality *according to the socially supported conception of social life*. In particular, a reason for the removal may be the use of administrative post for personal or family-clannish enrichment through blatant stealing, financial fraud, creation and support of possibilities to get exclusively high payment and other things of this kind which directly or indirectly cause damage to the contemporaries and descendants.

In other words the right of public ownership is based on the world understanding of individuals integrating a society and unconsciously

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

(automatically) reproduced cultural traditions, but not on juridical declarations. That means:

First, in a society's culture and psychology a *moral* worldview basis should appear in which **the ownership on the collectively used means of production** is understood as public irrespective of its legal form. And only after it the domination of *public ownership de facto* will express itself in the practice of controlling the society's multiindustrial production and consumption system and will legally ratify itself.

If there are juridical forms but no moral worldview basis then a "public" *de jure* property is doomed to be a *de facto* private property of a corporation of swindlers-administrators as it was mostly the case in the USSR in the course of its entire history though it was caused by different reasons in different periods.

Private property may be personal (family-clannish) as well as "elite"-corporate. And a corporation may have a legal form of a privileged class (nobility) or caste (merchant class in Russia) or it may not have such a form but act in a mafia-like manner (as bureaucracy in the USSR). In the case of private corporate property it may seem public and have the juridical status of a public one. In the USSR the «national» state and cooperative-kolkhoz property was public in form but because of "elite" exclusiveness and absence of social control over «nomenclature» bureaucracy, which over generations started reproducing itself as dynasties, all «public» property under the connivance of the rest of population became "elite"-corporate. This was a manifestation of an actual morality that dominated among the non-party population and in the Communist Party. During the «perestroika» and «democratization» this actual fact of life began to be legally substantiated¹.

Now when we have explained the question of *ownership on the means of production* and the difference between the public and private (personal

¹ But as far as it does not answer to everybody's live ideals both the "elite"-corporate «perestroika» and «democratization» proved to be a deadlock and what's more: are doomed to fail. Because inside the Russian civilization acts an internal conceptual power which is alternative to the global witch-demonic power.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

and corporate) ownership on the means of production let us turn to H. Ford's views on the capital.

«Capital that a business makes for itself, that is employed to expand the workman's opportunity and increase his comfort and prosperity, and that is used to give more and more men work, at the same time reducing the cost of service to the public — that sort of capital, even though it be under single control, is not a menace to humanity. **It is a working surplus held in trust and daily use for the benefit of all. The holder of such capital can scarcely regard it as a personal reward. No man can view such a surplus as his own, for he did not create it alone. It is the joint product of his whole organization**» (put in bold type by the authors) (Ch. 13. "Why be Poor?").

Thus it may be understood that though H. Ford is one of private owners and capitalists and a shareholder of «Ford Motors Company», he nonetheless actually perceives «Ford Motors» (and also all the other enterprises in the USA and in the world) as public property of all nations and mankind in general which is controlled personally by certain individuals. He does not go into the details of: who has been personally trusted to control this or that property by society; and who has usurped this right and misuses the legal right of private property by exploiting people's ignorance and the vices of historically developing culture. **But Henry Ford is a socialist by the essence of his words.**

This explains the calumnious character of Marxist articles on H. Ford and his activity:

In the 20th century the psychical Trotskyites¹ and their backstage masters claimed to build not a really socialist society but a slave-

¹ Trotskyism in its essence is a schizophrenic, aggressive politically active psyche, which may be disguised as any kind of ideology or sociological doctrine. And psychical Trotskyism is historically older than Marxism in which it found its powerful expression. Trotskyism as a psychical phenomenon is characterized by the non-coincidence of proclamation and dissembling, results and promises.

Therefore the «democrats» by whose efforts the USSR was destroyed in order as it was said to build a «normal bourgeois democracy and civil society» are Trotskyites if to judge by their psychological organization. For more details see the work of Internal Predictor of the USSR "The Sorrowful Legacy of Atlantis" ("Trotskyism is «Yesterday», but not «Tomorrow»").

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

owning system¹ on the basis of *exclusive exploitation* of the Ideas of socialism and justice in the social life organization *in the form of Marxism-Leninism*. That's why socialist «Fordizm» was so dangerous for their project.

On the other hand H. Ford developed the socialist ideas freely and independently of contemporary Marxist rubbish, which was hardly known to him. This fact only speaks for his, in this case, common sense. Because the real socialism on the basis of Marxism — *despite all the subjective desire of many true communists in and outside Russia to be faithful to Marxism* — cannot be objectively realized for two fundamentally important reasons:

- Philosophy with its «basic» question “What is primary: matter or mind?” takes us away from solving the problem of predicting consequences to the end of choosing the best scheme of action which makes the fully functional control possible. In other words if you do not foresee all the possible actions and their consequences beforehand how can you *consciously* choose an action which leads to the realization of *consciously* set goals?
- Marxist «political economy» is based on fictional categories that cannot be evaluated in the process of economical activity. («Required product» and «surplus product» — could you distinguish them in the warehouse; «required working hours» and «surplus working hours» — could you find the watch that shows when the former end and the latter begin; «expenditure of labor» in many fields of activity used as a basis of price formation theory but which cannot be objectively measured; only idiots can agree that *a bookkeeping operation* of «value transfer» — when *numbers* are transferred from one account

¹ That is why they insisted that socialist production relations cannot develop in a capitalist society and transition to socialism is possible only by revolution under their command. And revolutionary muddle helped the masters and higher-ups to clear out those social groups which could have become an obstacle in establishing an undivided tyrannical power under the slogans of «victory of socialism». It was this very strategy that made VChK, the Committee on extraordinary situations (the early form of KGB) in many places during the first years of soviet power a prototype of Hitler's Gestapo but in its Hebrew-Jewish variant.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

to another — *ratified by the legislation in action* is an objective economical process of transfer of *objectively immeasurable value* of means of production on the delivered product, etc.) As a result Marxist political economy cannot have anything in common with bookkeeping (socialism — according one of Lenin's aphoristic definitions — is «accounting and control»). The latter is a basis of control on the micro-level of economy and gives rise to statistics that is essential for analysis, modeling planning and control on the macro-level of multiindustrial production and consumption system¹.

Let us return to the part of H. Ford's book where we have stopped.

H. Ford continues:

«The owner's idea may have released all the energy and direction, but certainly it did not supply all the energy and direction. Every workman was a partner in the creation. No business can possibly be considered only with reference to to-day and to the individuals engaged in it. It must have the means to carry on. The best wages ought to be paid. A proper living ought to be assured every participant in the business — no matter what his part. But, for the sake of that business's ability to support those who work in it, a surplus has to be held somewhere. The truly honest manufacturer holds his surplus profits in that trust. Ultimately it does not matter where this surplus be held nor who controls it; it is its use that matters.

Capital that is not constantly creating more and better jobs is more useless than sand. Capital that is not constantly making conditions of daily labor better and the reward of daily labor more just, is not fulfilling its highest function. The highest use of capital is not to make more money, but to make money do more service for the betterment of life» (Ch. 13. "Why be Poor?").

What conclusion may be drawn from the last two paragraphs though H. Ford himself did not make it? — If it is said that «*No business can possibly be considered only with reference to to-day and to the individuals engaged in it. It must have the means to carry on. (...) Capital that is not constantly creating more and better jobs is more useless than sand. Capital that is not constantly making conditions of*

¹ For a more detailed analyses of the bankruptcy of philosophy and political economy of Marxism see the works of Internal Predictor of the USSR "Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences", "The Brief Course...", "Dead Water" in the editions starting from 1998.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

daily labor better and the reward of daily labor more just, is not fulfilling its highest function. The highest use of capital is not to make more money <personally by his owner>, but to make money do more service for the betterment of life <of everybody>» then, as the proverb goes, having said “A” — say “B”. In particular:

As the juridical private capital in its essence and origin is public property and not personal or family property then its control must be handed over not to the juridical kin-heirs according to the right of succession or a portion out described in a will as it takes place in case of private property. But it must be handed over to *the best in moral and professional qualities from the circle irrespective of his social background and post occupied by him* whether he is an owner, chairman of the directors' board, Chief Executive, top-manager, etc.

Though H. Ford himself handed the management of «Ford Motors» to his relatives¹ he was ready to eliminate that rule and thus turn a juridical

¹ Probably because he honestly believed that his heirs suit as professionals better for the goals of management and development of «Ford Motors» in the close perspective. Moreover it was done under the psychological pressure of historically developed and legally formed institute of private ownership over means of production and the absence of legal forms of *socialization (in the above discussed sense)* of private property on means of production.

In connection with this question it is important to draw a parallel with the USSR where under the formal legal domination of public ownership over the means of production a tendency was evident to hand over the management by the founders of firms to their children. The sons of aircraft designers A.N. Tupolev, A.I. Mikoyan, the close relatives of many outstanding figures in soviet science and engineering occupy the leading posts in the firms founded by their elder relatives. It is for everyone to decide himself to what extent this practice is efficient.

The heirs are not always the virtuosos as the founders were. For example in 1957 «Ford Motors» managed by the heirs of H. Ford found itself in a very difficult situation. A mass production of a new model was launched. It was called Edzel after a deceased by that time Edzel Ford, son of Henry Ford. According to the opinion of the American historians of automobile industry the quality of the model was very low and the design - defiantly forbidding. As a result a lot of units of this model produced in 1957 never found their market, turned into scrap metal and were left rusting for decades in the backyards of the independent dealers (wholesalers) who invested in them.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

private ownership over means of production into public ownership on paper and in practice.

Only if the right of enterprise management is inherited by the most deserving of candidates — irrespective of his right to inherit a family property of the firm founder as a relative «capital that is employed to expand the workman’s opportunity at the same time reducing the cost of service to the public, even though it be under single control, is not a menace to humanity».

However let us again stress that the right of public ownership on the means of production originates from the world understanding of separate individuals as well as society on the whole and cannot be realized legislatively in an opposition to the dominating morality and world understanding¹.

First, in a society’s culture and psychology a moral worldview basis should appear in which **the ownership on the collectively used means of production** is understood as public irrespective of its legal form and only after the domination of *public ownership de facto* will express itself in the practice of management of a social multiindustrial production and consumption system and will legally ratify itself.

Only when in society’s culture there is such moral worldview basis stable in succession of generations is it possible to remove inappropriate administrators from management on the initiative

There is a point of view that a soviet supersonic passenger liner Tu-144 was not a success because Alexander Tupolev, who was the son of Andrey Tupolev, became the head of the project under his father's protection and thus in his career-making pushed aside those probably more able and creatively gifted but without such powerful protection.

During the years of reforms and privatization many of such heirs by kinship became large shareholders — owners of privatised state property that was initially in juridical form a national public property.

¹ Though legislation and the enforcement accompanying it may partially contribute to the formation in a society of corresponding to it morality and world understanding. Yet one should bear in mind that legislation as it is, being one of the expressions of a *definite conception* of life organization, is dependent on the content of this conception and may benefit to the moral development as well as moral degradation of society.

4.5. Planned Economy of Bolsheviks is a Socialist Economy

from below or to hand over these posts to the most deserving by the firm's head.

Yet such a basis did not exist neither in the USA in times of H. Ford nor in Russia by 1917. It was not formed in the USSR either where public, especially in post-Stalin times, was considered by the majority as «belonging to nobody» which anybody can disrupt to use for his personal or family needs. As a result became possible a breakdown of the USSR and the privatization of «soviet heritage» by the financial and stock exchange speculators and marauders under the connivance and accomplice of the remaining part of population less successful in deceit and machination.

If the majority of the society understood that the **public property is a personal property of everyone, that it is a part he himself affords (directly or indirectly through the institutions of *his own* state) out of *his exclusively personal or family use to the public use of more or less broad circle of people***, — the breakdown of the USSR and the privatization of the «soviet heritage» would have been impossible. The attempts to act in this direction would have been considered by the politically active part of population an expression of mere insanity or an intentional aggression of exponents of degrading parasitic morality, and would have been opposed *in advance* by effective counteraction on the part of the true, i.e. conceptually powerful Bolshevik communists.

Part II

Historical Experience of Bolshevism in 20th Century and its Prospects

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism in 20th Century

H. Ford at the age of 59, being the person grown wise with experience, in his book “My Life and Work” in 1922 — in the year when the USSR was formed¹ — expressed a wish, which we already quoted in Part 4.4:

«In order to create a system which shall be as *independent* of the good-will of benevolent employers as of the ill-will of selfish ones, we shall have to find a basis in the actual facts of life itself».

His management of «Ford Motors» set an example that transition of the society to more effective way of production, aimed at satisfying vital needs of the majority (taking more or less conscientious part in work for the public good), is quite real and realizable task.

H. Ford proved this in practice at the level of microeconomy under conditions of biblical-and-talmudic degraded parasitic macroeconomy, built on the principles of mob-organized domination of usury and stock gambling, supported by the entire might of the state and its legal machine.

At all that H. Ford as an employer acted at the level of microeconomy; he had no authority to change legislation and state structure of the USA so that they complied with the principles of «Fordizm», the first American version of bolshevism in its essence. Understanding limited nature of such capabilities, H. Ford purchased newspaper “Dearborn Independent” in 1918 and from its pages he gave his views on historically formed organization of social, economical and political life of the USA and of the world. He opposed it to the principles of «Fordizm» as organizational principle of different way of life of the civilization, dependent on technosphere and manufacturing-and-distribution system.

However, Henry Ford did not succeed as the advocate of the ideas and leader of the public initiative of transformation of social life. Moreover, he was advised to stop his social and political activity under the threat of bankruptcy. Having published in the «Dearborn Independent» articles on social-and-political and economical issues and the part of the Jewry in them, H. Ford confronted with organized counteraction to the circulation of the newspaper and to the free discussion of the issues touched upon by

¹ December 30, 1922.

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

him. This counteraction increased after publication of «International Jew», the book, compiling articles published in «Dearborn Independent» during the previous years. Campaign of baiting and pressure carried out against H. Ford continued during the 1920-s; after all, H. Ford stopped his public political activity, seeing lack of the contemporary society's active support of social-and-political and economical opinions that he expressed.

Different things happened during this anti-Ford campaign. Thus, the owner of «XX Century Fox» wrote H. Ford a letter on behalf of the Jewish «community» of the USA. In this letter he offered him to stop his appearances on the «Jewish question», otherwise he promised to include in the released films pictures with **solely** Ford automobiles broken in the motor car accidents, accompanied by the relevant explanations of the number of the dead, injured, and *technical* reasons of the accident. And in the end of this campaign, H. Ford was given the text of abdication to be signed: he would renounce of everything he had published on the «Jewish question» and apologize to the Jewish «community».

«Details of renunciation and apology were worked out by his <H. Ford's> two representatives and well-known Jewish figures: Lewis Marshall and congressman Nathan Perelman. Marshall wrote the text of renunciation, which, he expected, would be the basis for Ford's apology to the Jewry and... expose the automobile titan to ridicule. "If I had his money, — said Marshall cynically during the conversation with his close friend, — I would not have signed such a humiliating statement even for 100 million dollars!" To the greatest Marshall's surprise, the letter of renunciation was published without a single correction and bore the Ford's signature.

In this letter special emphasis was laid on "extreme busyness" of a big businessman, which prevented him from focusing due attention to the articles being published in "Dearborn Independent". It was admitted that accusation brought against the Jews were of malicious, unjust and insincere character. "The Great Ford" humbly apologized to "the long-suffering Jewish people" for "unproved assertions and mistakes", contained in his newspaper.

Ford's renunciation was received by the "Jewish community" with unconcealed joy. "Anti-Semites of the world are mourning!"

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

— Yiddishers¹ press was breathless with joy. And still, did the “proud American” really repent?

After Ford’s death it was discovered that he did not sign any apology before the Jews. The signatures under the renunciation and letter of apology to Shapiro² were fabricated by his assistant, Harry Bennett, who told about it on the pages of magazine “True” in 1951: “I telephoned Ford. I told him that “the apology is already inscribed”, and added, “it looks very badly”. I tried to read the text over the telephone, but he stopped me. Then I reproduced Ford’s signature on the document. I always could sign for him very plausibly. Then I presented the paper to Wintermeier and Marshall. The signature was certified, and the matter was settled”» (“The International Jew”, Moskviyanin”, 1993, pp. 22, 23 — publishers’ preface).

Because H. Ford made no actual renunciation, it is necessary to mention one more fact, cited in the preface to “The International Jew”:

«Thus, Bernard Baruch was called <by H. Ford> “the Judas’s consul in America”, “the almighty Jew³” and “the most powerful man” in the days of the war <World War I of the 20th century>. When American reporters asked Baruch to comment on the “titles” given to him, **the closest advisor of all USA presidents of the first half of the 20th century** (put in bold type by the authors) tried to joke off: “Do you think I shall deny anything?!)” (“The International Jew”, the cited Russian edition, preface, p. 5).

Thus Bernard Baruch himself essentially proved by default Henry Ford’s assessment of the role of the Jewry (Hebrews) in making of the supragovernmental global policy, including organization of the World War I of the 20th century and revolutions in Russia and Germany, about which H. Ford wrote among other things.

¹ From the East-European Hebrews' spoken jargon— «Yiddish», originated on the basis of German language with addition of words from other languages.

² Chicago lawyer Aaron Shapiro in 1927 brought an action against Henry Ford accusing him of calumny. The cause of this was Ford's statement that Shapiro and other persons of Hebrewish origin (being Jews) participated in plot, which aim was to control American agriculture. The case was already being heard when an apology signed by Ford was produced to the court. The apology contained renunciation of previously brought accusations («International Jew», «Moskviyanin», 1993, publishers' preface, p. 22).

³ Meaning *Hebrew*, though Ford used the similar word. See the footnote at the page 68. (Footnote is done by the authors)

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

However, mentioning numerous facts concerning the role of the Hebrews in making of the internal and the foreign policy of the European states and of the USA, as well as of the global policy, and resting upon the counterfeit “The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion”¹, H. Ford was not able to shed light on this role authentically. In our opinion, one of the causes of this was his ignorance of many facts of the mankind history, and incomprehension of its general course in the past and probable trend in the future (which were determined by this ignorance).

But besides that, from the text of an interview given by H. Ford to newspaper “New York Times”, one can understand that having misused H. Ford’s ignorance in the sphere of knowledge of global civilization history and lack of systematically-integral sociological notions, the «Hebrews» themselves involved H. Ford in the activities, which they later on called «anti-Semitic». In 1915 H. Ford attempted to stop World War I of the 20th century. He freighted a ship, on which he and a group of public figures of the USA set off to the European coasts to initiate peace negotiations. H. Ford’s peace initiative did not meet with success. But later on he told a correspondent of the “New York Times”:

«It was the Jews themselves who convinced me that there is direct connection between the international Jewry and the war. Onboard of our ship there were two righteous Jews. Before we could sail 200 miles they began to instill to me the idea that the Jews ruled the world due to their control of gold². I was reluctant

¹ Concerning the «Protocols», refer to analytical note of IP the of USSR “Fascist-Minded «Semitism» from the Point of View of Being a Human” (file 970908-Фашиствующий_семитизм_с_точки_зрения_человечности.doc on the CD-distributed Information Base of Internal Predictor the USSR).

² The most high-speed transatlantic liners of those years (the “Mauritania” and the “Lusitania”) crossed the ocean at speed of approximately 25 knots (25 nautical miles per hour, one nautical mile equals to 1852 meters); other «decent» liners travelled at speed of about 20 knots; the «third-rate» ones — at speed of 13—17 knots. If H. Ford freighted a «decent» steamship, then hardly 10 hours passed after steamship's departure from New York, and passengers just came to themselves after leave-taking at port and just set up their belongings, when they started to put certain ideas into H. Ford's mind. And there was a more than a weeklong voyage ahead, comfortable saloons and strolls along the deck with the view at the ocean, which contributes to pondering...

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

to believe them, but they went into detail while illustrating the means the Jews used to control the warfare... They spoke for so long and looked so competent in what they said that they convinced me» (“The International Jew”, the cited Russian edition, preface, p. 3).

They succeeded in H. Ford’s involving into «Jewish question» not only because of his ignorance in history and sociology, but because he understood organization and algorithms of system integrity of multiindustrial production and production distribution better than organization and algorithms of individual’s mentality or algorithms of collective mentality generated by them.

It does not mean that he did not feel peculiarities of the people’s mentality and thus could not organize people in their collective activities. If he was insensitive to people’s difference in organizing their mentality and to the nature of collective mentality generated by them (which controls collective activities), there would not be company «Ford Motors» in the history (or, at least the company as we know it now). Although H. Ford was rather an engineer of the machines, technologies and organization than «the engineer of the human souls»¹, he saw and expressed the essence, which characterized his contemporaries and compatriots:

«There is no difficulty in picking out men <candidates for promotion>. They pick themselves out because — although one hears a great deal about the lack of opportunity for advancement — the average workman is more interested in a steady job than he is in advancement.

Scarcely more than five per cent of those who work for wages <i.e. of active adult population>, while they have the desire to receive more money, have also the willingness to accept the

But as could be understood from the history of Egypt and quotations from the Bible, cited in the Supplement, two these Jews were right except for one thing: save for the world, the Western regional civilization by that time was ruled by the heirs of ancient-Egypt hierarchy, by means of biblical culture on the whole, and within its course — by means of controlling and Jews, and finances, which were controlled by clans of Jewish usurious "aristocracy".

¹ The term which was used by J.V. Stalin to characterize the writers, since its their works during the pre-television epoch that in many respects formed morality and world understanding of the growing and grown-up generations of educated (i.e. literate) people.

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

additional responsibility and the additional work which goes with the higher places. Only about twenty-five per cent are even willing to be straw bosses, and most of them take that position because it carries with it more pay than working on a machine. Men of a more mechanical turn of mind, but with no desire for responsibility, go into the tool-making department where they receive considerably more pay than in production proper. But the vast majority of men want to stay put. **THEY WANT TO BE LED. THEY WANT TO HAVE EVERYTHING DONE FOR THEM AND TO HAVE NO RESPONSIBILITY <AND CONCERN>**¹. Therefore, in spite of the great mass of men, the difficulty is not to discover men to advance, but men who are willing to be advanced» (put in capitals by the authors, “My Life and Work”, Ch. 6. “Machines and Men”).

As is seen from H. Ford’s books, he did not try to discover the reasons of origination of irresponsibility and carelessness prevailing in the society and revealed by him. He did not try to discover the reasons of origination of associated parasitical, consumer attitude to all kinds of power and its carriers. And the matter concerns the USA, where (as is customary to consider):

- the social order is primordially more democratic than in monarchic Europe, which continued to support many traditions of class-and-caste order during the epoch of downfall of the monarchies (19th century — beginning of the 20th century), as well as during the post-monarchical epoch — due to the psychological inertia;
- every individual is primordially granted more freedom than in older countries of Europe and Asia, where the freedom of individual’s self-expression and creativity is somehow or other suppressed by historically formed traditions, rooted in the great antiquity;
- newly arrived population of the USA consisted of supposedly real freedom-lovers, who for the sake of freedom left their ethnic homeland, and they brought up their sons and grandsons, born and bred Americans of the first generation, also in the spirit of freedom².

¹ In essence such a widespread attitude to one’s life erases the difference between a man and a *working cattle while the owner of the latter is responsible for cattle’s way of living and acting*.

² In other words, H. Ford’s complaints could be easily explicable under the conditions of Russia, where the serfdom was repealed just two years before the

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

But *real freedom* is, first of all, the person's freedom of choice and his self-assignment of responsibility and care about the lots of the others and prosperity of everyone.

In other words, if, on the one part, the majority of Americans avoid undertaking responsibility and care (which was revealed by H. Ford), then this majority is not free, but is in the power of minority.

On the other part, H. Ford notices:

«We will always find Jews in the top-drawer society — where all the power is concentrated. This is the essence of the Jews question. How do they manage to get the top in all the countries? Who assists them?.. What do they do when they get the top?.. In every country where the Jews question is vital it becomes obvious that the root of the question comes from their ability to get hold of the power. Here, in the United States, the unquestionable fact is that in the last 50 years this minority has gained so much control while other, several dozen times bigger national groups failed to» (“The International Jew”, the cited Russian edition, preface, p. 9).

And in the other world understanding, the freedom is undertaking, first of all, *by one's own initiative*, one or another quality, fullness or breadth of power.

However, depending on to which extent the undertaking of power is accompanied by responsibility and concern for other people's fates and for everybody's prosperity, and depending on how exactly the terms «prosperity of a person» and «prosperity of the society» are understood and what they mean, to that extent freedom is really freedom, but not permissiveness towards the people.

Usually, the society does not care who personally takes care about human community of all people. This particularly applies to the crowd, more or less satisfied by its consumer status and efforts for its provision. The issue of personal composition of power arises when some social

birth of H. Ford and his contemporaries, and traditional serfdom psychology in people's behavior had not yet been replaced by some other psychology. The matter is that for Russia it is quite difficult to find reliable statistics on this issue.

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

groups (to the extent of the society majority) disagree about the power's activities.

And it was this disagreement with historically formed social order and system of production and distribution peculiar to this order, which made H. Ford ready to be brought to the «Jewish question».

However, having confronted with it, he did not try to analyze the causes of appearance of psychological differences in behavior motivation of Hebrews and the rest of multinational (by its origin) American society. He just «registered» this (in general, well-known) fact.

The cause of the «Jewish question» is not in «Hebrews' ability to retain the power under control», as Ford puts it, but in different circumstances, relating to the algorithms of person's mentality, which he did not study, namely:

- purposefulness in undertaking of power or absence of such purposefulness;
- authoritative actions of the people, who have become familiar with one or another quality of power in its completeness and breadth, which distinguish them from authoritative actions of the representatives of other cultures within the same power in the same social-and-historical circumstances.

So-called «Hebrews' ability to take power under control» is just the consequence of the causes, which were not revealed, understood or named by H. Ford — statistically expressed differences in algorithms of personal mentality of Hebrews and non-Hebrews.

The first cause of incessant arising of «Jewish question» in all crowd-“elitist” societies, where Jewish (Hebrews) diaspora exists, consists in the following: in situations, when *overwhelming* majority of non-Hebrews, as H. Ford noticed, evade from undertaking authoritative powers, the Hebrews do not evade from any power undertaking, moreover, they in many cases artificially create situations, when they could be able to take one power or another.

The second cause, in fact constituting the «Jewish question», matured for «massacre» of one or another kind, consists in the fact that the power, being under control of representatives of historically formed traditional Hebrews — *due to specific character of actions, peculiar to it*, **determined by still more profound and ancient causes** (generally not known even by the rabbinate, say nothing of common Jews) — *is*

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

apprehended by the rest of the society as the hostile power, parasitizing¹ on it.

To reveal and understand these more profound causes, more ancient than historically real Jewry and its culture means to understand the beginnings of the «Jewish question»².

¹ The statement that Jewish culture is built on parasitism produces many people's (irrespective of their origin) emotional, thoughtless reaction of aversion. Therefore we shall remind you once more: *usury is parasitism and the way of oppression of people and the offspring, but it is the backbone factor in biblical culture.*

The purpose of system of trade of personal copyrights and rights of «intellectual property» is to prevent culture, and especially scientific and technical progress from being the common property. This is the backbone parasitism and the way of oppression of people and the offspring too, developing in the 20th century in biblical civilization.

The ones who protest against such estimation of the institution of personal copyrights and rights of «intellectual property», should come to their senses; they should not close the issue of how to protect the society from the system, in which it is ruled on the basis of corporative-and-monopolistic buying-up and distribution of rights to use cultural, scientific and technical achievements with the issue of how the society should support the creators economically.

² IP's of the USSR outlooks at origination of the «Jewish question» are set out in paper “Dead Water” and, in more detail, in paper “Sinai Crusade”; its essence and prospects are considered in papers “Dead Water”, “Towards God’s Ruling...”, “The Sorrowful Legacy of Atlantis” (“Trotskyism is «Yesterday», but not «Tomorrow»”), “«Master and Margaret»: a Hymn to Demonism? Or the Gospel of the Covenantless Faith”.

Here, we shall briefly elucidate this issue. The priesthood of the ancient Egypt had degraded morally and ethically and had craved for undivided global intra-social power. Having seen the futility of force ways of achieving this goal, it saw fit to switch to establishment of world domination of "cultural cooperation". The essence of this new for those years way of aggression was to construct the culture, which, being accepted by other nations, made them dependent of the project bosses. Biblical culture had become this historically real culture. To disseminate this culture and to manage the project locally, they needed an instrument. As such an instrument, during the Egyptian captivity and 40-years long nomads' encampment along the Sinai desert, the historically real Jewry was bred on the basis of the same principles, used for breeding domestic animals' breeds with addition of some kinds of magic. Later on, this basis was inoculated with historically real Christianity — the teaching of Saul (apostle Paul), which replaced the withheld teaching of Christ for two thousand

→ → →

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

To solve the «Jewish question» it is necessary to find practical answer for the question:

Is it possible to change algorithms of Hebrews' and non-Hebrews' mentality (prevailing in the crowd-“elitist” society and expressed statistically) in such a way as to conclude the conflict, to establish harmony in people's relations irrespective of their origin, and the society itself and each person was in harmony with the biosphere, Cosmos and the God? And if this is objectively possible, how should this be done practically?

However, without revealing the beginnings of the «Jewish question» H. Ford could not give vitally valid answer for it. Because H. Ford was more occupied with management of «Ford Motors», and concerned himself with sociological on the whole and historical in particular problems superficially, actually incidentally during his spare time, he did not reveal and did not call these more profound or ancient causes by their proper names. H. Ford could not understand or ground from the historical cause-and-effect point of view the behavior peculiarity of overwhelming majority of representatives of traditional Jewry (Hebrews), and he did not reveal any historical prospects that would be the alternative to their parasitic world domination.

This gave grounds to the Jewish leaders in the USA (in person of Bernard Baruch) to laugh at the newspapermen for a start: “Do you think I shall deny anything?!” — But what is it that Baruch would deny? — He (as any Hebrew (=Jewish) internazi) sincerely agreed with the opinion expressed by the «anti-Semite» H. Ford:

«The international Jew ... rules not because he is rich, but because in a most marked degree he possesses the commercial and masterful genius of his race, and avails himself of a racial loyalty and solidarity the like of which exists in no other human group. In other words, transfer today the world-control of the international Jew to the hands of the highest commercially talented group of Gentiles, and the whole fabric of world-control would eventually

years. And Old Testament was provided with Talmudic comments. This is how historically real biblical culture and its sociology were formed.

Sociological doctrine of biblical project, revealing the essence of the “Jewish question”, is given in the Supplement.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

fall to pieces, because the Gentile lacks a certain quality, be it human or divine, be it natural or acquired, that the Jew possesses» (“The International Jew”, v.1, “IV-The Jewish Question—Fact or Fancy?”).

H. Ford did not engage himself in searching answers to the questions: are certain qualities of Hebrews and non-Hebrews (historically actually expressed in statistics and distinguishing them from each other in their behavior) given genetically and permanently by God? or they are culturally conditioned and could be altered (with God’s help) by the goodwill of the people themselves?

Should H. Ford truly elucidate these problems, B. Baruch, his likes and their backstage masters were past laughter at the newspapermen and the readership, because the matter is not only in personal qualities, which these or those Hebrews have, and which these or those non-Hebrews have not.

The point is that presence or lack of these personal qualities are mainly stipulated by the culture, formed and maintained within the channel of the doctrine of certain global policy. And at the same time, genetic apparatus and culture of the mankind and national societies are interconnected and influence each other¹.

The essence of biblical doctrine is that personal qualities of Hebrews and non-Hebrews are defined in it (see Supplement 1) and are somehow «programmable». Should H. Ford truly elucidate these problems, he would have to:

- either agree to the biblical doctrine and yield to it (they say, the nature of the races is objectively such and it is permanent, thus, it is necessary to yield),
- either develop some alternative for it.

Should he express even briefly the alternative (but necessarily GLOBAL) doctrine, B. Baruch, his likes and the masters of the biblical project right away felt past laughter at the newspapermen and the readership (especially as the circulation of “Dearborn Independent” reached at times half a million copies, spread all over the USA). They would have a problem unsolvable within the channel of the biblical project. Its essence is that it is impossible either to buy opponents, or to

¹ On this issue see IP’s of the USSR work “On Racial Doctrines: Unfounded, but Plausible”.

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

sell themselves to them, or to agree with them about mutually beneficial cooperation in future global policy conduct within the channel of the biblical doctrine¹.

But since H. Ford could not do it, then, having laughed at him, at the newspapermen and at the readership, the leaders and the masters of the international Jewry started using H. Ford's «anti-Semitism» and racism in the global project with conventional title «Moustache Clown»². H. Ford

¹ In this case H. Ford would completely realize the meaning of his surname, having opened the people way to new quality of life: «ford» means «passing» over the water obstacle. In certain mythology symbolizes culture as a whole. In this case, the matter concerns overcoming of biblical culture, which became a «water barrier» on the way to humanity.

But in the narrow practical and industrial-and-organizational shape, which «Fordizm» took, it could be adapted in practically any doctrine of industrial civilization life organization, if there was the will of its conceptual power.

² Once on TV they said that this is how comic actor of the 20th century, Charles Spencer Chaplin called Adolph Schicklgruber-Hitler. Schicklgruber is the Hebrewish surname, originating from the sobriquet «schickl-gruber», that stuck to the Hebrew, collecting the «schickl», internal tax in the Hebrewish community, which was established by the rabbinat.

Hitler is no more than a schicklgruber. His surname is the sign for those who understand the backstage history. «Holocaust» is the religious myth for the crowd as the continuation of the project «Moustached Clown»: it is cynical, but this is the truth of backstage history of the biblical civilization. Somehow involved in the backstage history, C. Chaplin parodied A. Hitler in the movie «Great Dictator». Its full version was restored by the USA on the basis of computer technologies and shown on 17.02.2002 at Berlin film festival.

«According to the initial Chaplin's idea, the final scene of the movie would show the fraternization of the hostile armies, and the soldiers would dance together. But he had to reject this idea due to technical difficulties concerned with the shooting of this scene (what could be difficult in it? — (comment supplied by the authors when citing). Instead, at the end of the film, Charlie Chaplin (who plays two parts in the film — the part of Hebrew hairdresser and the part of dictator Adenoid Heinkel) delivers monologue calling to the peace on the planet (on behalf of who: Hebrewish hairdresser and Hebrewish dictator— the clown who had fooled simple-minded German nationalists and "anti-Semites" (like H. Ford) of the whole world? — (question supplied by the authors when citing). (...)

Chaplin had been working on the film «Great Dictator» for over a year; he had been shooting the film at his own expense. After the film distribution it became one of the most commercial films. In 1940's it broke all the records of

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

got into it by himself because having not revealed and having not understood the beginnings of the «Jewish question», he did not differ objectively different phenomena of Marxism, bolshevism, socialism, communism and medley Zionism in their historically real interweaving. He (just like Hitler and many others hitherto) *identified them into the single phenomenon, supposedly aimlessly and groundlessly named by different words.*

Because of this misunderstanding H. Ford did not perceive A. Hitler as the provocateur, guided by the biblical «world backstage», — *imitator of fight for freedom against Hebrews' parasitism and supported Nazi party in Germany from its origination during 1920-s — 1930-s, erroneously perceiving it as the mouthpiece of German people's free will.*

And H. Ford's services in project «Moustache Clown» were rewarded by the master in person of the Fuhrer of the Third Reich, A. Hitler, in July 1938: in commemoration of his 75th anniversary H. Ford was decorated with the Cross of German Eagle Supreme Order. After this decorating, the Hebrewish and leftist press again started anti-Ford campaign. H. Ford (according to one of his friend's words) reacted this way:

«They (the Germans) awarded me a medal... They (the Jews) insist that I should return it; otherwise I will not be considered an American. It will not do! I will not reject it» (“The International Jew”, the cited Russian edition, Preface, p. 33).

It was about a year before the imitator of fight for freedom against Hebrewish parasitism started the war doomed to be worldwide. But H. Ford was in captivity of his phantom general sociological and general historical notions, although it was he who wrote soon after the World War I of the XX century ended:

handles in the USA and Great Britain» (Advertising-and-Information Agency “Novosti”, 18.01.2002, report about discovery at the cellar of C. Chaplin's house (in Switzerland) an amateur film with the episodes of Chaplin's shooting “Great Dictator”).

The war was under way, people died on the front lines and in the back areas, concentration camps were operating, but attitude of the Hebrewish “elite” (one of the spokesmen of which was Ch.S. Chaplin) was ironical...

The ones who would like to retort and stand up for Ch. Chaplin should know that **derided evil does not cease to be evil and not only does not cease to be dangerous, but becomes still more dangerous, because is perceived ridiculous, but not dangerous and threatening.**

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

«An impartial investigation of the last war, of what preceded it and what has come out of it, would show beyond a doubt that there is in the world a group of man with vast powers of control, that prefers to remain unknown, that does not seek office or any of the tokens of power, that belongs to no nation whatever but is international — a force that uses every government, every widespread business organization, every agency of publicity, every resource of national psychology, to throw the world into a panic for the sake of getting still more power over the world. An old gambling trick used to be for the gambler to cry «Police!» when a lot of money was on the table, and, in panic that followed, to seize the money and run off with it. There is a power within the world which cries «War!» and in the confusion of the nations, the unrestrained sacrifice which people make for safety and peace runs off with the spoils of the panic.

The point to keep in mind is that, through we won the military contest, the world has not yet, quite succeeded in winning a complete victory over the promoter of war. We ought not to forget that wars are a purely manufactured evil and are made according to a definite technique. A campaign for war is made upon us definite lines as a campaign for any other purpose. First, the people are worked upon. By clever tales the people's suspicions are aroused towards the nation against whom war is desired. Make the nation suspicions; make the other nation suspicions. All you need for this is a few agents with some cleverness and no conscience and a press whose interest is locked up with the interests that will be benefited by war. Then the «overt act» will soon appear. It is no trick at all to get an «overt act» once you work the hatred of two nations up to the proper pinch» («My Life and Work», Ch. 17. «Things in General»).

These events show that Bolshevistic trend objectively peculiar to H. Ford in his activities within «Ford Motors» was at his attempt to move it outside his company captured by the outer forces. They perverted it and carried it to an absurdity¹ in everything that exceeded the bounds of his

¹ «When «The International Jew» began to spread widely and started to have certain influence, American Jew Isaac Lindemann from the organization «American Hebrew» demanded Ford to prove the existence of the Jewish plot. Lindemann stated that he was ready to collect necessary funds to recruit the best detectives. In any case, irrespective of the results of investigation, he

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

professional activities as a technician and economist. The main reason of it is in personal H. Ford's objective (but not declared) morality, which stipulated his world understanding. In the culture of modern global civilization one can discover two kinds of world understanding¹.

FIRST WORLD UNDERSTANDING — «the I-centric» one. In this world understanding the mental tree develops in different directions from the personal «I», which undertakes the part of reference system zero point. During the process of mental tree development its separate branches absorb newer and newer information pertaining to various areas of life and activities of the person and the contemporary society and the mankind as a whole. Consciousness level thinking represents the unity of flow of emotions and flow of language structures and figurative ideas (this could be called emotionally-notional structure of the soul). Emotions

intended to publish the results. Henry Ford always sympathized with policemen and detectives, so it seemed to him that he was «tossed up» a brilliant idea. He just had to ensure that investigation was performed by his people, but not by the «Jewish agents»... The automobile king created special headquarters and gathered the team to perform operation designated “Secret World Government”. This team included rather motley people: two officers of the USA Secret Service, several professional detectives, and simply «brave semitologists». “Fearless heroes of the invisible front” followed the famous Jewish figures as shadows and sent ciphered messages to Detroit to their chief. Brave detectives had spent a lot of money trying to find secret telephone line between judge Brandes and the White House. No wonder their efforts were in vain: such line did not exist» (“The International Jew”, the cited Russian edition, Preface, p. 20).

However, the ancient plot did exist, but it worked on the other nearly well-known principles: see Supplement, and other IP's of the USSR works “Dead Water”, “Towards God's ruling...”, “The Sorrowful Legacy of Atlantis” (“Trotskyism is «Yesterday», but not «Tomorrow»”). These principles could be revealed by any person by simple reading of the Bible, Koran, myths of different nations and scientific books on history, memoirs of private persons and public figures ... One should just think about real events that are behind the narration. Authors and compilers of the texts might attract reader's attention to some facts and lead away from the others; they might witness something without understanding the essence of the things described.

¹ On this issue see USSR IP's works “Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences”, “«Master and Margaret»: a Hymn to Demonism? Or the Gospel of the Covenantless Faith”, “Come and Aid Me in My Disbelief... (On Dianetics and Scientology in Essence)”, “The Sorrowful Legacy of Atlantis” (“Trotskyism is «Yesterday», but not «Tomorrow»”).

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

in their turn constitute an outlet to the level of consciousness *in the form of ultimately generalized estimation of a “good” or a “bad” mood of realizably non-sensible morally stipulated results* of activity of unconscious levels of the person’s psyche, which excel several times the level of consciousness in their abilities of information processing¹.

In case of the I-centric algorithms of mentality, the flow of emotions is stipulated by those circumstances, which directly affect the personality. This results in changes of proper perception of «the I». Therefore the success or failure in certain activities depends on the emotional mood of the person with the I-centric world understanding, performing these activities. And many processes are beyond his comprehension because during the time necessary for this comprehension his «zero point» (from which he builds up his mental tree) changes. Every time this zero point changes the mental process is destroyed, not having achieved the result or having achieved a wrong one.²

On the other hand, by having assessed the actual morality of the carrier of the I-centric mentality algorithms and controlling his emotions, he could be driven to certain views and prevented from coming to some other opinions, undesirable to the guardians.

This happened to H. Ford: when he tried to become a social and political leader, he fell under guardianship because he had the I-centric world understanding. We shall not engage in extensive and keen

¹ Normally, in relations between consciousness and unconscious levels of mentality, the unconscious levels of mentality bear the principal task of information handling and behavior elaboration, whereas the conscious level performs setup of the «autopilot» of unconscious levels of mentality for solving certain problems.

² In other words, to hit upon something new and vitally well-founded, it is necessary not only to master some information as a preliminary, but also *to be in the mood, which will let you hit upon something*. Otherwise, the mental process in the desired direction either does not start, or, once started, it wanders away or interrupts. Due to such instability in the process of the I-centric thinking, even in cases when the same problems of the social life are thought over by the millions of people, the vitally well-founded solutions are found only by the dozens, and sometimes, only by a few.

Therefore, it is necessary to learn to be the master of your own mood—emotionally notional structure of the soul.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

“psychoanalysis” trying to prove this fact. Suffice it to say that the I-centrism of H. Ford’s world understanding directly appeared in the title of his book: “My Life and Work”. If his world understanding was not the I-centric, the title of the book would be different, for example, “*My Life and **OUR** (bold type supplied by the authors) Work*”, because, as H. Ford himself says in this book, all the achievements of «Ford Motors» are not his personal achievements, but the achievements of the collective, which appeared and developed under his direction on the principles of people’s friendly relations, i.e. on the principles of Bolshevism. If H. Ford acted differently (as the majority of his contemporary businessmen did), there would not be the «Ford Motors» as it historically formed, and probably no one except his close relatives and friends would know who was Henry Ford.

The I-centric world understanding is characterized by certain kaleidoscopic effect, in the sense that different notions in it are separated, have no connections between each other; the same relates to interrelations of notions and objective phenomena. And it was this kaleidoscopic peculiarity in the I-centric outlook that prevented

H. Ford from noticing the said inadequacy between the title of the book (my achievements) and its contents (work of the collective and its achievements).

The I-centrism in algorithms of mentality and world understanding is peculiar to the children during the process of their personal becoming. But as the person grows up, he pays attention to the interrelations between notions in his mentality and between phenomena in life that seemed to him separated before. He starts looking for and developing an alternative to I-centrism (though he can do it without realizing this and knowing neither the name of phenomenon, which we called I-centrism, nor the name of its alternative). The search of the alternative results in the second world understanding.

SECOND WORLD UNDERSTANDING — God-centric world understanding. In this world understanding the mental tree develops in sequence:

God ⇔ Creature Universe ⇔ object of a person’s attention *in interrelation of this object with all the rest of objects and subjects revealed by him during his lifetime.*

5. Results of «Fordizm» as the American Attempt of Bolshevism

In this world understanding, there is a «tuning fork» providing conformity of emotional and notional structures of a human soul. Of life as such:

God the Almighty makes no mistakes. Everything done is done the best possible way. But regarding the society, this is true with a reservation: *under such dispositions and ethics, which are peculiar to the people*¹.

Realization of this fact must be accompanied by joy — positive emotions and optimistic calmness. In such emotionally notional structure the algorithms of mentality works the best way during solving the problems that Life brings and eliminating the ones that it made in the past.

In God-centric world understanding, the kaleidoscopic effect is continually eliminated; the world is represented as still more detailed mosaic. Its «zero point» is basically *objectively permanent*, which is the steadfast basis for elimination of all the mistakes of world understanding and individual development of a person.

However, due to the culture of modern civilization, the I-centrism of mentality (to a greater or lesser extent) is reserved by the majority of the adults. Yet those who somehow converted to God-centric world understanding, sometimes fall down to the I-centrism under the influence of some mistakes of the formed morality, which are peculiar to them. But intellectual might of any individual in solving all the problems he is involved in, is always realized within the channel of certain world understanding: either the I-centric or God-centric.

¹ In other words, if you do not like things going on and the way they are going on, you should re-interpret your morals and ethics and help people around you to do the same. «God does not change the things happening to people, until the people themselves change their thoughts» (Koran, 13:12).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Having preserved the I-centrism of psyche algorithms, H. Ford turned out to be groundless as sociologist and practical public figure (he did not realize as «ford» — the wade across an obstacle), although in one of the branches of his I-centric world understanding he managed to express organizational and economical principles of Bolshevism and socialism.

6. Essence and Results of Stalin's Bolshevism

6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch

Historians and sociologists (perhaps, with rare exceptions) agree that the revolutions of 1917 in Russia were followed by the attempt of building up a new society on the principles incompatible with the principles of organization and functioning of capitalism.

This perhaps is the only thing that historians and sociologists agree upon, because depending on the personal bias towards one or another way of social life organization they understand flow of events in pre-revolutionary period (the end of 19th — the beginning of 20th century) differently. They also understand differently the flow of events in the period of history of RSFSR — USSR after the revolution and Civil War, when the party and the state were headed by J. Stalin. And correspondingly, they assess the results of this period differently. Therefore they see different prospects and possibilities for both Russia and the mankind on the whole.

However, in spite of all mutually exclusive conclusions made by historians and sociologists (both in the past and at present) studying problems of that period of world history and of modern sociology, they all (perhaps with rare exclusions) have one thing in common:

For them, use of such terms as «communism» or «socialism», «communism», «Marxism», «Bolshevism» and their derivatives is stipulated mainly by their feeling of «pen craft», feeling of «euphony» of the text or oral speech, but not by the peculiarities of the meaning of each of these words, which, in its turn, is stipulated by the peculiarities of actual phenomena of social life, named by these words.

But using these words as the interchangeable synonyms (just like L. Bronstein (L. Trotsky), G. Zyuganov, E. Gaidar, I. Khakamada, G. Yavlinsky and the majority of politologists do) it is practically impossible to understand the history of Russia of the end of 19th — the beginning of 20th century. Things do not get better if we add to this

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

nonsense one more group of synonyms built up on the basis of words «Zionism», «Judaism», «Jewry» (mostly meaning Hebrews indeed) etc¹, used by S. Nilus², A. Hitler, H. Ford and many others, including today's «skinheads», biblically «Orthodox» «Russians» and other «patriots» and nationalists of all countries.

Yes, analytical assessments and political manipulations, resulting from such sort of thoughtless indifference to life and to the unique meaning of each word of the living languages of every folk, under some circumstances are capable to emotionally wind up the crowd, urging it to heroic construction or demolition of communism. But still all of them represent harmful senseless noise whatever pathos they bring about as a result of mendacity of pathos.

Therefore before we turn to the epoch of Stalin's Bolshevism itself, let us define the terminology, which characterize the life of Soviet society and the rest of global civilization during that epoch.

* * *

National Self-Perception — perception of originality (uniqueness) of one's nation (first of all, as the bearer of culture) and differences between one's own culture and cultures of other nations, which also have originality and magnitude in the mankind history common to all nations.

Nationalism — perception of unique originality of one's nation and its culture combined with denial (generally, thoughtless one) of uniqueness and magnitude of other cultures and nations (which bear these cultures in generation succession) for the mankind and its future.

Nazism — attempts to destroy other nations and/or cultures created by them.

Such interpretation of nationalism and Nazism means that they can exist in the society under monarchy or under republic (state systems), or under slave-owning system, or feudalism, or capitalism, or socialism (economic structures). Nationalism and Nazism can

¹ Since in this issue we can refer to the statements of the rabbis and other Jewish authorities, some of who during the first post-revolution years stated that Judaism, communism and Zionism are generally the same.

² One of the first publishers of notorious "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" in Russia. He died in the USSR on 14.01.1929 at the age of 68 at large, in 1924 and 1927 underwent short-term imprisonments, but survived.

6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch

embrace either individual groups of population, or spread over the whole society.

Internazism — basically, the same as Nazism, but in mob-like execution of heterogeneous international diasporas (first of all, the Hebrewish Diaspora), but not in execution of some nation fallen into Nazism and state system supported by such nation.

Socialism *as economic structure* of social life assumes that many needs of any person and any family are guaranteed to be satisfied at the expense of direct and indirect reimbursement of corresponding costs by the state, which acts in the capacity of the representative of the whole society and the guarantor of person's rights and freedoms in this society.

In more general meaning, **socialism** includes many non-economical peculiarities of life of the society on the whole and of the people within it. These, first of all, are morality and structure of mentality, world understanding and ethics stipulated by this morality and appearing in socialist economic structure; for them, it is the most convenient and safe for the life of the society and any person.

Orientation of production-and-consumption system toward guaranteed satisfaction of people's needs primordially predetermines planned nature of socialist economy. Planned nature in the system of social production is accompanied by restrictions in some activities of private entrepreneurship on the basis of private property on means of production; some activities could be prohibited¹. Under socialism, restrictions on maximum income level for the members of society are introduced *inevitably*. This measure is necessary to protect the social order and each citizen who is loyal to it from misuse from the part of non-loyal private employers and other persons whose high income is excessive with respect to *state-declared* level of expenses, motivated by vital needs of a person and family of this society.

¹ Suppression of prostitution, gaming (gambling industry), production and distribution of drugs (let us remind you that tobacco and alcohol are also drugs) are socially useful even in case when they can exist in the society illegally for some period of time: the vice should not be protected or supported by existing legislation.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Such restrictions in the course of time result in domination of state sector of economy, although its means of production could still be not in public, but in private corporative property. Due to private-corporative nature of property on means of production in the society that has not matured to the socialism morally and ethically (in the wider sense than just an economic structure), many restrictions of public-and-socialist economy express interests of public oligarchy and turn out to be socially non-righteous and no less harmful for the social development than capitalism based on element of private entrepreneurship — either individual, or oligarchic-and-corporative.

Communism — order of social life, in which parasitism of the minority on the majority will disappear, all the demands will be satisfied securely and free of charge on principle “each gives what he is able to, each gets what he needs” on the basis of righteousness’ rule in the society, by steadily reproduced culture in succession of generations. This will be possible because of general growth of production facilities in all branches as well as because of transformation of culture: new generations will have different mentality and morality. They will not be depressed by the necessity of labor, mastering of professional skills and knowledge, participation in labor activity of the society *due to liberation of each person’s creative potential in transformed culture*; now, this potential (speaking of the majority of adults) is enslaved by awkward and unjust upbringing. In the communist society, labor will not become the very first vital need, as stated the Marxian propaganda meaning that labor is always subordinate to the task of satisfaction people’s needs in food, clothes and other products and services. The very first need will be personal and social development and activities within the channel of God’s Providence, and necessary labor in this process will take its harmonious place.

Capitalism in its initial form is, first of all, the economic structure of social life with supremacy of bourgeois-individualistic (perhaps, corporative¹) mode of production organization and distribution on the

¹ Corporation is the association of individuals for achievement of their personal goals by means of collective efforts. A single person alone could not achieve these goals; therefore they become common for these individuals for a certain period of time (within individuals’ lifetime). Although corporations may exist during the lifetime of many generations, any corporation would fall

6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch

basis of the right on private property and formal equal protection of the law for all citizens. Solving of vital personal and family problems is mainly placed on the person itself, on the family and on various *non-governmental* funds and public organizations. As any other economical-and-social structure, capitalism is stipulated by the morality that prevails in the society, and expresses the I-centric world understanding.

Even progressive taxation under capitalism sets practically no limits for income and accumulation, which remain after payment of taxes provided by legislation, and public sector of economy plays auxiliary part with respect to the sector operating on the basis of private property on means of production. As a result, the state owns unrewarding and unprofitable *under developed law of value* branches and industries; however, the society cannot do without them.

National-Socialism — socialism in the sense of economic structure and legal status for certain (one or several) nations *by name*, but representatives of other nations and person of mixed parentage (members of the same multinational society) are not covered by guarantees and norms of national-socialism provided for the citizens of national-socialist state¹.

International-Socialism is not an alternative for the national-socialism, as Marxists-internazis claim, but «priority socialism» for mob-organized international diasporas in multi-national and externally (formally) socialist-organized state with equal personal rights. In other words, international-socialism is a kind of internazism.

An alternative for both national-socialism and international-socialism is the «**multinational-socialism**». It actually provides freedom of personal development and equality of rights of citizens of different ethnic origin *in absence of mob-organized «priority socialism and communism» for international diasporas and «national minorities»*, where multinational society, *having sunk into international-socialism*, finds itself oppressed

apart if, at some moment, its critical (with respect to its stability) mass does not get from the corporation the things it is craving for «right now».

¹ For this reason, «National-Bolsheviks», headed by E. Limonov, could not be regarded as Bolsheviks in today's Russia.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

by mob-organized international diasporas of the minorities which parasitize on it. One of these diasporas act as a leader¹.

Marxism is the dogma of provocative-and-imitating nature, proclaiming inevitability of global-scale transition of mankind from «exploitation of a human by human» to the «kingdom of freedom», firstly, to socialism, and then, to communism.

The ideals of justice in socialist and communist society (as they are expressed in Marxism or expressed somehow differently) are attractive for the majority of people living by their own labor and oppressed by parasitism of ruling minority. Therefore, under certain historical conditions the crowd is responsive to the slogans, which it thinks are expressing its expectations of better life without any parasitism and oppression of the majority by the minority.

However the history shows that by no means all slogans are made a reality by those who throw them into the crowd, or by those who respond to the calls and sincerely works at making the slogans a reality. This happens not always because the ideals proclaimed by the slogans are objectively unrealizable, or the leaders are double-faced and hypocritical. This happens mostly because the leaders and the crowd in realization of proclaimed ideals are provocatively offered certainly unsuitable means by the backstage political script-writers, pursuing their own goals, and the

¹ Which this diaspora is, the followers, the participants and the opponents of the «zid-masonic» plot know equally well. For those who doubt its existence we shall cite an extract from the article «Masonry» of «The Big Soviet Encyclopedical Dictionary» (1986):

«Masons tried to create secret world-wide organization with the utopian purpose of peaceful unification of the mankind in the religious fraternal alliance. It played the largest part in 18th — in the beginning of 19th centuries. Both reactionary and progressive social movements were connected with masonry» (p. 770).

To what extent the purpose of zid-masonic plot was «utopian», i.e. objectively unrealizable, and how successful the Masonry was in 19th — 20th centuries, are separate questions. The authors of «The Big Soviet Encyclopedical Dictionary» did not find room in their dictionary for the answers to these questions, and those who are sure that zid-masonic plot did not exist may think about these answers by themselves, by observing present-day life and studying treatises of official historical science and chronicles and memoirs that did not pass the academic censorship.

6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch

leaders and the crowd can not reveal the unsuitability of those means in due time. This also relates to Marxism.

Imitation-and-provocative essence of Marxism is expressed in two facts. **Firstly**, in Marxist philosophy, the question of solving the problem of predictability of the multiversion future, which lies in the basis of any power and any government is replaced by the “fundamental” question of what is primary, either matter or consciousness. **Secondly**, Marxist political economy is metrologically inconsistent: in economical activity, it is impossible to bind it with accounting either on micro-level, or on macro-level of economics. Owing to these two *peculiarities of Marxism of fundamental nature* the crowd, which believes in Marxism, finds itself a hostage of the masters of Marxism, who possess certain «know-how» of exercising their ideological and economical power.

Trotskyism is not in the least one of the modifications of Marxism. The characteristic feature of Trotskyism in the communist movement, which occurred in the XX century «under the cotton wool» of Marxism, was complete deafness of Trotskyists to the essence of criticisms addressed to them¹. Besides that, they tended to suppress in life declarations made by Trotskyists, had a system of preteritions, on the grounds of which they were actually acting, having united in the collective unconscious.

This means that Trotskyism is a psychic phenomenon. The conflict between individual psyche and both individual and *collective (created by all Trotskyists in aggregate)* unconscious is peculiar to Trotskyism in sincere *expression of loyalty* by its followers. And in this conflict, the collective unconscious of the Trotskyists darkly triumphs, oppressing personally realized loyalty of each of them by the aggregate of the deeds of them all.

This is the peculiarity of mentality of those who managed to become a Trotskyist, but not the peculiarity of one or another specific ideology. Psychological type of a «Trotskyist» could be accompanied by various ideologies. And for this reason (of purely psychic nature) *equitable* relations with Trotskyism and Trotskyists personally on a level of

¹ That is, the Trotskyists behaved as though they were not subjected to substantial criticism, but people around them simply misunderstood the precision of their opinions, which expressed the absolute truth.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

intellectual discussion, arguments and counterarguments are fruitless and dangerous¹ for those who consider Trotskyism as one of the ideologies² and do not see its real UNDER-ideological hidden motive, independent of the enveloping ideology, which psycho-Trotskyist may change frankly many times throughout his lifetime³.

Intellect, which one turns to during the dispute trying to reason his interlocutor, or to reveal together with him the truth, which would help to overcome the former problems in communication with him, is just one component of the psyche as a whole. But psyche as a whole (in case it is Trotskyist-type) does not allow the psycho-Trotskyist to process the information intellectually, if this information can change the doctrine which is presently being the subject of the ideologically-formed branch of Trotskyism (one of the many), which psychologically the individual Trotskyism belongs to.

¹ As was shown by the experience of the Russian intelligentsia, which sincerely tried to dispute with the Trotskyist state power and became the victim of People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs in 1920's, as well as the experience of many victims of perestroika in USSR and democratization in the countries, that become its wreckage.

² This attitude to Trotskyism as the perverted ideology of scientific communism and identification of Marxism-Leninism with the science was the actual mistake of Bolshevism in USSR in 1917 — 1953.

Looking from the other side, the masters of psychical Trotskyism do not accept discussion and eradication of its psychic basis; therefore they try to present ideologically many-sided psychical Trotskyism as some ideology. They form attitude (either good or bad) of society to this ideology depending on their goals and the circumstances developed.

If some psychical-Trotskyists or their multitude die, this is either represented to the society as death for the high idea (when the «positive» assessment is given, as was in case of Templars, Trotsky and his associates), or is intentionally pronounced and exaggerated as maniacal, demoniac and obsessed (when the «negative» assessment is given, as was in case of Hitlerism). And this bubble covers actual ideas, which these maniacs were programmed to fulfill and which differ substantially from the ones they proclaimed.

³ The example is the «architect of perestroika» former member of the Central Committee of CPSU psychical-Trotskyist A.N. Yakovlev: from Marxism to Buddhism.

6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch

This psychical peculiarity¹ of many individuals is historically more ancient phenomenon than historically real Marxian Trotskyism in the communist movement of 20th century. In the past, they could not find any other word beside the term «obsession». And in the epoch of materialistic worldview dominance, they could not find such a word to name this phenomenon so that it corresponded to this type of mental degeneration. This phenomenon was named anew, but not in accordance with its essence, but after the pseudonym of one of its most striking representatives of Trotskyism in the communist movement of 20th century.

In its essence, Trotskyism is a schizophrenic, aggressive **politically active** psyche, which could cover itself with any ideology and any sociological doctrine.

That is why Marxism is basically the expression of psychical Trotskyism. K. Marx and F. Engels were psycho-Trotskyists. Hitler was a psycho-Trotskyist too: on identity in relations of Hitlerism and Trotskyist-version Marxism to many phenomena of social life see the USSR IP's work "Look Back in Anger..." At the USSR's decline, the psycho-Trotskyists of anti-communist trend were dissidents. And now, the psycho-Trotskyists are the majority of the activists of pro-bourgeois reforms in Russia and their opponents from the ranks of various patriotic parties and all *supposedly communist parties, unable to abandon Marxism*.

Bolshevism, as the history of the CPSU teaches us, appeared in 1903 at II congress of Russian Social Democratic Labor Party as one of the party fractions. As its opponents claimed, Bolsheviks never represented real majority² of the Marxian party until 1917, therefore Bolsheviks' opponents always protested against their self-denomination. But such

¹ Complete deafness to the substance of the criticisms directed against him combined with adherence to the principle of suppression of Trotskyists' pronounced declarations, system of dissembling, on the basis of which they are actually acting, having united in the collective unconscious.

² Russian word for «majority» is «bolshinstvo», there for «Bolshevism». «Menshevism» is the same-construction antonym for «Bolshevism», since «menshinstvo» is a Russian word for «minority».

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

opinion was caused by heterogeneous Mensheviks' misunderstanding of the essence of Bolshevism.

Bolshevism is neither a Russian modification of Marxism, nor a party membership. And the most senseless is the word combination «Jewish Bolshevism», used by Hitler in “Mein Kampf”, because Bolshevism is the phenomenon of spirit of the Russian civilization, but not of the spirit of the bearers of doctrine of biblical global slavery on the racial basis.

Bolshevism existed before Marxism; it somehow exists now. And it will exist henceforth.

As the Bolsheviks members of the Marxian party of Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Bolsheviks) claimed, it was them who expressed in politics strategic interests of the working majority of population of the multinational Russia, therefore only them could be called Bolsheviks. How faultless were Bolsheviks expressing the strategic interests of the working majority and to what extent this majority itself realizes its interests and is faithful to these interests in real life does not change the next. **The essence of Bolshevism** is not in numerical superiority of the followers of some ideas over the followers of other ideas and the thoughtless crowd, but in the following:

in sincere attempt to express and to make a reality of long-term strategic interests of the working majority, wishing that nobody parasitized on its labor and life. In other words, historically real essence of Bolshevism in each epoch is in support of transition process from historically formed crowd-“elitism” to the multinational humanity of the Earth of the future era.

Menshevism is, correspondingly, the opposite of Bolshevism, because it objectively expresses tendency of parasitism of all considering themselves “elite” on labor and life of the common people, the majority. Marxism is also Menshevism, and not only psychic Trotskyism; and psychic Trotskyism is always Menshevism.

Fascism is a kind of *culture of social government*, which is possible exclusively in crowd-“elitist” society. Fascism is one of the kinds of psychic Trotskyism.

The essence of fascism as such (irrespective of how it is named or which ideas it covers itself with and by which means it performs its power in the society) is in active support by the crowd of «small

6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch

people» — *under influence of their own ideological conviction* — the system of abuse of power by “elitist” oligarchy¹, which:

- represents unrighteousness as true «righteousness», and, on this basis, having perverted people’s world understanding, by all its subject might cultivates unrighteousness in the society, preventing people from becoming human;
- suppresses (under various pretences and by all its subject might) one and all, who doubts its righteousness and the righteousness of its policy, as well as those whom it suspects in this.

Crowd, by V.G. Belinsky’s definition, is the “gathering of people who live by the legends and reason by authority” (by A.S. Pushkin’s definition, «reasonless people»²), i.e. crowd is the multitude of individuals who live unscrupulously and, essentially, thoughtlessly, either automatically or under control from the outside. And no matter whether the ruling oligarchy acts publicly and ceremonially, exalting itself over society; or it exalts by reticence or in non-aware pride, publicly expressing humility and service to the crowd, naming it «people»; or it acts secretly, assuring the society of its supposed non-existence and, due to non-existence, in its inactivity, which results in supposedly spontaneous way of life of the society, and social life is not ruled by the scripts of conceptually masterful curators of oligarchy³.

¹ Present-day Russia is not a fascist state just because new oligarchy (that has appeared as the result of reforms in Russia) has no active public support. Although there are some groups and public movements that dream of its coming to power and establishing of fascist regime stable in its succession in generations. Among these fascist-dreamers are the leaders of “The Union of the Right Forces”: specifically, I.M. Khakamada, who accused of fascism Communist Party of Russian Federation and, personally, provocateur-imitator of fight for communism G.A. Zyuganov, and who made herself out to be a steadfast anti-fascist on November 9, 2001 in TV program “Freedom of Speech” (on NTV channel). This program discussed the question «Should one be afraid of communists’ coming to power?» and was presented by another fascist-dreamer, Savik Schuster.

² «The reasonless people have got used to drag after the novelties...» — poem “Hero” by A.S. Pushkin.

³ In propaganda of the doctrine of «its non-existence», the success was held by the chiefs of biblical project of total enslavement — the curators of the «zid-masonic» plot.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

This definition-description of fascism does not include frightening and striking features of its activities: symbolism; ideology, calling to violence and destruction of those whom fascist masters determined as incorrigible social evil; appeals to create political party with strict discipline and system of terror, fighting detachments, etc.

Since 1945, a lot was said about misanthropic nature of fascism on the grounds of the lesson that German fascism taught everybody. Due to the horrors of German fascism of 1933 — 1945 (which become negative-and-cultist), one might find the given definition superficial, estranged from the real life (abstract), and therefore irrelevant to the task of protection of the future from the threat of fascism.

But in fact, this definition is *the definition of fascism by nature*, and not by the place of its origination or peculiarities of its development and manifestation in the life of society, which distinguishes it qualitatively from the majority of the «definitions» of «fascism» given in different thesauruses and encyclopedias.

* *
*

Given definitions is not just an exercise in casuistry. The matter is that different phenomena of social life should be defined in such manner that their differences and interconnections were clear, and thus they should have different names. These definitions, which distinguish different phenomena of social life, allow us to have a different look at the events that took place in the USSR during Stalin's epoch, where:

- according to public opinion, new social structure, different from all historically known by that time, was built and named «socialist» directing its efforts towards communist prospective;
- Marxism was the theoretical basis of its development; moreover, it was its cult basis.

The first condition as such does not cause any disputes. The attempt of new society development is admitted by everyone, although the ideals, which sincere followers of socialism tried to make a reality during 1917 — 1953 are evaluated differently by different people. Some people say, it is an unrealizable chimera, adverse to the human nature, and therefore the attempt to carry it out is the evil and brings nothing but violence and suffering; in short, it is the slave barrack, a kind of fascism, a mistake of history. Other people say, it is objectively possible best future of the

6.1. Distinct Terminology is the Key to Understanding the Epoch

whole mankind, which, to be realized, requires subjective factors — development of culture and purposeful work, where mistakes or misuses could occur, sometimes with very grave consequences for both contemporaries and offspring.

Those who support the idea that USSR was created in 1917 as the result of the mistake of the history, and the whole its history was a mistake, would not be interested in discussion of circumstances connected with the Marxism as such and its interpretation by Stalin in his many-sided activities.

Instead, those who think that history did not make a mistake in 1917, having started open practice of building socialism and communism in the USSR and all over the world¹, are arguing about who was the true Marxist and communist in the USSR: J.V. Stalin and his associates? or L.D. Bronstein (better known under the nickname «Trotsky») and his associates? Relating to the present time, this dispute among the followers of Marxism results in the following question: to recommence building of communism means to continue work of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Trotsky? or to continue work of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin?

The answer to this question is many-sided and consists in the fact that:

- L.D. Bronstein was a true Marxist, and due to managerial inconsistency of philosophy and political economy of Marxism he was a pseudo-communist and died as a hostage of falsity of Marxism that he did not realize;
- V.I. Lenin (Ulyanov) was a true communist as much as he had capabilities not to be a psycho-Trotskyist, true to the canons of Marxism in steadfast readiness to press the stream of life in accordance with them;
- J.V. Stalin was a true Bolshevik and communist, therefore, he was not a Marxist;
- J.V. Stalin was not the successor of Marx — Engels — Lenin's tack, but the successor of Bolshevistic tack of Stephan Razin — Lenin (in such its constituent, when V.I. Lenin stepped over Marxism), since

¹ God the Almighty makes no mistakes. Everything done is done the best possible way under such dispositions and ethics, which are peculiar to the people.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

V.I. Lenin under the cover of Marxism was building Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Bolsheviks) as an instrument for realization of political will of Bolshevism, which in principle could become conceptually autocratic (what actually happened when J.V. Stalin had headed the *ruling* party and State system of the USSR), and afterwards to exceed the bounds of Marxism.

The first one to sense it was L.D. Bronstein (Trotsky). In his work “Our Political Tasks” (written as early as in 1904) he assessed V.I. Lenin’s attitude to Marxism as follows:

«Indeed, it is impossible to treat the best legacy of proletariat more cynically than Lenin does! To him, Marxism is not the method of scientific research, inflicting serious theoretical obligations; it is... a mop, when he needs to wipe out his tracks, a white screen, when he needs to display his grandeur, folding rule, when he needs to produce his party conscience!» (L.D. Trotsky, “On the History of Russian Revolution”, collected works of L.D. Bronstein edited by N.A. Vasetsky, Moscow, “Politizdat”, 1990, p. 77).

And that is not the whole story. From V.I.Lenin’s pen came some equivocal statements, fraught with failure of Marxism by its nature. Here is one of them:

«We do not take Marx’s theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are sure that it only placed the corner stones of the science, which the socialists should advance further in all directions unless they want to be behind the times» (V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, 5th edition, vol. 4, p. 184).

But if it turns out that the «corner stone» is unsuitable for the intended course, another «corner stone» will be found inevitably, this is just a matter of time. And this happened during the development of Bolshevism. However, neither L.D. Bronstein, nor his associates or successors and continuators of his work could find any means to suppress development of Bolshevism in the society.

6.2. On Hidden Motive of Revolutions of 1917

But to see this, it is necessary to understand how the interests of various heterogeneous inner and outer political forces collided in Russia in revolutions of 1917. These forces were characterized by different degrees of orderliness and understanding of the current events, understanding of probability of realization of their interests (moreover, not all of them were aware of these), and, above all, which were characterized by interpenetration.

Let us start with the interior of the empire. Life of the major part of the population in Russia left much to be desired notwithstanding how it is idealized nowadays by the «patriots» of biblical-«Orthodox Church» monarchic persuasion. On the eve of the revolution of 1905, the life of Russia was characterized by the following factors: lack of land among the peasants of the European part of the country and decline of the soil fertility due to low culture of aeromechanics; stratification of rural population into kulaks and field-hands, caused not by exceptional diligence of ones and laziness of the others, but by economical and moral-and-psychological legacy of serfdom and by free market self-regulation in the epoch after the serfdom cancellation; 12 — 14-hour working day in industry without social security in old age, without the system of operational safety, health insurance and occupational accident insurance; under conditions of Mason-filled bureaucracy's sabotage and misinterpretation of governmental measures of relaxation interclass tension and resolution of interclass contradictions¹; the majority of population was unable to provide education for their children, and, sometimes, the adults did not understand the necessity of education; infringement of the *God-given rights* of the majority of population of the country due to the legislation peculiar to estate-and-caste structure, and economical circumstances that accompanied it; as consequence of low educational standard of the majority of population, technical-and-technological dependence of Russia on other countries and foreign private and mob-and-corporative capital.

¹ On this issue see the publications: A. Spiridovich, "Gendarme's Notes" (Moscow, "Hudozhestvennaya literatura", 1991, reprint of edition 1930, Moscow, "Proletariy") and S. Yu. Vitte, "Memories" (Moscow, 1960) and Internal Predictor's of the USSR comments to them in work "Decapsulation".

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

In other words, the potential for riot in Russia was created by centuries-old policy of the ruling class — Russian nobility, which was the personnel basis for formation of state administrative machine and command staff of army and navy. Besides that, previously created potential of riot was developed by long-term activity of various «*new Russians*» of those days, «*nouveau riches*», *upper bourgeoisie of Russia, which grew rich without God*, who grew by leaps and bounds in the epoch after serfdom cancellation, when there appeared the market of cheap manpower because the poor from the village started out for the town in search of a job.

The «world backstage», performing the biblical project of the total enslavement, differs from the overwhelming majority of those malcontent with it: it is quite a good estimator of the God's connivance in respect of its opponents. And in overwhelming majority of cases known in the History, its opponents could not oppose it anything besides their arrogant complacency, ignorance, and unwillingness to think independently instead of «reasoning by authority» of some writ or chieftain. Therefore they could not solve the imminent problems (which could happen in any society) beforehand in accordance with their own political scenarios; this cleared the way for resolution or aggravation of these problems according to the scenarios introduced in collective psyche of the society by the «world backstage».

In contrast to the national ruling “elites”, which lived under these problems comfortably and in social-and-political activities limited themselves to parlor conversations and exposure of vices in their works of art, the «world backstage» was active. Performing the biblical project of total enslavement, it always interpreted national “elites” with autocratic arrogance as the competitors in exploitation of the resources of the planet and demotic population of these countries. Therefore it purposefully nurtured in Russia potential for future distemper by hands of the Russian ruling classes.

Besides that, the «world backstage» by the middle of 19th century was discontented with the social processes in the «advanced» Western countries. There bourgeois-democratic revolutions already had initiated development of capitalism on the basis of freedom of private entrepreneurship, market self-regulation. Which had resulted in consumption race, useless squandering of social and nature resources. And also had resulted in utmost degree of society polarization into super-

6.2. On Hidden Motive of Revolutions of 1917

rich minority and destitute; economically-dependent majority, which was essentially deprived of civil rights in spite of all legal declarations of bourgeois revolutions about freedom and equal protection of the law. Consequently, the potential of riot and future global biosphere-and-ecological crisis was also growing up spontaneously in the «advanced» countries.

In addition to these inner problems of the «advanced» countries, there was the global problem of colonialism, because national self-consciousness was growing in the colonies, and early national liberation riots and wars shown that the problem of global power establishment and maintenance should not be generally solved by military methods, and military methods should be of subordinate nature.

According to these circumstances, **the «world backstage» while organizing the revolution in Russia tried to solve two tasks:**

- **regional** — to eliminate the local ruling “elite” and, along with it, the multinational “elitist” *state* autocracy¹ of Russia with the purpose of

¹ Autocracy is, at the minimum, independence of the society in development of its policy and ideology within the channel of certain conception, at the maximum, conceptual imperiousness of the society and its statehood.

Owing to prevalence of the Biblical cult, the Russian empire was autocratic at the minimum. Though it was not conceptually imperious, but, because the Russian church was and did not submit to Rome as the "Universal" church, and propagandized not individualism but collectivism in contrast to miscellaneous protestantisms, autocratic Russia carried a threat to the «world backstage». It was the threat to obtain the global conceptual imperiousness and autocracy at the maximum. The «world backstage» and its provinces could feel this threat, but to what extent - the issue remains open.

In the following epoch, they understood it this way: *«The turn occurred closer to the late 1870-s. (...) At two utmost “points” — North America and Japan — bourgeois system became firmly established. The world was getting more compact and more unyielding to unification at the same time»*, a Soviet historian Mikhail Yakovlevich Gefter cautiously said about this issue (late now: he died in 1996) in his article “Russia and Marx” in the magazine “Communist”, № 18, 1988.

M. Ya. Gefter put the *utmost “points”* in quotation marks: it is obvious that he did not mean geographical *utmost points*, because in such case he would do without quotation marks. But if he presupposed differences in culture and peculiarities of the establishing bourgeois system, the quotation marks are quite relevant: these are really *utmost “points”* of the «common bushel», which measures the “bourgeoisness” of the society. In these utmost “points”,

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

integration of its common people as the labor force into the Western regional civilization;

- **global** — development of *infinitely dependent*, i.e. conceptually powerless social-and-economic formation, which would be free of defects of western-type capitalism which had historically developed by that time (which H. Ford and many others wrote about).

Because the internal revolutions of the XIX century under the slogans of socialism were not a success in the «advanced» European countries, and global problems continued to accrue, the global scenario had been changed. In new global scenario, Russia was to serve as the starting point for global transformations and the exporter of the revolution. Russia would convert all the mother countries of Western regional civilization, their colonies and «retarded» countries, which retained state independence to the norms of life of artificially created formation alternative to the historically developed western-type capitalism. In those years this project was called «world socialist revolution». And in the course of its fulfillment, revolutions in Russia and Germany¹ were to initiate creation of military-and-economic and cultural-and-ideological «base» for further expansion of the new regime to the other regions of the world.

To solve these interrelated problems, the «world backstage» needed cardinal, or, at least, revolutionary reconstruction of relation between the power and the property rights in Russia in its favor. Therefore, it was necessary to change the political course of Russia so that its state autocracy would come to political and economical failure. This was accomplished by hands of arrogant ruling “elite” which plunged Russia

bourgeois system was developing in qualitatively different manners: in the USA, under total control of *inter*-national Jewish usurious capital; in Japan, under *complete control* of heterogeneous national capital.

Autocratic Russia of the end of XIX — beginning of XX century, just like Japan, did not want to get under control of *inter*-national Jewish usurious capital, and this was the sign of its intractability. But, unlike Japan, the control over the economy and politics from the part of multinational *capital*, which was *loyal* to the empire, was not complete.

¹ On November 9, 1918 Kaiser abdicated the crown; and on that very day Karl Liebknecht proclaimed Germany a socialist republic. But, owing to weak political will of social-democrats, in January 1919 in Germany bourgeois liberalism prevailed, and ultimately, it surrendered the power to Hitler’s psychical-Trotskyite Nazism.

6.2. On Hidden Motive of Revolutions of 1917

into Russian-Japanese¹, and, ten years later, into World War I of the 20th century without having prepared the country for the victory in both wars.

By that time, Marxism and other corresponding scenarios of seizure and retention of power by the periphery of the «world backstage» had already been introduced in Russia. And in the form of the theory of permanent revolution (which presupposed during the revolution and performance of transformations armed seizure of state power and merciless suppression of opponents of the new regime), started by A.L. Gelfand² (Parvus) and developed by L.D. Bronstein (Trotsky), political scenarios of the «world backstage» assumed the most complete appearance. In the theory of permanent revolution, everything was already scheduled as early as in 1905: from repressions towards the ruling classes (who were assessed as the incorrigible enemies of revolution) to transfer of the revolution to the village and forced establishment of socialist production relations in the village. Also, the export of revolution to other countries (where internal revolutionary forces were too weak to perform revolution and social-and-economic transformations by themselves) was motivated³.

So the revolution, which happened in 1917, and was called the Great October Socialist revolution, occurred due to ideological fertility of Russian “elite” and feverish activity of the «world backstage» periphery in the country. However, Russia differed from the advanced capitalist countries of that epoch: in Russia, there was Bolshevism (as this notion was defined in Part 6.1).

¹ The war was *Japanese-Russian*, but not Russian-Japanese, as it is called by prevailing tradition of historical science, because it has started when Japanese destroyers assaulted the Russian squadron in Port Arthur. In addition, as some sources report, after the cruise from the Japanese naval bases to the area of future military operations, Japanese destroyers entered the near naval base of Great Britain, and from there they made night raid on the Russian squadron in Port-Arthur.

² Aleksandr Lazarevich Gelfand (1869 — 1924) — a swindler of the end of 19th — beginning of 20th centuries: he started as a Marxist-revolutionary; after the revolution of 1905 — 1907 he left revolutionary activity for stock gambling; in 1917, he participated in organizing transit of revolutionary-emigrants (including V.I. Lenin) from Switzerland to neutral Sweden (via Germany), and further to Russia.

³ Particularly, see above-mentioned collected works by L.D. Bronstein edited by N.A. Vasetsky (Moscow, «Politizdat», 1990).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Bolshevism is the social moral-and-psychological phenomenon, tracing its roots back to pre-bylina¹ antiquity of regional civilization of Russia. So-called «Serpent's Mounds» (earth-and-wood fortifications that stretch for thousands kilometers across the Ukrainian steppes southward of Kiev, and date back to the first millennium B.C.) are the evidence of pre-bylina antiquity of Bolshevism: first, their construction was not possible under conditions of tribal fragmentation and predominance of petty psychology of individualism and clannishness; second, true history of their creation is forgotten, and bylinas gave the fabulous version².

The spirit of Bolshevism, even if not realized by the individuals who support it with their efforts and actions, is the most powerful force in history of modern global civilization, although not everyone sees its direct manifestations and actions. As a matter of fact, that is what distinguished the church of Russia from Catholicism, Protestantism of every stripe that appeared later on, and also from all other autonomic landed churches, which called themselves «Orthodox», too. When Russia had been christened, the power of Bolshevism (under conditions of development level of people's culture and world understanding of those days) was not enough to prevent invasion of biblical project under the guise of Christianity; however, the power of spontaneous Bolshevism was enough to make this project get stuck desperately, to start comprehension and development of global Russian project, which was its alternative.

In 19th century, Bolshevism left Russian Orthodox Church, having exhausted facility of development on the basis of its dogma and organizational structures. And, trying Marxism on as the lexical shell,

¹ BYLINA is the Russian name for a story, which belongs as a part to ancient Russian epic literature.

² Bylinas explained their origin as follows. Russian hero and Serpent after the battle where neither side could defeat the opponent, decided to live in peace and divide the Earth with the border, so that one half would be ruled by the Serpent, the other one — by the hero. Therefore the hero made a plow the Serpent harnessed himself into it, and they started to divide the Earth with the furrow. During this “tillage” the hero directed the Serpent into the Black Sea and drowned him. The Serpent ceased to plague the Russian people, and the furrow remained and is called «Serpent's Mounds» since then.

When the science began to study verbal folk tradition, commentators of bylinas perceived the Serpent as the personification of steppe nomads: actual Serpent's Mounds were constructed as means of protection from the raids of their cavalry.

6.2. On Hidden Motive of Revolutions of 1917

Bolshevism penetrated into Marxism exactly the same way as it penetrated 900 years before into the biblical church that came to Russia from the mendacious Byzantium. Then, Russian church (owing to penetration of the spirit of Bolshevism in it) acquired originality, which distinguished it from the origins and foreign analogues. The same way, on the boundary of 19th — 20th centuries Marxism in Russia acquired inner originality of purport of life implied by the Bolsheviks, which distinguished it from the version, affirmed by the «world backstage». This fact doomed internazi Marxian project of «world socialist revolution» to failure.

The failure happened practically immediately after the Soviet regime was established in Russia, although initially it looked as malfunction, which allowed changes in scenario of further actions. The project of «world socialist revolution» failed because V.I. Lenin had insisted on making *obscene (his estimation)* peace with Germany and its allies.

True Marxist-Internazi L.D. Bronstein (Trotsky) stood against that: at first, in open inner-party polemics, and then, being the chief of Soviet delegation at peace negotiations with Germany in Brest-Litovsk (today, city of Brest in Byelorussia on the border with Poland), tried to ruin the resolution adopted in Moscow. Despite direct instructions given by V.I. Lenin, he proclaimed truly Marxian revolutionary policy «neither war nor peace». Essentially, it called Germany and its allies to continue the war and condemned Russia (which was disorganized by revolution) to involuntary resistance to aggression. However, the peace was made despite Trotskyists' activities. An attempt to recommence the war by assassinating German ambassador, Count Mirbach (which occurred after a time on July 6, 1918 in Moscow), by the hands of left-wing socialist-revolutionaries did not result in recommencement of military operations.

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»: Socialism at an Individual Country

Such actions of L.D. Bronstein and politically myopic left-wing social-revolutionaries considered within Russia at first sight seem hysterically-senseless. But if we consider the situation in global scale, this is not so by far. Brest peace treaty slowed down forcing of revolutionary situation in Germany and Austro-Hungary. Due to its influence on the course of events¹, revolutions in these countries under slogans of socialism started, but as Marxian internazi revolutions they failed; they created multitude of bourgeois republics and Yugoslavian monarchy out of two Central European monarchies.

In Russia by spring of 1918 aversion to the new power and sabotage of its undertakings by the part of population (first of all, by the representatives of former ruling classes and variegated «middle class») began to develop into Civil War. This put a question before the «world backstage», which it should support in the Civil War: either Marxian Soviet power, which developed during the revolution (even though contaminated with Bolshevism), or counter-revolution?

The victory of counter-revolution would inevitably result in firm establishment of nazi fascist regime in Russia (the history of Germany confirmed this later on). Though the «world backstage» had time to give Germany its protégé as the Fuhrer, curing Germany from fascism was the waste of time in the global project of replacement of capitalism with different social system with the lower level of intrasocial tension and more harmonious relations between society and biosphere. But it is quite difficult to promote the protégé for the position of Fuhrer under conditions of Civil War. And in case of the counter-revolution's victory, multinational “elitist” imperial Nazism would incinerate not only the hateful Bolsheviks, misinterpreters of Marxism, but also the staff of professional Internazi revolutionaries. This would make the project of «world socialist revolution» in 20th century unrealizable. Therefore the «world backstage» decided to assist the Internazi Marxian power (though

¹ If it were not concluded, the revolutionary situation in Russian and Europe would have only grown further. The internazi revolution, covered by Marxist socialist slogans, could have won not only in Russian, but on the European continent at large.

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»...

infected with multinational Bolshevism) in winning the victory in the Civil War, planning to solve the problem of Bolshevism suppression later on depending on circumstances.

The «world backstage» exercises its power by means different from those used by the rulers of the states and which are perceived by the men of the crowd as the means of execution of power in the life of the society. The governments issue the laws that concern all citizens (subjects), and directives that are addressed to the chiefs of certain state structures personally, whereas the «world backstage» participates, through its periphery in the society, in the activity of State machinery and social institutions, by either supporting **their independent activities** or by *sabotaging them, but supporting at the same time other activities, activities of other structures both within the society and in other countries.*

This power is executed on the basis of moulding the worldview of certain groups within the crowd-“elitist” society in a pre-emptive (anticipatory) manner. Due to the worldview moulded in this way whole social groups and classes act as if on their own accord but in a manner which is necessary for the «world backstage». This allows getting by with a minimal number of non-documentary directives (this is a sort of «pre-telephone right» existing from times immemorial). In each country those directives are addressed specifically to a very narrow circle of the «world backstage’s» periphery co-coordinators who are initiated into its activities.¹

In accordance with this customary practice «world backstage» permitted the bourgeois regimes of Europe and America with Japan’s complicity to start an intervention into Soviet Russia in order to split and colonize it with support lent by local counter-revolutionary forces.

But as the global history studies on the Civil War and intervention indicate, counter-revolution was being defeated on the battlefield because it was being let down by its foreign allies. Under the pressure of their internal movements who put forward slogans like «Keep your hands off Soviet Russia!» military deliveries were being called off shortly before

¹ Because such a method is used by the «world backstage» to execute power on the local level any attempts to discover and unmask the «world conspiracy» and the agents of the «world government» by detective or police means like it was done by H. Ford always result in absurdity.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

decisive battles.¹ Admiral A. Kolchak, (who was the potential head of the multinational “elitist” imperial Nazism if the counter-revolution had got the upper hand), was betrayed by the interventionists following a direct order from their masonry superiors. He was handed over to the revolutionary authorities that did not hesitate in doing away with him quickly.

The Civil War’s last front in Russia was actually the Crimean front fought against baron P. Vrangel. M. Frunze gave his word of honor to preserve the life of those who would yield themselves prisoner. After P.Vrangel fled abroad the Crimean formation stopped resisting and surrendered in an organized way. Immediately after that M. Frunze by order of the high command was transferred to a new appointment. In his absence the internazis (it was exactly internazis who organized that *military crime*: Sklyansky, Zalkind (Zemlyachka), Bella Kun) killed 50,000 imprisoned White army officers in the Crimea. They broke the promises of preserving the life of prisoners of war thereby depriving Bolsheviks of potential managerial personnel whose effort would be directed to the nation’s benefit.² This incident is nothing exceptional. It is

¹ In the course of history Russian defence industry and various military supplies warehouses became concentrated on the territory which subsequently came under Soviet control. Those warehouses were so tightly filled that even in the late 1930’s when the «ZiS-3» gun was being developed one of the requirements consisted in the capability of firing 76-mm shells which were left in abundance after World War I and the Civil War. Complying with this requirement resulted in a lower charge power and inferior performance characteristics.

The reason warehouses were overfilled was that the opposition to the regime of Nicholas II adopted the organisational structure of masonry and sabotaged the war waged by the tsarist regime. Instead it was preparing a coup d’etat to substitute it by a bourgeois republic or a constitutional monarchy that would according to their plan finish the war victoriously. But A. Kerensky turned out to be an agent of the «world backstage» (on this issue refer to the book by N. Yakovlev, “August 1st, 1914”, Moscow 1974; additional issue 3, Moscow, “Moskvityanin” publishing house). He conducted such a political course of the Interim government that would enable Marxist internazis to seize power. To this end he abandoned general L. Kornilov who led the march of front-line army units towards the revolutionary Petrograd and declared him a traitor.

² One should keep in mind the following in this connection. In the revolution of 1905 — 1907 all the people of the Russian empire were free in

→ → →

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»...

among the last in a whole series of similar incidents that took place in the course of the Civil war. In the course of war mass destruction, in some places amounting to complete destruction, of the former ruling “elite’s” representatives together with their families (including children) was a customary phenomenon. The victims of such massacres engaged in no anti-Soviet activities whatsoever. Along with that there were so many Hebrews among the VChK’s (National Emergency and Security Committee) executive staff, both in central and peripheral divisions (especially in the Ukraine), that the VChK of the time could be considered as a prototype of Hitler’s Gestapo only in its Hebrewish variant.

Such purposeful policy of eliminating the former ruling “elite’s” representatives which the internazi revolutionaries executed in the course

choosing the side they politically supported. Yet immediately after the February revolution, which was timed to Purim (the holiday of Jewish internazism celebrated in the memory of annihilating the national ruling “elite” of ancient Persia), a terror operation was conducted in Gelsinfor — at that time the main base of the Baltic Navy, now Helsinki. In the course of that act of terror guerrillas were killing officers without any legal grounds, and many of those perished people had nothing to be blamed for by lower ranks. Similar terror operations were carried out in the army, and one of the low rank military who killed his officer was conferred an order of St. George by Guchkov (for some time was the military and navy minister in the Provisional Government). Because those acts were committed in the name of revolution, officers who were politically illiterate responded to those mean acts with spontaneous emotions and engaged in counter-revolutionary activity that it was already too late to perform.

This means that many who died fighting in the Civil war on the White army’s side were forced to oppose revolution by Marxist internazis who wanted to prevent it from becoming truly socialist and anti-Marxist. Similarly, Kronshtadt mutiny was organized with complicity of Zinovyev (Apfelbaum) to the end of suppressing the anti-internazism constituent of the revolution. The Kronshtadt mutiny’s slogan was «Soviets without communists!». «Marxists» prefer to be called someone else, including «communists» because they do not want to stain the name of their teacher. The crowd does not bother about the difference between those words and the social and political phenomena which they denominate.

One can read in greater detail about how Russian officers were pushed towards counter-revolutionary activity by internazi revolutionaries in the work by Internal Predictor of the USSR “Exchanging opinions” or in the article by Gerald Graf “The blood of officers” published in the “Slovo” magazine, № 8, 1990, pp. 22 — 25)

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of revolution and the Civil War resulted in the Hebrews' having an overwhelming majority in the party and government bodies and in the mass media. This has a twofold explanation. First, it was an effect of the internazi's personnel policy proper: promoting their own kin to key posts. Second, it resulted from the fact that at the end of the 19th century it was the Hebrews who became the best-educated part of the diverse people populating the Russian empire. They were ahead of all other ethnic groups according to statistics on education¹, and working in government bodies required a certain minimal educational level that the rest of the country's population did not possess.

Yet in the very first years of peaceful life the «world backstage» and its RSFSR-USSR local representatives discovered the fact that most workers and peasants were loyal to the Soviet regime and many of them, especially young people, actively supported it on their own accord.² At the

¹ One may ask what was the Russian ruling “elite” thinking about when it let that happen? It was as early as the 18th century that it was given a sign in the person of Mikhail Lomonosov (1711 — 1765), a sign showing that they were deeply wrong in giving no chance to get an education to the common people. It was easier for the “elite” to believe that M. Lomonosov was an illegitimate son of Peter the Great than to acknowledge that God gives His divine spark according to His Will paying no attention to the hierarchy of castes established by people, and therefore it is better not to make up those silly hierarchies of personal relationships so as not to stand in the way of God's Will.

² Many of our contemporaries will not be able to understand the reasons for that. Therefore in order to clarify the reasons and goals of the support lent by young workers and peasants to the Soviet regime let us remind you that the lower classes of the Russian empire were almost completely deprived of rights (one should only remember about notes reading «no admittance to park for dogs and people of lower ranks»), including the right of education and personal development, that they had to work like dogs and were paid a wage which did not enable them to satisfy their individual and family needs in the demographically grounded range. As a result of the revolution which was accompanied by maltreatment and economic devastation brought about by the imperial and then Civil War the well-being of most families did not return to the pre-war level (the level of 1913 which was considered as a standard which the USSR's economic statistics were being compared with almost up to the end of the 1970's). Yet for young working and country people there opened up new options for personal development and serving the society which were not available to them before 1917. So as you see, there *was* something worth

→ → →

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»...

same time there was a growth in a certain phenomenon which internazis call anti-Semitism occurring throughout the entire society.¹ Under the social conditions existing at the time individuals like L. Bronstein (Trotsky), L. Rosenfeld (Kamenev), G. Apfelbaum (Zinovyev) and others of their kinship — at the time the cult leaders of the revolution and the «working people» who have won the Civil War — could not personify state power during the long period of building a new social order which then lay yet ahead.²

One should also understand that there is one kind of attitude to a revolution and the new power which follows in its wake if the revolution takes place while an imperialist war is going on and while everyone is tired of that war (except the “elite” who make fortunes on it). But there is a completely different attitude to a revolution if the new power arises as a result of a victory won by an aggressor who has started a *«revolutionary fight for the sake of liberating fellow workers of another country from the yoke of capital»* while those workers themselves have not yet become

supporting the Soviet power for and coming forward with initiatives in building socialism.

¹ Things got so serious that Yu. Larin (Mikhail Lurie) came forward in 1929 with a book called “Jews and anti-Semitism in the USSR” which was published simultaneously both in Moscow and Leningrad. There he tried to provide a believable explanation of the «Jewish issue» and to lull the interest common people had for it. He presented it as an inconsistent prejudice inherited from Russia’s past when it was a «prison of nation» where the ruling regime bred strife between nations in order to eliminate the threat of revolution. He also explained their particularly active creativity and their unnaturally large share among the revolutionary parties’ members by the fact that it was their response to the particularly strong oppression of Hebrews on the part of tsarism.

M. Lurie is N. Buharin’s second father-in-law. After the Great October socialist revolution he worked in committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet of National Economy on financial management, on trade nationalization, on establishing sovkhozi (a kind of collective farms) and others. He died in 1932.

² Clearly Trotsky did not understand this and kept trying to be a leader while refusing to get rid of his loyalty to internazism. This is the very reason why he got it on his head with an alpenstock. Had he been a bolshevik he would have lived till his old age like L. Kaganovich.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

inspired with the thought of a revolution and a new power.¹ It is equally so if the new power arises through a coup d'état organized in a country living a peaceful life.² Psychic Trotskyites and Marxists in the USSR did not regard those circumstances of great political momentum³ as a political reality.⁴

Besides, while Russia fought the Civil War the revolutionary situation in European countries came to naught.

Due to these circumstances the «world backstage» had to agree with V. Lenin's point of view: first establish socialism in a separate individual country, then transition to socialism in all other countries. V. Lenin expressed this point of view in as early as 1915. Among the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) top officials this point of view was shared by J. Stalin.

As noted by some biographers of J. Stalin, in the pre-Revolutionary and the early post-revolutionary years he was among the last to join the (party) majority that had already been formed before. This defined the way he made his party career. His works were written in a language befitting common people (see his Collected works). On the one hand, it

¹ It is common knowledge how the people of Afghanistan responded to the USSR's attempt of fulfilling its «international» duty in 1979.

² It can be exemplified by the attitude towards the socialist idea shared by people in the Baltic States. In 1917 red Latish riflemen did not even think about something like Latvia's separation from Russia. They were at one with Siberian riflemen (see the stenograph report on the VI Convention of the RSDLP held in August 1917: "The Proceedings of Conventions and Conferences of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) — Sixth Convention", Moscow, Leningrad, 1927). After the October revolution of 1917 red Latish riflemen became one of the most reliable supporters of the new state. In one of his articles L. Bronstein (Trotsky) went as far as asserting that had it not been for them, the Soviet power would have collapsed. In 1940 after the Baltic States joined the Soviet Union, what was organized internally by the periphery of internazi «Comintern», protest against the Soviet power and the USSR appeared immediately and was expanding until the collapse of the USSR in 1991.

³ One of the definitions ascribed to politics is the art of the possible.

⁴ And as subsequently disclosed in the course of history the Trotskyite periphery in the USSR's armed forces cherished their delirious dreams of the «revolutionary war» to the end of establishing Marxist socialism throughout the world until the case of marshals who were brought to court in 1937. They even managed to produce some «scientific» papers on this issue.

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»...

made them easily accessible for the understanding of the common working people who were semiliterate and poorly educated. On the other hand, it convinced the intelligentsia who took up the ruling role in the party of J. Stalin's own illiteracy because he seemed not to be able of mastering that «highly scientific» argot which was used by the party intelligentsia in their oral and written word and which the common people could not understand (e.g., immanent, permanent, fideism, gnoseology and similar words used in the literature of Marxist intelligentsia). Therefore for party leaders of Trotsky's type Stalin was neither an outstanding party philosopher, economist and publicist writer¹ nor an outstanding orator capable of enticing the crowd towards the feats of revolution by word of mouth. The intelligentsia leaders and their supporters believed him to be an ill-bred (having no good manners), rude, poorly educated (a half-educated seminarian²), lazy (has written nothing during his last exile) man and therefore a man incapable of thinking independently.

This created a false impression that J.V. Stalin could be controlled by cleverer and better-educated leaders even if he did become the top party executive. That is why Stalin's promotions to higher and higher levels of power inside the party produced no objection or opposition of the «world backstage».

¹ Judging from the knowledge readily available today V. Lenin was nearly the only party figure who recognized the great value Stalin's pre-revolutionary theoretic works had for the cause of bolshevism, the work "Marxism and the national issue" among them. In this work J.V. Stalin provided a definition for the term «nation» which indicates that Hebrew is not a nation but something else what J.V. Stalin gave no definition for.

² Because he received a systematic (religious) education in a seminary J.V. Stalin was one of the few party leaders who had a thorough knowledge of the Biblical doctrine of global enslavement. This fact is likewise beyond the understanding of many of his modern opponents and supporters. But thanks to that systematic education he at least sensed that there is no difference between the Bible and Marxism on the level of their content: both are a means of enslaving the mankind.

One can find the grounds for this statement in the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR "It is Time I Should Start the Tale of Stalin...", "The Sorrowful Legacy of Atlantis" ("Trotskyism is «Yesterday», but not «Tomorrow»"), "A review of possible ways post-1995 history might take" (separate editions and collected articles "Old scenarios in a different wording?")

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Besides, J.V. Stalin was a member of a national minority like the majority of revolution leaders, namely, a Georgian, which seemed to guarantee that he would suppress any threat of «Great Russian» nationalism or Nazism.

All those factors resulted in that the «world backstage» found it plausible to entrust the task of personifying the success of socialism in a separate individual country to J. Stalin.

Bolsheviks, on their part, were also pondering who was to succeed and continue their cause as V. Lenin's illness resulting from his injury¹ was deteriorating and making him less and less capable of leading the party and the state.

In this connection we shall turn to a document known as «The address to the convention» which is reported by the CPSU's historic tradition as having been written down from V. Lenin's words by *several* of his secretaries and at different times between December 1922 and January 1923.

The letter concerns the ways to avoid a party split in future and to ensure the Central Committee's stability through *formal means* but not through **achieving a unity of opinions on all the issues of party activity, this unity being based on the common methodology of cognition and world understanding shared by the party members.**²

«I think that the most important people as far as this kind of stability is concerned are such CC³ members as Stalin and Trotsky. The terms they are on in my opinion comprise the greater half of the danger posed by that kind of split which could be avoided. In my judgment it can be avoided through increasing the number of CC members up to 50 or 100 people among other things.⁴

¹ As was made known as early as the years of Perestroika, the injury damaged one of the carotid arteries. Due its constriction the brain suffered a lack of blood circulation. This led to functional disorder, general disorder of nervous activity and subsequent death.

² This task has never been set out directly by the leaders of the RSDLP, CPSU and CPRF. The basis of party organization has always been thought to be the regulations and party discipline. This is what dooms CPRF to fail politically.

³ «CC» means «Central Committee».

⁴ Essentially implementing this scheme in a party of active and energetic people excluded the option of the CC's functioning in a secret mafia-like way of «leadership» and was directed against crowd-«elitism».

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»...

Having taken the post of general secretary Comrade Stalin has concentrated in his hands a power of limitless authority, and I am not sure whether he will always be able to use that power with enough caution or not. On the other hand, comrade Trotsky is distinguished not only by his outstanding abilities¹, as his opposition to the CC in regard to the issue of NKPS² has demonstrated.³ Personally he seems to be the most able man in the current CC, yet he carries it too far with his self-confidence and caring too much for the purely administrative side of our cause.

The above-mentioned two qualities of the two outstanding leaders in our current CC can accidentally lead to a split, and if our party does not take measures to counter it, the split can occur unexpectedly.

I shall not speak any more about the personal qualities of other CC members. I should only like to remind you that the incident with Zinovyev and Kamenev was of course caused not by chance, yet they personally can be hardly blamed for it, just like Trotsky can be hardly blamed for his non-bolshevism» (V. Lenin, Collected works, issue 5, volume 45, the notes of December 24, 1922 continued, dictated by V. Lenin on December 25, 1922).

J. Stalin's qualities are described further in the addition to the notes of December 25, 1922. This is what was written down by **another secretary** of V. Lenin, L. Fotiyeva (1881 — 1975) on January 4, 1923:

«Stalin is too rude, and this drawback which is tolerable among ourselves, the communists, becomes intolerable for a man in the office of the general secretary. That is why I suggest the comrades to think of a way to remove Stalin from this post and appoint a different man to it. In all the other respects this man should differ from comrade Stalin in only one way — having the advantage of being more tolerable, loyal, polite and attentive towards comrades, less whimsical, etc. This circumstance might seem to be trivial. But I think that in respect to avoiding a split and to what I said above about the relationship between Stalin and Trotsky this is not trivial or this is a trifle which could prove to be decisive».

¹ A question naturally arises about the qualities not mentioned here: what else is Trotsky notable for except for his outstanding abilities?

² The ministry of transport.

³ The national railway commissariat (NKPS) — the name of that ministry at the time.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Psychic Trotskyite writers have commented upon the “Address to the convention” by V. Lenin over and over again, making special emphasis on the addition to the address of January 4, 1923. They implied that it contained a Lenin’s warning that nobody listened to. Yet almost the only thing that escaped their understanding is exactly what V. Lenin really warned Bolsheviks from, as well as the fact that in this letter V. Lenin actually recommends J.V. Stalin to the party of *Bolsheviks* as his successor.

In order to understand what V. Lenin really warned the party from in his «Address to the convention» let us consider the testimonial V. Lenin gave to the members of ACP (B) Central Committee unbiased by turbulent emotions. V. Lenin openly describes all the candidates for the post of party leader (no matter what this post is called) apart from J.V. Stalin as non-Bolsheviks (Trotsky), as people unreliable in business (Kamenev, Zinovyev, Trotsky whom V. Lenin called «little Judas» in one of his works), as bureaucrats who can forget about the true cause carried away by administrative formalism (Trotsky, Buharin¹, Pyatakov²).

Thus, only J.V. Stalin remains. He has already concentrated in his hands an enormous power on the post of the *general secretary*³ which speaks of his professional qualities as an administrator, of his ability to maintain a certain balance between form (administrative issues) and content (i.e. the cause itself) and of his capabilities as a leader. Yet along with that he is sometimes rude, intolerant, capricious.

¹ «Buharin is not only the most prominent and most valuable party theorist, he is also justly considered to be the party’s favorite. Yet it is very doubtful if his theories can be considered entirely Marxist, because there is something scholastic about him (he never studied and, I think, never understood dialectics)» (“Address to the convention”, records of December 25, 1922).

² «Pyatakov is certainly a man of unbending will and outstanding ability, yet he gets too much carried away by administrative work and the administrative side of our cause to be relied on in a serious political matter» (“Address to the convention”, records of December 25, 1922).

³ Initially this was an important and demanding post yet of a purely technical nature. The person holding this post was in charge of the Central Committee’s secretariat which was to free the «leaders» of the routine bureaucratic work: preparing materials for the meeting of leaders, printing and mailing the resolutions passed on those meetings, etc.

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»...

Given the testimonies of all the other «leaders» the addition to the «Address» of January 4, 1923 is nothing **but empty rhetoric**: *«We should have appointed somebody else instead of Stalin: someone equal to Stalin professionally but who would not be so rude and intolerant. Do you know someone like that? — I don't»*. And at the same time this is a **hint to Stalin**: *«Learn to be tolerant, my dear comrade, or it will cost you your head notwithstanding your good professional qualities. You will end the same way as I did: they will destroy you before you will be able to finish our cause. You see for yourself, there are no bolshevist people capable of being in charge among the party «leaders» ... yet we must continue with the cause of bolshevism, otherwise masons and empty talkers from among intelligentsia carried along by them will walk all over the common people»*.

Following these meditations let us comment in greater detail the following phrase of V. Lenin: «the October incident¹ with Zinovyev and Kamenev was of course caused not by chance, yet they personally can be hardly blamed for it, just like Trotsky can be hardly blamed for his non-bolshevism»

The way V. Lenin characterized L. Rosenfeld (Kamenev), G. Apfelbaum (Zinovyev) and L. Bronstein (Trotsky) leads us to compare it with the legal status of slaves in a slave-owning society:

A slave cannot be held responsible for anything by the society of free people. For any damage inflicted by a slave his owner is held responsible. And only the owner has a right of punishing the slave in a way he himself chooses. Nobody from among the free people has a right to impede him in executing that right.²

Therefore the testimonial he gave to Bronstein, Rosenfeld, Apfelbaum is synonymous to a definition given to a slave's legal status, simply in a different wording. Taking this into account and taking into account the knowledge we now have of that era, the above-mentioned testimonial given to that «trio» by V. Lenin can be only understood as a hint that the

¹ Behind some days before great October socialist revolution they have published in the newspaper the notice on forthcoming revolt.

² Essentially in ancient slave-owning societies working cattle and slaves had the same «legal status».

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

party «leaders» he mentions are actually puppets, slaves of masonry masters, executive periphery of the «world backstage». And one should not think that this conclusion is a far-fetched one while what V. Lenin meant is something completely different: V. Lenin was a lawyer, he knew legal history starting from the ancient times, and when speaking at the IV Comintern congress in December 1922 he demanded of Communist party members to leave Masonic lodges.¹

If we attempt to describe how different people not aware of the backstage hidden motives perceive the testimonials of CC members given by V. Lenin in his «Address to the convention» we shall see that they see completely different things as being significant in that address.

That J.V. Stalin is sometimes rude, has the guts not to follow «high society manners» was significant (and is still significant) for representatives of the carelessly babbling intelligentsia among the party ranks and of the leaders who have an intellectual background or have joined intelligentsia while working as professional revolutionaries. They prefer the party leaders to be intelligent talkers like themselves.

But among the common people who are busy doing real vital work (i.e. among the party masses) rudeness was not considered to be a serious vice at the time, like it was the case among the refined intelligentsia. The common people have not paid and do not pay much attention to a man's rudeness if this man possesses professional qualities useful for the society. The common people are usually intolerant not to rude people but to those who bully others misusing their social status or talents, and one can do this while being at the same time exquisitely polite. Had Lenin written that Stalin mocked and bullied his party comrades, people would have regarded such a warning with an utterly different degree of concern.

Bolshevist party members from among the common people paid attention to the fact that J.V. Stalin had concentrated power in his

¹ This happened less than a month before he dictated the “Address to the convention”, which is several days before his health condition aggravated sharply. After that fit he was taken to Gorki (not Gorky) where he died in slightly more than a year. Yet V. Lenin's demand of the Communist party members to leave Masonic lodges was silenced by the official cult history of the CPSU.

6.3. New Line of the «World Backstage»...

hands, i.e. he was not afraid of taking the responsibility for their common cause, that he had the qualities of a leader and administrator capable of real work. And rude words and actions do not always reflect spite, and even if they are the case, they have no serious effect... Besides, *for a person to lose his temper and start being rude* it takes those around him to bring the person into this condition.

One should also bear in mind that the knowledge we have of what Stalin was like in intercourse is based on the reminiscences of his contemporaries. And remember that they were often written down from third persons and were carefully selected by anti-Stalinists later. But in those years not only V. Lenin, N. Krupskaya and other party leaders had a real experience of communicating with Stalin. Therefore there could be opinions on J. Stalin's «politeness» which were different from the view V. Lenin expressed in his «Address to the convention» and which did not become a part of the cult at the time of the 20th Convention for that very reason.

In the years of Perestroika the «fight against Stalinism» livened up, and the TV broadcast a documentary shot at the place of Stalin's last exile in the Turukhansky territory. There was nothing underneath the concrete framework of the glass «aquarium» which once protected Stalin's museum from rough weather. The walls were covered with writings: both condemning Stalin and asking for forgiveness for having not been able to preserve the USSR — the first bolshevist state — after he passed away.

Then they interviewed an old woman, an inhabitant of that village, who remembered Stalin's living there in exile. She was asked, «What do you remember?» When she heard the question, youth lit up her eyes, and she answered: **«He was a kind man. He treated ill people with herbs...»**

Thus it seems that J.V. Stalin behaved differently with different people, depending on what those people were like, what their inside was like, and what J.V. Stalin himself thought them to be...

As a result, the Bolsheviks of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) seconded J.V. Stalin and not anyone else as the party leader, judging from the testimonials given to the «leaders» by V. Lenin and from their personal experience of speaking and working with leaders.

Thus both the «world backstage» and Bolsheviks in Russia itself concurred that comrade Joseph Stalin could be entrusted the task of

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

leadership in the cause of building socialism in a separate country. Yet under socialism the «world backstage» and Bolsheviks meant completely different, mutually exclusive ways of socially organizing people's life. The result of those coinciding social and political processes was J. Stalin's coming to personify bolshevist statehood in the 20th century.

6.4. Unpreparedness of Russia for Socialism and its Consequences

Russia was economically, culturally and morally not ready for the socialist mode of life neither in 1917 nor after the Civil War. Everyone knew it¹: both opponents and advocates of socialism. After the Revolution the camp of advocates of socialism split during the Civil War.

Understanding that Russia is not ready for socialism, some public figures proposed it would transfer to multi-party bourgeois democracy for the culture and economy to have enough time for development and for the objective and subjective precondition of transferring to socialism to appear.

Others — the Bolsheviks headed by Vladimir Lenin and the Trotskyists headed by Leon D. Bronstein — also shared the view that Russia was not ready for socialism in respect of culture and economy. What they insisted on was that only under the guidance of the Bolsheviks' Party and the Soviets of Workers and Peasants' deputies is it possible to develop the culture and economy and to build the real socialism. Only under these circumstances will the working class and the peasants be able to escape exploitation by internal and foreign private capital, which will otherwise set in for at least several decades. It was very likely to happen under the conditions of bourgeois democracy civil liberties and private enterprise permissiveness, wherein inter-industry proportions and gross industries' capacities² are determined by the law of value due to the market self-regulation. To ground the above statement we are drawing Lenin's opinion here:

«...infinitely stereotyped, for instance, is the argument they learned by rote during the development of West-European Social-Democracy, namely, that we are not yet ripe for socialism, but as certain "learned" gentleman among them put it, the objective economic premises for socialism do not exist in our country. Does it not occur to any of them to ask: what about the people that found itself in a revolutionary situation such as that created during

¹ It was one of the reasons why the prospect of the socialist revolution victory was not considered a feasible one by the ruling classes.

² For more information on these discrepancies see "The History of CPSU" text-books of the soviet period, works of Lenin and Bronstein (Trotsky), which cover the post-revolution subjects, those of the Civil War and of the early period of socialism building in the USSR.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

the first imperialist war? Might it not, influenced by the hopelessness of its situation, fling itself into a struggle that would offer it at least some chance of securing conditions for the further development of civilization that were somewhat unusual?

«The development of the productive forces of Russia has not yet attained the level that makes socialism possible». All the heroes of the Second International, including of course Sukhanov, beat the drums about this proposition. They keep harping on this incontrovertible proposition in a thousand different keys and make it the decisive criterion of our revolution.

(...)

If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say just what that definite “level of culture” is, for it differs in every Western European country), why can we not begin by first achieving the prerequisites for that definite level of culture in a revolutionary way, and *then*, with the aid of the workers’ and peasants’ government and Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations?

(...)

You say that civilization is necessary for the building of socialism. Very well. But why could we not first create such prerequisites of civilization in our country by the expulsion of the landowners and the Russian capitalists and then start moving toward socialism? Where, in what books, have you read that such variations of the customary historical sequence of events are impermissible or impossible?

Napoleon, I remember, wrote: “*On s’engage et puis... on voit*”. Rendered freely this means: “First engage in a serious battle and then see what happens.” Well, we did first engage in a serious battle in October 1917 and then saw such details of development (from the standpoint of world history they were certainly details) as the Brest peace, the New Economic Policy, and so forth. And now there can be no doubt that in the main we have been victorious. (V.I. Lenin. “Our Revolution (Apropos of N. Sukhanov’s Notes)”, Lenin, Collected Works, 5th edition, volume 45, p. 378 — 382).

J.V. Stalin wrote on the same issue, but 35 years after the Great October Socialist Revolution:

«The answer to this question was given by Lenin in his writings on the “tax in kind” and in his celebrated «cooperative plan».

Lenin’s answer may be briefly summed up as follows:

a) Favorable conditions for the assumption of power should not be missed — the proletariat should assume power without waiting

6.4. Unpreparedness of Russia for Socialism and its Consequences

until capitalism has succeeded in ruining the millions of small and medium individual producers;

b) The means of production in industry should be expropriated and converted into public property;

c) As to the small and medium individual producers, they should be gradually united in producers' cooperatives, i.e., in large agricultural enterprises, collective farms;

d) Industry should be developed to the utmost and the collective farms should be placed on the modern technical basis of large-scale production, not expropriating them, but on the contrary generously supplying them with first-class tractors and other machines;

e) In order to ensure an economic bond between town and country, between industry and agriculture, commodity production (exchange through purchase and sale) should be preserved for a certain period, it being the form of economic tie with the town which is **alone acceptable** to the peasants, and Soviet trade — state, cooperative, and collective-farm — should be developed to the fullest and the capitalists of all types and descriptions ousted from trading activity.

The history of socialist construction in our country has shown that this path of development, mapped out by Lenin, has fully justified itself. (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economic Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, Ch. 2. “Commodity Production under Socialism”).

In fact such policy was initially bound to cause more than one interpretation and to create internal conflicts. **Firstly**, it implied that the government and party would render support to those implicating the ideals of socialism and the doctrine of its construction according to their own worldview and to the Party leaders' understanding of it (i.e. in the way it was presented in the official propaganda). **Secondly**, it implied forcing of the ideologically uncommitted layers of the society to join the socialist mode of life. It concerned the layers who didn't have any particular ideas about the ideal social order in their minds, whose actions were guided by individualistic interests of a replete and comfortable life for themselves and their families and who would be loyal to any government that could provide acceptable labor conditions and consumers' well-being. **Thirdly**, it implies investigating and suppressing anti-socialist activity — in the understanding of the top party leaders.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

But this is the ideal version.

In practice actions of all three of the above-mentioned types can be characteristic of the same people when taken in different time and under different circumstances. This is possible owing to the customs and the mentality of the crowd-“elitist” society. This concerns both the sundry rulers implementing the declarations of building the new society and the masses controlled by these rulers. Thus, the personal mistakes and abuse of power by the repression machine workers were made objectively inevitable¹. Besides, in real life the government can be truly mistaken about the vision of socialism and the methods of building it. As a result, it was those having less misunderstanding about socialism that were bound to become the victims of the repression machine simply because they were unable to convince the party and its machinery of their viewpoint. This is what predetermined personal and subjective mistakes by the top leaders of the party to become the system errors in the social self-government.

That is why one should not think that the history of Russia-USSR in the first half of the twentieth century could have been less mean and sanguinary had L. Bronstein or any another of the protagonists of any kind of socialism been at the head of the Party and the state after Lenin’s disease. Neither would it be so if Soviet government had admitted that Russia was not ready for socialism and thus it had introduced a multi-party system in the country². As a result of this, the state machinery would fall under the control of the advocates of the class-caste-based regime or of those relying on the civil society of capitalism, based on the hierarchy of the purses. Everything happened in the best possible way

¹ In the late 19th — early 20th century, socialism and communism were in fact propagated as the ideal just community. Historian V. Klyuchevski knew both his contemporary society and the projects of the socialist reorganization, which were popular among the up-in-the-cloud left intelligentsia of those years. Back in the late 19th century he characterized the prospects of Russia’s transfer to socialism in late 19th — early 20th century in just one phrase. This is a key phrase for understanding of the post-revolution decades of real and alleged socialist building: «The just community made up of scoundrels». It is obvious that the more persistent the scoundrels are in their scoundrelling, the more disastrous will be the imposing of socialism in this society, which was successfully proved by the history of the USSR.

² Such actions on behalf of the German social-democracy in 1918 resulted in Hitler’s coming to power in 1933 together with the National-Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP in German).

6.4. Unpreparedness of Russia for Socialism and its Consequences

anyway, taking into consideration the customs of the society and the ethics pertaining to it¹.

But at that moment Russia was still expecting to solve the conceptual uncertainty in the society and the culture: either the righteous communal life, or however you may call it, where your personal development is ensured and where everyone is protected against parasitism on his or her labor and life; or the hierarchy of mutual oppression and claims to oppress the neighbors, where parasitism on one another and on the biosphere altogether is inevitable. These two conceptions cannot coexist in one society under any circumstances. It only depends on by what means they struggle against each other.

It is appropriate to draw the utterance of Decembrist Pavel Pestel² as far as the policy of the Soviet State during the period of Stalin's real socialism building is concerned:

«The experience of all centuries and of all the states proved that the people are <or, to be more exact, become> shaped by the government and by the laws under which they live».

Although Pestel speaks of the government and the laws, what is meant here is the bearers of the conceptual power who arbitrarily shape the society, for they control the state government, lawmaking (as a component

¹ To escape the bloodshed of the first half of the 20th century it was necessary during the second half of the 19th century to work out the global alternative to the Marxist scenario of the world socialist revolution. To do this we had to revise the history of the mankind and the history of the multinational Russian regional civilization in it. We had to change our attitude to the «holy writings» and to overcome the idealistic atheism of the existing religious cults, which pervert people's understanding of God, of the relationship of each and every person with God, and of God's Providence. But we also had to overcome the materialistic atheism of science, which rejects the existence of God. Only in this case might there have begun forming the culture, based on the honest faith in God and the conscious, above-the-riot dialogue with Him of every person throughout the life. But Russian intelligentsia turned out to be incapable of solving this problem in due time. As a result of this, we lost the alternative opportunity for development without external wars, revolutions, the Civil War and the abuse of power in the post-war years.

² One of leaders of the revolt on 14 (25) December of 1825 against the power of Russian Emperor Nicholas I.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of the state power) and partly the execution of the laws, which are expressing a certain conception of social order as well as people's attitude towards it and towards the conceptual power, which initializes this order. The real and potential differences between the various governments and laws, proposed by Pestel, which determine the peoples of countries as well as a particular people of a certain country viewed over different periods, inevitably implies differences in the conceptions, some of which may even be mutually exclusive within one national or multi-national society; or within the humanity — if taken on the global scale.

Having said this we may pass over to the analysis of the achievements and underachievements of Bolshevism in Stalin's epoch.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming the Power of Marxism

If building socialism is regarded as establishing a social order (i.e. in a broader sense of the word than the definition for economic structure given in chapter 6.1) it includes three interconnected and mutually dependant processes:

- personal development of people belonging to actively living adult generations. It ensures that they re-define their attitude to life, become a part of socialism which is being built and turn into its advocates. They join the socialist society in a natural process, freeing themselves from the norms of crowd-“elitist” culture they have been imposed on in their childhood and adolescence in the course of upbringing and education, which norms are characteristic of certain social groups in non-socialist social and economic structures;
- development of the society’s culture on the whole and of its subcultures. It forms the basis and means of molding the morals, ethics and world understanding of future generations which would make the ideals of righteous community (socialism and communism) their natural life ideals and would render crowd-“elitism”, along with oppression of human beings and parasitism on life and labor, impossible in their society, neither in overt (openly proclaimed) nor in covert (when people are not aware of them) forms;
- implementing the principles of socialism into the economic production and consumption activity of the technical civilization, carried out with the state’s support (first of all, planned economy directed towards safeguarding the demographically grounded needs of the population in the succession of generations).

Though it is the third issue which is the most visible phenomenon in social life, the priority of importance corresponds to the order in which the above-mentioned processes have been listed. (This priority is understood in terms of the irreversible nature of consequences for the society’s life which happen during the time period of one social development cycle. This cycle corresponds to the interval between one *point at which the past is provided a new understanding and plans for the future are worked out* and the next such point)

In other words, personal development is the main thing in building socialism. And because *socialism in the broad sense of the word* is an

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

image of the society's life, building socialism achieves the greater success, the more people are active in their personal development in accordance to God's Will.

This is true because cultural development means that there appears something new and socially useful in it — useful in terms of failing to support degraded parasitic processes or prompt people to support them. At that development of culture is a way of expressing personal development and creativity in the course of God's Will available to all the people of the actively living generations. And production and consumption activity, principles on which it is organized and the means which those principles are realized by (including the relations between people in terms of production and consumption) are a part of cultural development.¹

In any multinational or national culture, as well as in subcultures of individual social groups, three more or less developed movements can be discovered (meaning that culture on the whole is something like a vector in *multidimensional space which is defined through movements which cannot be expressed through each other*):

- conservative — objectively aimed at reproducing the existing life-style in future generations without changes and innovations;
- nihilistic — putting up the slogan of «everything's bad! We can't live a life like this!» yet providing no alternative (or the means to work out an alternative and realize its ideals);
- aspiring to the future — aiming at implementing a certain ideal of how people should live within society and how society should live within the biosphere of the Earth in the future.

The number of representatives of each of the above-mentioned movements and their contents in terms of ideas define the society's prospects.

Thus, in 19th century Russia the ruling classes consisted mainly of people representing the conservative movement who paid no heed to the problems of their era and the need to resolve them. More or less educated

¹ If this view on cause-and-effect relations in social life is accepted, the Great October socialist revolution in Russia, just like any other reform does, happened somewhere in the middle of the interval between two points at which the politically active part of the society finds a new understanding for their past and prospects, as well as for the past and prospects of the entire mankind.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

young people who were psychically unstable or emotionally over-excited represented nihilism. *The void created by the absence of those aspiring to realize in future a certain original Russian ideal¹* was filled up by

¹ 19th century Russia inherited such an absence of aspiration to bright future from older days. K. Valishevsky provides an analysis of the era preceding the reign of Ivan the Terrible and his reign proper in his book “Ivan the Terrible” (Moscow, «IKPA» publishing house, 1989, a reprint of the 1912 edition). He notes that it was typical of Russian art (arts and crafts along with architecture were the prevalent activities of the time, unlike the genres serving to entertain, which prevail today) to imitate all the other cultures and accumulate completely different elements adopted from the outside.

Both Russian and foreign historians who came to discover this fact either left it without comment reporting it as a historically objective fact of life, or drew a conclusion on its grounds about the Russian spirit being creatively barren, sometimes implying this conclusion in the undercurrent.

Though to illustrate the above-mentioned point of view on Russian culture we referred only to K. Valishevsky who speaks only of the era of Ivan the Terrible, such opinions are supported in respect of all the periods of Russian history by many people. The conclusion about creative barrenness of the Russian spirit and the facts of direct and indirect borrowing which justified that conclusion enabled foreign and Russian political scientists of all times to pile up countless doctrines. Foreign scientists devised the means of conquering and colonizing Russia while Russian scientists tried to think of a way to betray their Motherland for a larger price to foreigners who allegedly were advanced in every field. Therefore, when viewed in terms of this global tradition of political and cultural studies Gorbachev’s Perestroika and subsequent pro-Western bourgeois reforms are nothing new.

Actually what had been described by researchers of Russian culture throughout the entire recorded history of Russian multinational civilization as imitation and accumulation of heterogeneous borrowings in one’s own culture while being creatively barren itself is something else. It is one of the aspects of the multinational Russian spirit’s creativity engaged in creating a global civilization and culture which unites all national cultures. This is the past of globalization done the Russian, not the biblical way.

The fact that in the past there was little creative work proper in the generally accepted understanding of this word while the cultural heritage of other nations was being integrated within Russian culture can be explained the following way. It was caused by the Biblical yoke which the regional multinational Russian civilization was developing under, as the Bible was indeed assimilated but was not properly understood.

Due to that fact it was typical of the formally Orthodox Russians to have a double religion during the entire history of the country, and this duplicity

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

distinguished the Russian Orthodox religion from all the foreign Christian religions: Catholicism, Protestantism in all of its modifications and other autonomic Orthodox churches. It was perhaps only the members of the Church hierarchy whose psyche was crushed by the Bible that were free of this religious duplicity.

But among the common Orthodox people having a double religion had been prevalent in the past and is still prevalent nowadays. It reflects itself in the most diverse facts of life. To begin with, during its entire history Russian civilization was free from internal religious wars (the schism dividing the church into Nikonians and Old Believers was an internal matter of the Orthodox church), and the Orthodox people and the people of other religions lived peacefully in their common regions and worked together to the benefit of all. And to end with, the priest who sanctified the farm of an Orthodox peasant did not dare to sanctify his banya (bath-house) as it was not only the place to wash one's body, it was also the place where ancient pagan rituals were performed, which was connected with countless unfounded superstitions and where Orthodox people entered only after they took off their cross worn under the clothes as it would scare off the spirits. And even today many artists claiming to be Orthodox quite often praise Russian paganism and express it in their works.

It is well-known that according to the Bible the history of the Biblical culture must end with disasters of global magnitude: earthquakes, wars, epidemics, etc. One can read about these fine perspective in greater detail in the "Revelation of John the Divine" (Apocalypse) which concludes the canon of the "New Testament" and the Christian Bible on the whole. The West has ousted paganism from its life though it is *a perfectly sensible dialogue between man and God carried out in the language of the phenomena of life* (for a more detailed explanation of what paganism is see the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR "Towards God's Ruling...", "Sufism and Masonry: What the Difference is", "Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences"). Though it is full of superstitions of all sorts, yet it is devoid of religious duplicity: those who are not blunt Satanists, occultists, agnostics or atheists do not doubt in the Bible's being truly a Divine revelation if it is the version corresponding to their faith. Therefore the entire Western world is working in accordance with the algorithms of Biblical sociology and is cheerfully hastening the global disaster that is prescribed by the Bible on the whole and by the Apocalypse in particular.

In Russia Apocalyptic prophecies had indeed always been a cult, and during the country's entire history contemporary calamities had been interpreted in terms of Apocalyptic views and symbolism. But due to double religion the pagan part of the Russian spirit had always objected against the catastrophic end of the modern global civilizations' history predicted without alternatives.

→ → →

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

Marxism. As it gained more popularity, Marxism encouraged thoughtless nihilists to join the internazi revolutionary movement. It offered the socialist ideal to those people who were unhappy with living in the conditions of contemporary Russia while limiting their control over themselves and over social processes by means of Marxist philosophy, conception of global historic process¹ and political economy.

Yet in order to express that alternative in accordance to God's Will it was necessary to find a new understanding of the Bible and refuse to acknowledge its historically formed version as a text of Divine Revelation. Instead, it was necessary, rejecting blunt atheism or Satanism, to proceed from believing in God (or in gods) to the inmost personal belief in trust to God in one's conscience and Life. This opens the way to creating one's own destiny and the destiny of the entire mankind in concord with God's Will.

The entire history of Russia since the christening is the history about the way which the Russian spirit goes by in order to reach that point. And until that point is reached, *the void created by the absence of aspiration to realize in future a certain original Russian ideal* will inevitably be the case, yet as the nature does not tolerate emptiness, this void is filled up with imported Apocalyptic notions different in every epoch. This is typical of the entire culture of pre-revolutionary Russia with minor exceptions: A.S. Pushkin though formally remaining a Biblical Orthodox managed to escape the biblical captivity by means of allegories and symbolism in the narratives of his works of art.

Actually the process of overcoming this void is deeper from the historic point of view, because the very fact of the Biblical culture's appearance in Russia was possible only due to that paganism of Russian culture became mixed with polytheism and idolatry. The Bible historically really became the first widely known religious text which made some note of believing in God the Almighty though all the same the Biblical dogma was distorted by additions the «world backstage» introduced having coveted an **absolute global power over societies** which has nothing to do with God yet is exercised in His name.

¹ It is called «historical materialism» in Marxism and can be briefly described by the following theses: «the man originated from his apelike forefather as a result of labor activity and natural selection»; «class struggle is the moving force of history»; «violence is history's midwife», though violence in this quality is always preceded by hypocrisy breeding ignorance; «social being determines social consciousness».

What is individual consciousness? Most people at least sense it in their personal experience even without understanding it. But «social consciousness» is yet another abstraction invented by Marxism which cannot be consistently understood. Hence come the unfortunate consequences for those who believe

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Along with the above-mentioned movements there are subcultures existing in societies. They can be called «relic» movements. Their bearers who are statistically small in number live their lives following a motto «it used to be better before!» and act politically under the slogan «back to the past!» They go as far as trying to impose the stone age of modern global civilization or even the *customs of Atlantis* which led to its downfall on the future (*during the entire history of the Biblical civilization sjud-masonry has been working to achieve it*).

Most of the «relics» existing today used to be fairly widely spread some time in the past, but they have given up their position and became the lot of social minority as a result of a long-term gradual evolution of culture on the whole and as a result of *short-term changes in life which occurred in the course of revolutions, reforms, conquests, peaceful integration into other cultures, etc.* Yet it would be wrong to say that such relics have had their last day.¹ They exist due to mistakes committed by society in the course of its past cultural development and disclose through all or some of their aspects the defectiveness (incompleteness) and viciousness of the society's culture and subcultures which succeeded in domination to the ones that became «relics».

that this statement is true, as well as for their fellow citizens and their descendants.

To learn how the multitude of individuals generate the collective psyche and how the individual psyche interacts with the collective psyche determining the social being as well as the individual and collective psyche of future generations, see the following works by Internal Predictor of the USSR: “Sufficiently common theory of control” (“Principles of Personnel Policy belonging to a state, an «anti-state», a social initiative”), “On Racial Doctrines: Unfounded, but Plausible”, “Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences”, “The Sorrowful Legacy of Atlantis” (“Trotskyism is «Yesterday», but not «Tomorrow»”), “On imitating and instigating activities”.

¹ In this case there simply would be nobody who supports them among the members of society, and the relics would become «fossils», not subcultures which continue to exist.

This, in particular, can be said of gypsies one of the characteristic traits of whose culture is parasitism on the non-gypsy society which they live in. This quality of gypsy culture has even originated a special verb in the Russian language — «vytsyganit'» (from «tsygan» — gypsy) meaning to persuade, to induce somebody to give something as a «present» despite his own intentions.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

«Relics» *disappear and cease to be a living reproach* for two reasons. Both the subcultures and culture on the whole dominating in the society take from them everything viable that they had previously rejected; or, because people have creatively developed the dominating subcultures and culture on the whole, they get over the defectiveness and viciousness characteristic of them at some historic stages independently.¹

In the periods of transition from one culture dominating the crowd-“elitist” society to another, the former dominating culture does not yet take up the position of a «relic» because its bearers are yet the representatives of the conservative movement of the former dominating culture, large in number, including many the former nihilists scared by the changes which are taking place (or have taken place). In other words, in the period preceding short-term changes in the life of a crowd-“elitist” society, the conservative cultural movement and partially the nihilistic cultural movement, become the reactionary cultural movement. Its political activity is determined both by the nature of the subculture that has become a reactionary one, and the way it is influenced by bearers of other subcultures. When the period of transition comes to an end, the reactionary movement either disappears completely, having given everything valuable to the new dominating culture on the whole and to the subculture prevailing in it, or turns into one of the «relics».

But it is typical of transition periods to have their own «conservative» and «nihilistic» movements. Conservatism of a transition period acts according to the slogan «the goal in itself is nothing! Moving towards it is everything!», though this slogan is not always proclaimed in public. This movement in the culture of a transition period is supported by a part of former nihilists, as well as by those for whom the «era of *endless* changes» creates an opportunity of «fishing in troubled waters». Conservatives of a transition period are not interested in the goals of the

¹ Even if the native people of a culture disappear completely, viable «relics» cannot be destroyed. It is demonstrated by the interest to reconstruct the culture of pre-Columbian American civilization, as well as by the «game» of Indians (including movies) some white Americans play in. The result of those games is that the culture of the native people of those lands still exist as a relic pointing out to Americans the defectiveness and viciousness of their own culture in various aspects.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

reforms and the means of accomplishing them. They approve of any reform which does not endanger (in their opinion) their personal welfare and security and which provides a cover to conceal their shady dealings and frauds. Unlike them, nihilists of a transition period tend to be sincere in claiming their faithfulness to the goals of reforms, yet they do not always accept the means and methods of accomplishing the goals of reforms, the individuals who are in charge of reforms and who carry out reforms. It could also well be that they are not capable of doing anything practical and have to pretend to criticize out of principles — for the sake of fighting for the truth — simply because they are incapable of doing anything well.

Most conservatives of a transition period and most nihilists of a transition period deliberately or unknowingly put on a mask of advocating the movement of aspiring to the future whose true representatives are really bent on realizing the ideals proclaimed as goals of social life transformation.

Beside the above-mentioned movements in the transition period culture there is a smaller or a greater number of confused people. Some of them perish because they lost their purpose in life, though the ways leading to their death can vary; some of them form a «personnel reserve» for active movements of the transition period culture. After they get over the initial confusion, they join the reactionaries, conservatives or nihilists of the transition period or the sincere advocates of the goals proclaimed for the reforms being carried out in the society who aspire to the future. Many confused people become a sort of nomads traveling from one movement to another or support different movements of the transition period culture by different aspects of their activities.

There is no national culture that is devoid of arts. In the life of any society civilized enough artistic work, arts are closely connected with philosophy, history and social science which in their turn influence creative work and arts to the extent that their accomplishments are mastered by the men of arts due to the general development of the society's culture or in the course of self-education. There are several important circumstances in the interaction of arts and sciences.

In the crowd-“elitist” society arts in most cases surpass philosophy and social sciences in the capability to reveal the problems of today and the perspective of the society's life and development.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

The works of philosophy and social science address almost exclusively the intellectual level of psyche of those who encounter them, their direct impact on the emotional component of psyche is at a minimum — emotions arise as a secondary reaction of subconscious levels to the meaning of a scientific work, which the consciousness has grasped. And grasping the meaning of a scientific work in any case requires a sufficient level of preliminary education, both in terms of knowing certain data and possessing the skill of concentrating one's attention and intellect on the subject of a scientific work. Hence many are incapable of understanding scientific treatises of no matter what subject they pursue or how high the level of research described in them is.

As to works of art, they appeal directly both to the level of consciousness and to the subconscious levels of human psyche. Because works of art appeal directly to the subconscious levels of psyche, they turn out to produce a more or less strong effect on anyone who encounters them voluntarily or involuntarily, requiring virtually no preliminary knowledge.¹

The time between the end of the Civil War in 1920 and the murder of J.V. Stalin in 1953 is the transition period.

Therefore any cultural conceptions which do not distinguish between the above-mentioned cultural movements existing in the pre-revolutionary era and in the time of socialist building and the essence of each one of them; the conceptions which do not perceive the nature of transition of said cultural movements past the borderline of the revolution and the Civil War; the conceptions which do not perceive their nature and interaction in the time of building socialism in an individual country led by J.V. Stalin when that country was in a hostile capitalist surrounding; the conceptions which do not see the differences in the nature of scientific philosophical and social works and the works of art, as well as the difference in the ways they are perceived by people — such conceptions are useless and

¹ The issue of forming an artistic taste is important, but essentially it comes to two points. First, how is the rejecting of some artistic styles and ability of enjoying others cultivated. Second, what consequences of such cultivated aversion to some styles and works and enjoying other styles and works will there be for society

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

contribute nothing but factual knowledge for our understanding of that era.

Moreover, nowadays many analysts expressing their opinion on that era, as well as the public which believes those condemnations, tend to forget that our generations are the product and heirs of that era. Consequently we perceive things which had not been usual for social life before that era and which had been introduced exactly due to its coming as natural and customary. The customary nature of what has been passed over to us and what we have become familiar with in our childhood and adolescence as readily available is the reason why nowadays many active politicians, philosophy and social science scholars, men of arts thoughtlessly continue the above-mentioned movements of the transition period culture. Because they thoughtlessly and mechanically reproduce the cultural movements of those years and of even earlier times under new historical circumstances, fifty years after J.V. Stalin was assassinated our society has not managed to pass the next borderline of re-defining its understanding of the past and of working out plans for the future. In other words, to use the slang of computer engineers, the process of transition is buzzing. Therefore it is necessary to compare what is customary and natural for us with what was customary and natural in the era preceding the transition period.

It is natural for us to know how to read and write, though many people have learned that skill without ever learning to feel Life and think about its sense independently. For 1917 Russia it was natural that 85 % of the population could not read or write for which reason they were entirely denied access to written culture. As a consequence, they were limited in acquiring any new knowledge or skill to taking them over by way of demonstration and oral explanation of those who possessed that knowledge or skill. Under such circumstances the society was incapable either of a moral and ethic or spiritual development or scientific and technological progress. To be more precise, the speed at which the society could master and process information was so low that it was doomed to perish under the burden of various problems it itself created and could not resolve in time.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

In the very first decade after the end of the Civil War illiteracy among the adult population was eliminated¹. Also, homeless children who lost their parents during the revolution and the Civil War were provided for. At the same time, the system of popular schooling was being developed. Every year more students were taken in, and the quality of universal compulsory education was gradually improved reaching a standard that allowed people to enter universities and technical schools. At that time many young people had no opportunity to get an education while being fully provided for by their family or society and had to start working while still in their teens. But many of them dreamed of getting a job, which required a specialized secondary or higher education. The Soviet government helped them make that dream come true, creating a system of «rabfaks» (workers' faculties, many of which were established at universities), where young workers and country people could prepare themselves for entering a college. At some of rabfaks students were freed from work and received state scholarships. At other rabfaks students continued to work and used their spare time for studying. Also, a system of evening schools, technical schools, night and correspondence education at universities was developed for those who had started to work before acquiring the education desired.

Thanks to the opportunities of getting a specialized secondary (a technical school) or higher professional education created by the Soviet

¹ This is a qualitative transformation of society, its impact on daily life and its consequences being by far greater than those of introducing computer and Internet technologies which process we are witnesses and participants of today.

Opponents may say that the government of Nicholas II worked out a program that provided for eliminating illiteracy by 1920. Yet, they would say, World War I, the revolution and the Civil War impeded its realization. Such opponents should know that, first, Russia had no reasons to enter that war — it was to continue the peaceful policy of P. Stolypin, and there would be neither a revolution, nor a Civil War; second, it was as far back as Alexander III who had a chance of issuing a decree on eliminating illiteracy and developing popular schooling instead of issuing a decree about «the cook's children» which denied access to education for common people. If accompanied by righteous internal policy, this could create a personnel reserve of people loyal to the state who could resolve the problem of social development of the multinational Russian civilization by way of reform and not by way of a revolutionary upheaval.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

government, a large number of young people entered the field of science, technology and art. Prior to 1917 they were denied this opportunity¹ due to the order of castes and classes where the hierarchy of unrighteously made fortunes prevailed. On this basis new schools of science, design and engineering started to spring up and old ones began developing in the USSR as early as the 1920-s. It was the support of scientific and RD schools that outstanding Russian scientists and inventors lacked in the pre-revolutionary years, because starting from the middle of the 19th century science and engineering were becoming the field for collective activity where a man of genius having no support of highly qualified and educated associates was going to accomplish nothing on his own.

As a result of this policy, as far back as the early 1950-s the educational level of the USSR's population (i.e. of workers and farmers — the most numerous classes of that era) came to be the highest in the world. The USSR was also leading in the number of university students per one thousand of population, by far exceeding advanced capitalist countries in terms of this characteristic. One should also keep in mind, that in the early 1950-s our secondary education (which became compulsory at the end of the USSR's existence) and higher education conformed to the highest standards on the world scale when educational system of different states were compared.²

¹ Many people got the opportunity of verifying this statement by their own experience and the experience of their children and grand-children after the bourgeois reformers came to power.

² Even in the 1970-s when diplomas of most Soviet universities and colleges were not recognized in advanced capitalist countries, the graduates of our universities were superior to foreign graduates in the field of fundamental education allowing them to easily master the applied factual material which has always been serving (with minor exceptions) as the basis of the entire Western system of higher professional education.

Our diplomas were not recognized in the West due to two factors. First, the applied factual material necessary for working in the USSR and in the West was different. Second, due to the closed nature of Western professional corporations.

That our system of education whose principles had not changed since the times of Stalin was better than the Western one even at the end of «zastoy» (stagnation) can be proven by the fact that graduates of Soviet colleges take up a disproportionately large share among the theoretical physicists, chemists and programmers of the USA. Our graduates were taught not how to do things, they

→ → →

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

Owing to the accomplishments of scientific and engineering design schools developing on the basis of the immense personnel resource encompassing the entire people, by the early 1950s the Soviet Union became independent from foreign science and technology in the sense that our science and industry became capable of developing and producing on their own everything that was necessary for the state which in many aspects worked for the interests of the majority of workers. One has to admit though that the share of pioneering developments (ones which are first in the world) was small in that period, because in the 1920-s — 1940-s the Soviet Union was mostly assimilating foreign accomplishments in order to bridge the educational gap between Russia and advanced countries and to break free from the dependence of almost all the branches of industry and science on them inherited from the Russian empire.

All these factors combined created objective prerequisites for the USSR to continue developing culturally, scientifically and technically at a faster pace than advanced capitalist states. Yet the educational system created at the time had one fundamental flaw:

The Marxist cult existing in the society perverted the entire complex of philosophic and social sciences and psychology, impeded the proper development of biology and medicine which is based on general biology.¹

Owing to the perverted nature of the complex of sciences on man and society, a discord between sciences, first of all philosophy and social science, and creative work in all arts was unavoidable in the USSR.² Yet

learned how things are interconnected in nature and technology, and this fundamental knowledge allowed them when necessary to answer the question of how to do things on their own, thereby resolving applied problems.

¹ Russia will spend many decades to overcome the consequences of that perversion.

² The conflict of worldviews called «physicists and lyric poets» (natural scientists, engineers and those educated in the humanities) sprung up in the late 1950-s — early 1960-s and was one of the late expressions of that discord. Yet the name given to that conflict is inaccurate: making natural sciences, called «physics», the object of the «lyric poets» criticism, this name helped the philosophy prevailing in educated circles escape that criticism, though it is

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

given the dominant position of Marxism within the educational system this discord was beneficial for the society and its future perspective, because in a crowd-“elitist” society arts and creative work in most cases surpass philosophy and social science in revealing the society’s current problems and future life and development prospects.¹ Of course, this statement holds true in respect of not every work of art and not every scientific work. It holds true in respect of heterogeneous creative work on the whole as a type of activity and of science as a type of activity.

Therefore, without understanding that there existed a discord between artistic work and philosophy and social science it is impossible to understand the essence of that artistic style which was later termed «socialist realism». And it is equally impossible to understand the essence and role of the so-called «avant-gardism and modernism» in all of its manifestations, which were inherited by the transition period era from the pre-revolutionary times.

First of all, after the Soviet state was established, a revision of the Empire’s artistic heritage was begun. The works of pre-revolutionary conservative and reactionary movements were no longer being published (literature, art) or reproduced (music, plays). Some were banned, part of them destroyed, part hidden in the depositories of museums, archives and libraries. In our era the works of the pre-revolutionary nihilistic movement are known as works of «critical realism»² and the works of all sorts of «avant-gardism» in literature, theatre, art and music.

philosophy which is in any epoch the source of methods and accomplishments of natural sciences.

¹ Proof of this statement is provided in the following works by Internal Predictor of the USSR: “The Small House in Kolomna” (a comment on the story of the same name by A. Pushkin), “Ruslan and Lyudmila” (How the state of Russian people and the peoples of the USSR developed and came into being in the course of the global historic process, expressed by means of imagery belonging to the First Russia’s Poet A. Pushkin), “Copper Horseman is Something Different from the Copper Snake...”, “«Master and Margaret»: a Hymn to Demonism? Or the Gospel of the Covenantless Faith”.

² They all share the spirit of despair and insolubility of social problems considered by the authors because those problems themselves are created by the unnatural Biblical culture which the authors could not rid themselves of. This is the very reason why they are attributed to the nihilistic cultural movement.

They have no «positive hero» whom contemporaries could imitate and thereby arrive at the future happiness of the society. The fates of all characters

→ → →

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

One should also keep in mind, that in every era «avant-gardism and modernism» is not a homogeneous phenomenon. Along with pursuit of new forms and ways to express a meaning in works of art, there is the morally and psychically unhealthy constituent in it which either reflects the delirium of mentally ill people, or the demonically unhealthy ambition of a person who has nothing to say or show people yet is awfully keen on asserting him or herself by becoming known as a great artist, actor, poet or musician. And in the times of social crisis «avant-gardism» is represented mostly by works of art reflecting moral and psychic morbidity or aggressive striving for self-assertion or the demonic ambition of fame. This applies to the overwhelming majority of «avant-garde» “masterpieces” of the pre-revolutionary and post-revolutionary times.

It was the course of history that by the time of the revolution the authors of «critical realism» works were either dead or managed to join the consuming “elite” of the empire.

Those of the men of arts belonging to this movement who had survived the revolution refused to accept the new regime not only because they were afraid of repressions. To a large extent the reason was their unwillingness to lose that hard-won “elite” status. As a result, many of them left for foreign countries (I. Bunin, I. Repin, A. Gorky). When life in the USSR became stable, some of them agreed to return to their motherland. Here those who returned continued working but performed different roles (A. Tolstoy and A. Gorky: A. Tolstoy was an active socialist realist writer, while A. Gorky was *considered to be the founder* and personification of socialist realism, though he was rather a devoted nihilist than a realist aspiring to the future).

The others died abroad (I. Repin, I. Bunin), refusing to return to their homeland and thereby to «serve the regime» which would employ their creative work or authority (so they thought), the regime where national bolshevism and anti-national Marxist psychic Trotskyism — equally alien to them — were intertwined. Yet actually they refused to serve not the regime but their people because they refused to contribute their artistic work to the cause of separating bolshevism and psychic Trotskyism in all

from Chatsky, Onegin, and Pechorin to Bazarov and Dostoyevsky’s heroes are warnings, saying: do not follow them but look for other ways to shape your destiny and the destiny of the society.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

fields of people's life, and thereby they refused to contribute to the cause of liberating the country and people from the power of psychic Trotskyism.

The conservative cultural movement existing in the USSR of the period of transition to socialism consists of permanent revolutionary Marxist psychic Trotskyites from the ideological point of view, and from the artistic style point of view — of all sorts of abstractionist avant-gardism which is the expression of psychic Trotskyism. In other words, in psychic Trotskyism there was no conflict between its social science and art. But there *was* a conflict between psychic Trotskyism and life. That is why many who genuinely searched for new forms and ways to express the sense of Life in art and aspired to the future could not survive in that environment. One of them was V. Mayakovsky who became known as an avant-garde futurist¹ poet as far back as the pre-revolutionary years. There were also many others who were hunted down by the members of RAPP² and of other associations of r-r-revolutionary artists.

The bolshevist leadership of the USSR headed by J.V. Stalin was not mistaken³ in equating the political fraction of the All-Union Communist

¹ The name of the movement is derived from «future». It shows that V. Mayakovsky looked for the way to the bright future and was not an advocate of avant-gardism as such which is permanently nihilistic and therefore useless to society. In most cases avant-gardism can be characterized by a joke:

- *Art should be useful...*
- *Useful for people?*
- *No, for the artist.*

V. Mayakovsky cared for people's happiness, not for becoming a well-to-do businessman who fools the fastidious bourgeois and empties their pockets, like one of the 20th centuries best-known avant-gardists — Pablo Picasso — once confessed.

² Russian association of proletarian writers.

³ The opposition to the bureaucratic regimes and socialist ideals continued to express itself artistically in nihilistic avant-gardism in the post-1953 times. The so-called «Bulldozed exhibition» of the Khrushchev period was aimed directly at stimulating this artistic movement.

But nihilism is barren, as the history of post-1985 artistic development in Russia demonstrated. It is barren in the following sense: in the Soviet era every work of art was aimed at expressing some kind of idea. Nihilistic avant-gardism is devoid of ideas. Or, more precisely, it has only one idea — permissiveness of instinctive manifestations. But instincts are the same for everyone, and perversions of instincts bring nothing new: they remain to be

→ → →

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

Party (Bolsheviks) led by L. Bronstein (Trotsky) which formed the opposition to bolshevists and the avant-gardism in the post-revolutionary art, though many men of arts did not understand then and do not understand now the reasons for the bolshevists to reject avant-gardism and the goals of suppressing it.

The reality is that most of mentally ill people are not aware of their illness. It is mainly schizophrenic people and dopers who applaud to schizophrenia and ravings stimulated by dopes (from cigarettes and alcohol to heavier drugs) expressed in artistic work. What schizophrenic and delirious art, especially the one produced by men of great talent, evokes from mentally healthy people is mainly pity. But apart from complete mental cases — those who have a more or less acute mental disease, there are quite a lot of people in a crowd-“elitist” society whose psychic stability and self-control leave much to be desired. And such people, depending on what circumstances they find themselves in, what kind of art (above all, music, art, cinema and in future computer interactive¹ games and virtual plays) they are influenced by, can either become mentally ill or escape this unfortunate lot which is dangerous both for themselves and their fellow citizens.

Therefore one must distinguish suppressing **nihilistic** avant-gardism, which does not care about the people’s future destiny from oppressing a creative search of novel artistic forms and means of expressing the sense of Life in art. Suppressing **nihilistic** avant-gardism is objectively the means of protecting teenagers whose psyche is still being molded, as well as many adult mentally unstable people, preventing them from becoming more or less mad owing to the influence of avant-garde art. This is a

instincts under different covers and nothing else. Most «discoveries» of the avant-gardism of the late 20th century repeat the perversions of Russian pre-revolutionary decadence. The only difference lies in applying modern technical achievements that were not known in those times.

¹ I.e. those working in a dialogue with the program running on a multimedia computer which generates a certain video stream, accompanying sound and in future — a stream of other artificial sensations of the imaginary game reality.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

means of protecting the society's moral and psychic health¹, though since it cannot substitute the rest of such means it isn't self-sufficient.

¹ It is known that substances with a drug-like effect are produced in the organism of a man who falls under the influence of rock-music. Therefore the slogan «Rock-music against drugs» is nonsense: rock-music is a drug itself.

Besides, by suppressing the psyche with short bars and jagged and phase-shifted rhythms, rock-music is capable of suppressing the inner co-ordination of the sensitive and intellectual activity rhythms for a certain time, thereby making the people dependant on it dumb and narrow-minded.

As shown by subsequent investigation, the 19-year old lad who shot dead 16 people at a school in Erfurt on April 26, 2002 (13 teachers, two schoolchildren and a policewoman who arrived at the site of the tragedy among the police unit) and after that shot himself, was brought up by a single mother who did not cope with his upbringing. As a result, he was expelled from school for missing classes and forging documents after he was left in the same form for the second year. He was a fan of computer «shooter» games and rock-music, and a song was found among his «music» records that contained the words like «kill your teacher with a shotgun». A person in that kind of moral and mental condition was yet a legal holder of a weapon and a member of a shooting club, which is evidence of the fact that it was not only him but also German state officials who had big problems with mental health and with conscience, especially taking into account that it is by far more than the first incident of the kind in Germany and the USA.

Scarcely more than a week after the disaster in Germany which was given a cult status by the mass media, especially online ones, all across Europe, on April 30th news came of a similar tragedy that occurred in a school on the territory of former Yugoslavia: a thirteen-year-old teenager shot down several teachers and himself.

Of course, in most cases there is no strict conditionality of a person's behavior, connecting art and actions. But on the scale of society such dependency reflected in the behavior of a part of the people is revealed by means of statistics. But the people belonging to the I-centric individualist psychical type proceed from the absence of the strict dependency of actions on art in the general case and bluntly refuse to take in that statistics of social life, refuse to make it an object of state policy and the policy of public organizations. And this makes them nothing less than rascals.

This is one of the **many** circumstances leading to the question: is the artist responsible for the consequences his art has? Or is it the victims of his artistic work and their victims who are responsible for the consequences?

That is why, when M. Zhvanetsky in one of his stories called KGB agents «the fine arts scholars in civilian clothes» he was essentially right: **fine art studies are one of the lines of state and social security**. But it was known before M. Zhvanetsky.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

During the last two decades of the USSR's existence the intelligentsia (mostly people with I-centric individualist or individualist-corporate cast of psyche) has been making lots of fun over «socialist realism». It has been the custom to accuse it of creative barrenness, servility towards the ruling regime which caused socialist realist artists do nothing but embellish, decorate and create a false impression of the «foul socialist» reality.

Everyone got their share: M. Sholohov for “Virgin Soil Upturned” and for the alleged plagiarism of “The Quiet Don”¹, A. Gorky for being at the head of the team of authors who wrote the book “The Stalin Channel”² about how the White sea — Baltic sea channel was designed and built between 1929 and 1932 by prisoners of the NKVD's GULAG (special prisoner servitude camps). But it was the cinema that received the largest share of condemnation, as cinema in the USSR was a state monopoly serving the state's policy from the very beginning. Due to the exclusively state nature of cinema in the USSR it must be considered the most prominent manifestation of socialist realism both at its best and at its worst.

Let us therefore turn to cinema. “The Kuban Cossacks” movie alone suffered hundreds of attacks and accusations from the democratisers for its false bombast (affluence in a kolkhoz in the days of crops failure and famine of the 1949), for embellishing and «embroidering» the reality. Yet at the time this film had many fans, including people in Kuban. The critics of the democratic wing explain such examples of socialist realist arts'

¹ A. Solzhenitsin has not yet apologized for this calumny, which he so energetically disseminated.

² It is a very interesting book, by the way. **Even nowadays it would be useful to republish it as a textbook for the faculties of history, sociology and law at universities.** It speaks the truth, though not the whole truth, about the White sea — Baltic sea camp of the NKVD. The book reveals the principles on which the system of correctional institutions should ideally be based.

Those who disagree with this approach should know that if society has to have prisons, it must define the aims and principles of running them. And it should take care in practical everyday life that this system of penalty execution and correction operates in conformity to those aims and principles, which are originally determined by the power of social life conception adopted by the society.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

popularity by saying that people escaped from the dreadful Soviet reality into a world of dreams.

They seem to be sure that Bolsheviks, the advocates of socialism and communism, have nothing to disprove that assumption with. But those who *think so* actually enter an intellectual blind alley, because that assumption leads to a very simple question:

What was it that people returned with back to the world of Soviet reality from the world of dreams created in socialist realist movies and other arts?

The most general answer would be that they returned from the world of Soviet movie-dreams with something completely different from what modern teenagers come back with from the world of Hollywood movie-dreams and what drunkards and other drug addicts of all times including the times of bourgeois reforms in Russia come back with from their drug-dreams.

Of course, socialist realism altogether was not a homogeneous phenomenon. It did have servility to the regime amounting to vindication of all abuses committed by officials and attempts to prove them non-existent, as well as claiming any accusations directed against those officials to be calumny. But there was also something else, something which makes the answer to the question about the way of coming back from the world of dreams evoked by socialist realism to the social and historic reality to be the answer to the question about the true nature of socialist realism and its historic momentum which is very much different from the opinions of the dissident intelligentsia. This statement cannot be proven logically. But art speaks for itself, not depending on the manner in which it is presented by the critics and what terms they use to define its styles and genres. Let us then turn to facts.

A film festival showing 37 Soviet films, beginning from the times of Stalin and ending with the early 1960-s, took place in 2000 in New-York. All the local critics who had by that time no reasons to be afraid of the military and economic might of the «superstate № 2» and to perform the order of their country's authorities, declared unanimously and rapturously: **«This is some kind of a different civilization!»**

And this was the *essentially* correct *assessment* of true socialist realism. In order to understand the reasons why the Americans having a huge experience in film industry responded so rapturously to old films of

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

the Soviet era (which also had technical drawbacks in comparison to Hollywood technical masterpieces of the late 20th century), we should turn to another occurrence which has a thematic relationship to that film festival.

In the middle 1990-s an exhibition of art and sculpture of the Stalin's bolshevism era was held in Europe with triumphant success. The show also visited Russia: it was exhibited in the Russian museum (St. Petersburg) under the title "**The Campaign for Happiness**". This aspiration for the bright and happy future for all laborers is the core essence of *true* socialist realism of the Stalin bolshevism era preserved by the leading artists of all the Soviet republics in the later years.

Having watched the 37 Soviet movies, Americans responded not just to propaganda of strange ideas, they responded to the campaign for the happiness of each and every member of society organized on different moral and ethic principles. While they were scared of the USSR earlier, those principles expressed in the behavior of film characters not only frightened them no more, they became attractive for many of them when its might ceased to pose a threat.¹ Hence the rapturous and essentially correct response: «This is some kind of a different civilization».

Yes, it is a different — new global civilization, which is to come. Its moral and ethics were demonstrated in the best works of socialist realist arts which utilized the means of the techno sphere of the 20th century's 1st half. And this essence — the campaign for happiness which is really possible, which is to be achieved in life through the labor of people themselves, through their moral and ethics — is what

¹ Is there someone who wouldn't like to live in a society where it is safe to walk the streets of a large city at night, or stroll in a park alone or with a loved one without endangering oneself to an attack or abuse? Is there someone who wouldn't like to live in a society where children are safe in the streets, at school (were there any schoolchildren and teachers killed in Soviet schools by their nutty armed fellow students?) and while driving in a bus, and where any adult will help a child? Is there someone who wouldn't like to live in a society where a skilled doctor lends help in the nick of time and is interested in curing the patient, not in the customer's wallet? — One may continue asking those questions relating to the comparison of the civil society's reality and the world of «dreams» evoked by the works of socialist realism art. And it is the civil society of capitalism that fails to provide answers to those questions.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

is beyond the comprehension of the morally perverted people who denounce socialist realism of the Soviet era on the whole and of the Stalin bolshevist era in particular.

This campaign for happiness is essentially much more positive and creative than the whole lot of Hollywood fights on Earth and in space, sex and devilry which is poured daily into the minds of Russians and Americans from all the TV channels and which is nothing else than a campaign for *disasters and permanent unhappiness led in the crowd-“elitist” society*.

US criminalists have for a long time known that this is true because the deliberate imitation of movie rascals and heroes driven into a corner by the circumstances set by the script is manifested in all the spheres of crime statistics.

And there is also the *unintentional* reproduction of screen horrors (both *individual and collective*), which enter people’s lives as a result of programming of the individual and social psyche performed by the films.¹ The terror attacks of September 11th, 2001 are among other things the culmination of the influence American movie business has had on the life of American society. It was not therefore caused by chance that right after September 11th the horrified Americans chose not to distribute many films containing violence or having a Satanist, criminal or terrorist theme. Yet their patience will not last long: under the circumstances of bourgeois «liberalism» the profit of a private business is more important than social life security, therefore art criticism and art direction within the course of a certain state policy are out of competence of US top governmental bodies and special services², unlike the USSR (particularly the USSR of the Stalin bolshevist period).

In the times of Stalin’s bolshevism the society was influenced by the art of «critical realism» which concentrated on how bad a life of a

¹ This aspect can be revealed as a decrease in crime following the end of violence and devilry shown in movie theatres and on television, yet the film industry bosses will never let that happen: profit at any cost.

² Otherwise it only remains to assume that the campaign for unhappiness carried out by artistic means is one of the aims of US state policy.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

common man is under crowd-“elitism”¹, as well as by the art of «socialist realism» which was supposed to show the proper way of establishing such relationships between people in everyday life and in work (collective work because there is no other within the historically formed technosphere) that every person working conscientiously could live happily.

This is the theme of the films «Counter-plan» (about working enthusiasm), «The Kuban Cossacks», «The Tale of Siberian Land», «The Big Family» (based on a novel by V. Kochetov «The Zhurbins»), «The Work You Serve», «My Dear Man» (based on the novels by Yu. German), «Volunteers», «Valery Chkalov» and others. There were also movies about how one should love and protect **one's own** Soviet government and socialism — *the people's power, achieved by the common people through much suffering and blood in the course of the Great October socialist revolution and the Civil War* («Ironclad» «Potyomkin», «Chapayev», «An Optimistic Tragedy», «The Quiet Don», «How Steel Was Hardened», «The Dagger») and defended in the Great Patriotic war («The Story of a Real Man», «The Youth Guards», «In the Trenches of Stalingrad», «Two Captains»)².

¹ Besides, it taught people «manners» — the norms of politeness existing in the ruling classes of the Russian empire.

² One of the paradoxical features of the epoch and of artistic works, which are ascribed to «socialist realism» according to the above-mentioned principle of expressing the campaign for happiness, consists in that many of those works were created by talented unscrupulous time-servers who were no Bolsheviks and communists by their views, moral and actual behavior. This was demonstrated by the diaries of some of them published subsequently and by the previously unknown facts of their biographies disclosed by contemporaries, as well as their own creative activity in the time succeeding the era of Stalin's bolshevism.

Among such time-servers were V. Vishnevsky — the author of «An Optimistic Tragedy», and A. Rybakov — the author of «The Dagger» and «*The Children of Arbat*» — *an extremely shallow and therefore a slanderous book about that epoch.*

One might ask: how should we treat the fact that a bolshevist state was creating its culture through the talent of those who were essentially its opponents? In our opinion one should treat that fact like one treats the ride to St.Petersburg on Christmas night that the devil gave to Vakula the blacksmith in one of the stories by Nikolai Gogol: *If one has to continue with one's cause but has nothing to use but evil forces, with God's help one may use even them.*

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Another question which arises in connection to the essence of socialist realism is the following one: how could such films as «Peter I», «Alexander Nevsky», «Ivan the Terrible» appear in its framework contrary to the Marxist ideas of the so-called «proletarian internationalism» and «world revolution»? One of the popular opinion is that as soon as J.V. Stalin «felt the smell of fire» (as soon as he became aware of the threat from Hitler's Germany), he forgot immediately about K. Marx, «proletarian internationalism», «world revolution», «classless society» and other kinds of ideological cover used to disguise his personal dictatorship, and decided to produce an artistic representation of imperial patriotism which he personally needed to cynically retain his power for the sake of power.

But the point is that J.V. Stalin acted not according to immediate circumstances but according to a long-term political strategy, and his regime was not power for the sake of personal power as many have thought it to be and still do so now. Those were not the films about the imperial crowd-“elitist” patriotism in the spirit of «for faith, for the tsar and for country» and about the right of the sovereign who is obsessed with lies and flattery of his associates to execute or grant pardon to loyal subjects and traitors alike. These are films about the bolshevist nationwide civilizational building¹ in the past and about the mistakes committed in the course of that building which resulted in countless victims and ruined lives of many generations.

Maybe those who are being used will change their minds and become less evil than they used to be...

¹ Russia is the regional civilization of many peoples. It is different from other regional civilizations by being the only truly regional civilization, which has been developing for the largest part of its history within the borders of a state common for all of its peoples. Due to this circumstance patriotism in Russia can be manifested both as devotion to its civilizational building and in the sense widely used in the West as devotion to a state structure which has formed on a certain territory in the course of history. If Russian history is analyzed, it is clear that the common people of Russia have been more or less consciously engaged in civilizational building while the national “elites” were molding state structure to their own benefit. Due to such a division of labor by castes, as soon as the “elite” state system became an obstacle to civilizational building, the “elite” immediately declared the common people of Russian regional civilization unpatriotic in the sense of being devoted to the historically formed state system.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

In other words the essence of genuine artistic work within the style of so-called «socialist realism» is its being objectively aspired to the righteous future. And the era of Stalin's bolshevism is the era when this artistic movement was lent purposeful support by the state for the first time in history.

This kind of state support was effective to the extent to which the state's officials who were more or less involved in lending that support acted to their good will and understood the problems and prospects of the society, — on the one hand. And on the other hand, its effectiveness was justified by how sincerely artists themselves were devoted to the ideal and the cause of achieving a social happiness for everyone who refuse to acknowledge the right of others to act parasites either on themselves or on others. It was also determined by how much yielding to circumstances the unscrupulous yet talented time-servers were expressing that ideal and its practicability by their works in such a way that the society and above all the younger generations would respond.

Notwithstanding the mistakes and deliberate perversion of this artistic and political line by statesmen and the artists' prostitution on the system of their work's state support, **it was the art of socialist realism that in the times of Stalin's bolshevism gave the society what philosophy and social science could not give — the feeling that happiness on Earth is possible and that the cause of bolshevism is objectively a right one, the feeling of a safe future.**

Thanks to the masterpieces created by socialist realism art in the era of Stalin's bolshevism and later, the cause of bolshevism survived Stalin's death, survived Khrushchev's times, «zastoi» (stagnation), perestroika (reconstruction) and the bourgeois reforms of the 1990-s.

It was the art of socialist realism that enabled the society to bridge the gap between science and artistic work. The final and supreme achievement of socialist realism was the science-fiction novel by Ivan Antonovitch¹ Yefremov "The Hour of the Bull". The gap between science and art is not yet bridged in that novel, but Ivan Antonovitch did approach

¹ Real patronymic is Antipovitch.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

in it the borderline by crossing which one will eliminate that gap once and for all.

The novel could have become a work of global momentum. After it was published and became widely known, Stanley Kubrick, the American film director among whose works are such well-known and popular movies as “Spartac” and “Space Odyssey 2001”, suggested making a screen version of the novel. But the psychic Trotskyite party and state officials of the USSR rejected the project out of hand, and it was never fulfilled.

It was also thanks to socialist realism that the USSR under the leadership of J.V. Stalin was prepared to Victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941 — 1945 and was indeed victorious. The generation born in the years of 1905 — 1914 played a special role in that victory. Their childhood passed in the pre-revolutionary period, but their personal development as teenagers took place while socialism and the culture of the new society were being practically established, and many of them took part in that process.

Unlike the older generations they were young when the revolution and the Civil War broke out and were open in their feelings and understanding, and unlike younger generations they had a personal and distinctly remembered experience of pre-revolutionary life, not some abstract notions based on *incomplete* stories told by elders, books and other works of art. Besides, their personal development as teenagers was taking place in a period when the Soviet party and state crowd-“elitism” had not yet time enough to develop. Later it grew to the extent enabling it to turn some teenagers (the minority) into demons permanently opposed to any regime, and some of them (the majority) — into zombies, programmed by Marxist ideology, which has paralyzed their will. This is what happened to people of younger generations with minor exceptions.

Owing to the above-mentioned reasons the people born in the years of 1905 — 1914 were active in building and defending socialism in the USSR and therefore considered the Soviet power to be truly their own — the power of the working people which they were a part of.

The Soviet party and state crowd-“elitism” was created by another generation — the one whose youth, not the teens fell on the Civil War period. It was this generation that produced active bureaucrats and time-servers who used the Soviet governmental bodies and the party as a means

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

to pursue their personal, family and clan interests, who advocated the ideas of socialism and social justice only to the extent which conformed to their end of remaining in power. The theme of this hypocrisy in respect to the ideals of revolution and communism was also reflected in the epochal work of socialist realism — the novel by N. Ostrovsky (1904 — 1936) “How Steel Was Hardened”.

It was the generation born in 1905 — 1914 that many outstanding figures in the field of art, science, education, military belonged to. Yet most of them did not make a bright career because the generation of activists who emerged during the Civil War was still young and refused to give up their hard-earned top posts in the party and governmental bodies and professional corporations.

While the generation of Bolsheviks born in 1905 — 1914 was still active and numerous, those bent on restoring capitalism simply had no personnel reserves to recruit the executors of their plans. That is why nothing like the restoration of capitalism carried out openly in 1985 could occur while they lived actively, even though this generation of Bolsheviks was demoralized by the lies of the 20th and 22nd Conventions of the CPSU.¹

This was possible because that generation believed in Marxism which they had only a superficial (skin-deep) knowledge of. As a result, they misunderstood the cause-and-effect relations within historic processes. Besides, this superficial knowledge of Marxism was accompanied by the

¹ The worst lie was the thesis: «Stalin is to be blamed for everything which happened in the USSR while he was head of state».

The point is that the statements «it happened while Stalin was head of state» and «Stalin is to blame» are not necessarily equivalent and complementary. Much of what was typical of the Stalin’s bolshevism era and is now condemned was caused by events that had happened even before J.V. Stalin was born.

Historic processes proceed with phase shifts — the events are retarded in respect of their causes as it happens in all natural processes. The statement «Stalin is to blame for everything that happened in the USSR while he was head of state» ignores the retardation of events in respect to their causes and is therefore a folly, which allows lying while reporting sound facts. Yet this folly is the basis of the entire “denunciation of J. Stalin” matter brought up in the times of Khrushchev and perestroika.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

belief that all the three sources, all the three constituents of Marxism were true (the theory of socialism, philosophy, political economy). And firmest was the belief in its philosophy and political economy as scientific grounds of socialism and communism. If one shares this belief, then L. Bronstein (Trotsky) appears to be a true communist and idealist, an uncompromising romantic revolutionary. Consequently all his accusations and similar accusations brought by Khrushchev's nomenclature against J.V. Stalin for perversion of Soviet power, oppressing democracy within the party and in the society appear to be just.¹ The falsehood of these assertions is exposed only when Marxist philosophy and political economy are proven inconsistent, and L. Bronstein proclaimed his faithfulness to Marxism until the very end of his days.

But if one does not know that Marxism is inconsistent and dooms Marxists to the inescapable discrepancy of their *unpractical words* and their *actual doings*, judging from words one is led to believe that L. Bronstein is right, he and other Marxist of «Lenin guards» are victims while J.V. Stalin is a power-greedy tyrant, usurper, who perverted the scientific ideas and the practice of building communism.

Without going into the essence of Marxist philosophy and political economy it is *impossible* to counter Marxism and its well-meaning bombast and disclosures of actual and imaginary wrongs of Stalin's bolshevism by intellectual rational means — *on the basis of language culture*.

Modern Marxist psychic Trotskyism and its political organization called «IV International» are supported by the universal ignorance of what Marxist philosophy and political economy are practically. In order to break free one must imagine that one is personally solving the problems of running a country on the basis of Marxism. Then many things will become clear: the basic question of philosophy is a «wrong» one and is useless from the managerial point of view, that political economy and accounting are different things, that the pattern of production exchange

¹ The same goes to the accusations against J.V. Stalin and the post-Stalin USSR brought by A. Sakharov, psychical Trotskyite and anti-Marxist, and his followers: as sociologists and historians they are all barren flowers and perverts, who were not intellectually countered by the regime of Brezhnev and Gorbachev simply because it chose not to.

6.5. «Social Realism» as a Means of Overcoming ... of Marxism

between branches of economy cannot be brought down to the first and second divisions distinguished in Marxism.

But nobody from among the so-called communists gets involved in it — almost everyone thinks it enough for him and for the cause of communism to support the leaders of a certain party. This gives the leaders an opportunity to shepherd the mob of the believers in communism on the basis of Marxism.

The same explains the victory of psychic Trotskyism at the 20th and 22nd CPSU Conventions which served as one of the reasons of the *lifeless* «freedom-loving» cherished by the «men of the sixties» (the generation, which mentality was formed by Khrushchev's policies of the 1960s) who lapsed into kitchen intrigues, drunken poetry-making and raging non-conformity, of *zastoi* (stagnation), of emergence of perestroika in 1985 and of the collapse of the USSR in 1991.

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism in the Second World War of the 20th Century

On the whole by late 1930-s the success of the USSR in the matter of building a new system of inter-social relationship in one country was indisputable, although the economic aspect of the new civilization was based upon the forced technical and technological support of developed capitalist countries which I have already mentioned in the previous chapters.

Here it's appropriate to remind that «world backstage» was going to spread the achievements of the social experiment in the USSR into other countries. That is why during the whole process of the socialistic building from World War I to World War II various authoritative representatives of the western intelligentsia were coming to Russia, traveling around the country communicating with simple people in their work and rest and with sundry nomenclature “elite”, and even attending public trials over the enemies of the people etc. Although there were different comments¹, on the whole the *non-state* propaganda on behalf of the authoritative representatives of the western intelligentsia was of pro-Soviet character rather than of anti-Soviet character and it contributed to forming the favorable attitude in the bourgeois democracy countries to the social experiment in USSR.

In those years the general public (especially the educated and enlightened part of it) was more afraid of a Hitler dictatorship rather than of a Stalin dictatorship especially since «anti-Semitism» was considered an especially dangerous crime in the USSR and the «persistent anti-Semites» could pay with their lives since the criminal codes of different Union republics provided different punishment for it up to death by shooting (supposedly due to the extent of anti-Semitism there).

The implementation of the world socialist revolution was still on the global scenario by «world backstage» in those years, it only was to

¹ Andre Gide gave a negative comment in his book “Return from the USSR”, while Lion Feuchtwanger gave a positive comment in his book “Moscow. 1937”. See the book “Two looks from abroad”, Moscow, “Izdatelstvo Politicheskoi Literaturi”, 1990. For comments on both of the above-mentioned reports of the trips to the USSR see the work of the Internal Predictor of the USSR “On imitating and instigating activities”.

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

happen under the new historical conditions. The transition to socialism was meant to happen after the liberation of continental Europe from Hitler's yoke (at the first stage) during the liberation campaign of the Red Army to Europe.

V.B.Rezun (pen-name — V.Suvorov) passionately defends this supposition in his books “Icebreaker”, “The M-Day” and others, but he ascribes this scenario to Josef Stalin himself rather than to the world supra-government «backstage» which he is reluctant to either notice directly or to deduce its existence by applying the analytical methods for various social statistic figures; methods well-known to him from his work in the intelligence service. That is why this is not «world backstage» working through the western sjid-masonry which V. Suvorov claims to be the aggressor, but the USSR, attacked by the other aggressor — fascist Germany — in order to forestall the soviet assault which was supposedly to have come in approximately two weeks¹.

But in fact, the biblical «world backstage» had begun its existence long before Josef Stalin took the lead of the USSR. Throughout the whole biblical epoch of the global civilization it was making the global political scenarios in order to fulfill their doctrine (enclosed in the Appendix at the end of this book). Meanwhile in 1941 according to the global political scenario of «world backstage» the USSR was not to initialize the war anymore, even under the pretext of liberating Europe from Hitler's yoke.

Firstly, the public opinion of the majority in Europe and America did not see the direction of the global historical process, but considered the history of the states to be only a sequence of incoherent and meaningless fortuities. Hence, the public opinion was utterly unfavorable towards the attempt to restore the Soviet power in Finland² during the winter war of

¹ The only thing to praise Rezun for is that he was the first to show the great and diverse work, which was carried out by Stalin to win the war, imposed on the USSR in 1941. (*Rezun even gives the justification of the repressions against top commanders of Workers and Peasants' Red Army in his book “Purification” («Очищение»).* However he draws some unauthentic data while covering this subject.

See the collected articles “Intelligent Viewpoint” (1996) for the comment of the Internal Predictor of the USSR on the books “Icebreaker” by V. Rezun, and “Operation «Storm»” by I.L. Bunich.

² The Soviet power was overthrown in Finland in 1918 under the military support of Hitler. Before that, Soviet power was developing in Finland as well

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

1939 — 1940, when the USSR was assigned to the position of the aggressor. Besides this, the inclusion of the Baltic bourgeois democracies into the USSR due to the exported revolutions and pro-Soviet upheavals in late August 1940, carried out by the local periphery of Comintern from within the countries, caused an utmost negative response, too. And it did not matter that by that time it had been almost a year since the Second World War began and entering the USSR provided the Baltic States with objective protection from Hitler's occupation¹. Moreover, it geographically improved the fronts' configuration of the future anti-Hitler coalition, which had already become an objective necessity for its time and was due to be created in the nearest future.

Secondly, it was not only the pro-Marxist international-socialistic opposition which was present in the western bourgeois-democratic states and confronted the historically developed social and economic systems, which were completely dominated by the supragovernment usury of the Jewish clans. In each of the bourgeois democratic countries there was also a rather powerful nationalist opposition. Depending on the internal conditions, the opposition to the bourgeois democracy was either purely

as on the rest of the territory of the Russian Empire, which stayed free from the German occupation until November 1917.

¹ At that time the political scenarios of the «world backstage» did not allow the Baltic States to become independent bourgeois democracies. It was only the question of which country — Germany or the USSR — would take them under its jurisdiction.

The leaders of the USSR were faced with a dilemma, and it was not a dilemma of occupying the Baltic States or letting them develop on their own. The dilemma was between letting Hitler occupy the Baltic States under the support of the local Nazis and preventing this variant by means of the Soviet Union's occupation of them.

It was natural for that epoch that pro-German and pro-capitalist elements were repressed with the inclusion of the Baltic States in the USSR and that it was accompanied by abuses.

Bourgeois democracies in these countries were unable to prevent the immersing uncompromising oppositions and were likely to give way to Nazism. Even nowadays the democracies in these countries are nothing but hopeless conceit of their “elite”. They should be wiser. They complain about Stalin and even regret that Hitler did not occupy their country instead of thinking about what was vicious inside the bourgeois democracies of the Baltic states and made them be «the grass on the battlefield» and the victims of the divine connivance.

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

oligarchic or national-socialistic. But either variant of it presented a historically real pro-Hitler «Fifth column», which played a role in Hitler's occupation of all European countries; and which was ready to betray the historically developed regimes in all the countries¹ which for this or that reason Hitler did not have a chance to invade.

It was the to nationalist opposition which Rudolf Hess appealed when coming to Great Britain in May 1941, with some peace proposals, *which remain classified to this day*. In the US there was also a strong national-socialist and other pro-German opposition, which was already mentioned in the previous chapter. As for Argentina it was about to be the South-American branch of the Third Reich in the years before the War.

To neutralize the internal nationalist opposition in the western countries of bourgeois democracy and to deprive its activists of the support of the politically inert general public it was necessary for the «world backstage» to discredit the idea of national self-consciousness. For these purposes Hitler had to lead Germany to Nazism and to sacrifice the country to the world socialist revolution by assaulting the USSR. Moreover, Germany's warfare had to become a savage and brutal campaign of cleansing the territory of its population, unlike the moderate police occupation of Europe before 1941². Such a war was supposed to finish with the crushing defeat of Germany, especially with the western countries supporting the USSR.

Besides, as it has already been mentioned above, for the achievements of the social experiment in the USSR to be introduced in other countries without further resistance, the USSR had to acquire an attractive and desirable image, while the other countries' own bourgeois regimes which were performing the policy of indulging and encouraging Hitlerism throughout 1930-s were supposed to become loathsome. For these purposes the USSR had to stop being just the abstract cult symbol of the bright future it had always been in the eyes of the left intelligentsia in 1930-s. It had to represent the last feasible hope for the general public frightened by the nazi atrocities; the hope that only the power of the

¹ Except in the USSR where the fifth column was mainly wiped out during the prewar repressions. However its activity would occasionally reveal itself and sometimes bring rather harsh consequences.

² The biggest repressions against Hebrews in Europe were also performed after the German invasion to the USSR.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Soviet Union which could protect mankind from subjugation to the German fascism. For this sake and in order to make the European liberation campaign by the Red Army universally and impeccably justified in the respect of the morals, and thus heartily welcomed in the countries occupied by Hitler, the USSR also had to become the victim of the fascist Germany aggression.

In the middle of the twentieth century, as well as in the beginning of it, there again was a need to organize a world war to implement the project of «the World Socialist Revolution» under the banners of Marxism.

The political scenarios of Trotskyite Marxists did not meet this scenario at all:

- they were still obsessed with the idea to begin the revolutionary war in order to liberate the working people which would turn a lot of people away from the idea of socialist rearrangement of the world;
- the scenario of overthrowing Bolshevik Stalin who had significantly subdued the bureaucratic machine of the party and of the state — overthrow of the ruling regime resulting from the war defeat, like it happened in the Russian-Japanese War or in the First World War — this scenario directly contradicted the global political scenario and the scenario of the Second World War by «world backstage». Squaring accounts personally with Stalin was postponed to the postwar period by «world backstage».

That is why the «world backstage» not only did not impede the liquidation of Leon Bronstein, but also assisted in doing away with his followers in the USSR and in the Comintern, who didn't catch the spirit of the times. As a result during the invasion in the USSR the support of the Hitler aggression by the «fifth column» was reduced to only to several episodes¹.

¹ The most serious incident of those happened when general D.G. Pavlov did not perform the directive to put on the alert the troops of the Western Special Command. It became one of the major reasons for the catastrophe of summer 1941. During the investigation Pavlov admitted his parricide but at the court he recanted his evidence. The inquest considered his confession of guilt enough evidence and did not take pains to make any proper evidence base. As a result the investigation could prove only the negligence of functions. For this Pavlov was sentenced to death by shooting. Later, after his death, he was

→ → →

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

On assaulting Poland on September 1st, 1939, Germany found itself involved in a world war that she was not ready to win. After that, the only chance for her to escape the lot of the sacrifice to the «world socialist revolution» project was to hold sacred the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact of August 1939, and to carry out the “Sea-Lion” operation in 1941. The latter would let Germany quit the war in spite of the position of the ruling “elite” of Great Britain¹, which refused the peace proposed through Rudolf Hess. Germany could then revise its racist sociologic doctrine in the spirit of multinational Bolshevism in order to unite the peoples of the USSR, Germany, and other countries within the conception of multi-national socialism building, for Germany had already been freed from the power of Marxism while the USSR was still to solve this problem.

In 1941 the treaty was the only means for Germany to make the «world backstage» reconsider their global political scenarios including those for Germany itself. Stalin left this opportunity open for Germany

discharged by the neo-Trotskyite Khrushchev’s regime to support the myth of «surprise attack» and to place all the guilt for it personally on Stalin.

In reality, it is a notorious fact that the Navy of the USSR met the «surprise attack» at the battle alarm, i.e. it was not a surprise for them. If one branch meets the “surprise attack” at the battle alarm while units and formations of other branches are really taken off guard by this attack it speaks for the criminal negligence of many of the top commanders at the minimum or for organized parricide at the maximum.

Aware of this fact the neo-Trotskyite regime persecuted the former commander in chief of the Navy, admiral N.G. Kuznetsov, in the post-war period. Marshal of the USSR G.K. Zhukov, whose level of intellect and proficiency contributed to the above mentioned consequences and who was partly responsible for the catastrophe of summer 1941 (he was the head of the General Staff and deputy Defense People’s Commissar of the USSR from July 30, 1940), took part in creation and support of the myth of the «surprise German attack».

¹ But do not be quick to lament that the above-mentioned scenario did not take place in history. At that time Great Britain was the center of the global colonial empire and suppressed millions of people around the world. The welfare of her own people was provided by the policy of colonialism and slave ownership as prescribed by the biblical doctrine. This is a cocktail of Judaic internazism and Anglo-Saxon Nazism. We will not dispute here which Nazism — German or British — is «better».

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

until June 22, 1941, inclusive¹. But the Germans transferred all the attorney personally to Hitler, who after a good deal of nervousness and hesitation in the evening of June 21, 1941, still made the decision to invade the USSR the next morning according to Barbarossa plan. And the “Sea-Lion” plan for invading into Great Britain, which was developed simultaneously with Barbarossa, later *acquired the meaning* of a successful strategic disinformation².

Thus as a result of the Germans’ horrific shortsightedness and weak will and because of Hitler’s adherence to «world backstage», Germany was routed and the idea of national self-consciousness was identified with nazism, fascism, and racism and became desecrated for many decades ahead in the majority of the cultures on the earth.

As a result of Germany’s utter rout, the USSR acquired tremendous moral authority, which was indisputable up until the so-called «Caribbean Crisis»³ in 1962. Besides, the socialist planned economy of the USSR proved its efficiency in the years of preparation to win the war, during the war itself, as well as in the post-war period of rehabilitation of the economy. This was obvious both from the manufacture growth figures and from the characteristics of the cultural development of the society.

¹ According to some publications, on June 22, 1941, after the outbreak of hostility the Soviet government contacted Berlin over the radio proposing to stop the German troops (on the assumption that it was not the German invasion to the USSR but a provocation aimed at initiating a war between Germany and the USSR, despite the agreement between their governments).

² Both the plans were developed as plans of real military operations to be carried out. At the same time both of them could serve as a misinforming and diversionary maneuver versus each other. *Both of them were rather adventurous* and because of this each of them would be considered by many foreign military specialists as deliberate misinformation, which could not be the basis for real military operations.

³ The world community did not forgive the USSR for placing its rockets on Cuba although they were not against the military and rocket bases as well as aerodromes of strategic aviation of the USA and its allies that surrounded the USSR and its allies. This speaks of «the world community».

On the other hand placing the rockets on Cuba was a political provocation. There was no military need for it. This circumstance speaks of the USSR government: political shortsightedness and the atmosphere of error that allowed the appearance of the puppet Khrushchev’s anti-bolshevist regime (the puppet regime for the «world backstage»).

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

However, virtually right after the completion of the Second World War the «world backstage» began supporting anti-Soviet forces throughout the part of the world not controlled by the USSR. In addition, it was not only the state structure of the USSR which was condemned. According to the state propaganda of the bourgeois democracies, the very idea of socialism as the basis of social life structure was announced a variety of the personality suppressing «totalitarian tyranny».

But at the same time, these same countries of bourgeois democracies began introducing many of the socialist elements of the economic and social order, which proved themselves efficient in the USSR and Hitler's Germany: planning and regulating activities of the state on the macro-economic level, development of the social security for the youth as well as the adults and the elderly people who lost their health, etc¹. And in most of the higher educational establishments the bourgeois democratic state system would shut its eyes to the propaganda among the students of the Trotskyite trend of Marxism.

Along with this, there was a qualitative change in the character of economic and cultural relations between the USSR and the West as compared to both the period of cooperation of the «united nations» in their struggle against Hitlerism during World War II and as compared to the prewar years when on quite a legal basis scientific and technical designs and technologies were flowing from Europe and the USA (which were more advanced in this respect) over to the USSR (although this aspect was not covered by Soviet historians neither in text-books of history nor in any general public oriented publications). After the Second World War «the Iron Curtain» appeared, which actually did not exist even after the Revolution of 1917, during the Civil War or in the years of diplomatic isolation, when for a long time the USSR was not recognized by the many developed capitalist countries.

¹ The development of socialism went so far in the USA that a former soviet citizen Victor Fridman, who left the USSR for the United States to escape from the soviet socialism, discovered the unacceptable socialism in the country of his dream. He wrote the book "The Socialist States of America" on this (see the article of Victoria Averbuch "Comrades Cowboys" published in "Rossiyskaya Gazeta", № 37 February 28, 2002).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

This circumstance suggests the idea that something happened inside the USSR that the «world backstage» considered as a menace to its absolute global power.

In our viewpoint it was still in the pre-war years that the «world backstage» had reasons to expect the USSR could go beyond its control, when in the first half of the twentieth century it was operating under the ideology of introduced Marxism and in the organizational form of a Marxist party. Since this misgiving was not groundless, the main problem for the «world backstage» became to restrain, suppress and root out Bolshevism in the USSR, but not to extend its socialist culture to other countries. The latter would not go further than simply adopting certain elements of socialism and allowing the propaganda of Trotskyism trend Marxism among the students.

To ground the statement that in the age of Stalin's Bolshevism the USSR went beyond the control of the «world backstage» we will first say that:

Under the political situation of the summer of 1939 *the Soviet-German Non-Aggression pact* was not only unnecessary, but also potentially dangerous for implementation of «the world socialist revolution» scenario.

The matter is that in both of the countries there were active generations who saw the reality and the consequences of the past war between Russia and Germany. Thus they were true supporters of good neighborly relations and cultural connections between the two countries. Throughout history it became obvious that the best periods of living in both of the countries were in times of their alliance, reciprocal trade relations, and cultural exchange. The creative potential of the people, longing to avoid a new armed conflict, was a reality in both the states. It only should be called for and supported on the state policy level.

That is why for the «world backstage», mainly based on the power of the USA, the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact presented an opportunity for unacceptable change in the global distribution of economic and military power into blocks of allied states. This would breach the «backstage's» major «divide-and-rule» principle of global management.

Before the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact of 1939 there were:

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

«The US and Great Britain» as the force determining the victory of one of the parties in the pair: «Germany and its allies» on the one side of the front line and the USSR without almost any allies, on the other side of the front line.

The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact made it as follows:

There emerged a potential duel situation: the US against the united *Eurasian block* headed by *Bolshevist* USSR and Germany (which could probably unite into one allied state). It was another question which political leaders from both the states would survive this scenario and who would sink into political or physical oblivion.

Observation of the treaty between the political leaders of the two countries would open the door just for this variant¹. If Germany and the USSR developed in this direction, the global situation would go beyond the control of the «world backstage». That was why *when describing how much Stalin needed the non-aggression treaty with Germany in order to make the first attack himself, Victor Rezun was presenting the «world backstage» as organizing and inspiring the First and the Second World Wars.*

Although this scenario-maximum did not work out in the twentieth century, the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact still limited the freedom of the political maneuver of the «world backstage» and thus provided a victory of Bolshevism in global politics.

¹ The abstract humanists who complain of the immoral cooperation with the fascist regime of Germany either do not understand the global historical process or are *hypocrites for they consciously or subconsciously agree to live under the Doctrine (which we draw in the Supplement 1)*.

From the point of view of Bolshevism both Nazism and internazism have to be eliminated. For this it is necessary to interact with both — to interact to an acceptable extent for Bolsheviks.

Let the abstract humanists answer why they are not indignant about the whole global civilization living under the Doctrine? (See the Supplement 1 of this book for the doctrine)

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Without this treaty the German invasion into Poland¹, which had become imminent by that time could automatically develop into military conflict between the USSR and Germany. The USSR could take under its protection the western regions of Belarus and the Ukraine, which were occupied by Poland after the dissolution of the Russian Empire, or a part of the Polish troops could try to cross the Soviet boundaries to get interned.

This scenario of the Soviet-German conflict was bound to automatically develop if in August 1939, the USSR concluded the treaty of alliance with Great Britain and France instead of the non-aggression pact with Germany. The draft project of the treaty proposed by France and Great Britain did not oblige them to coordinate their military operations with the USSR within certain terms after the USSR's enter in case of the German invasion into one of them or into Poland. Also, Poland refused to let the Soviet troops through its territory to come into military contact with German forces in the case of a German invasion into Poland.

It was idiotic of the ruling bourgeois regimes of Great Britain and France to pursue this policy. Their governments still cherished hopes to

¹ The motivation of Germany to initiate the war against Poland: the Polish government impeded the land communication over its territory between Western Prussia (now Kaliningrad region of the Russian Federation) and the rest of the Germany. As far as the mutually acceptable agreements on this are concerned *both parties obviously tried to avoid them* acting under the pressure of the «world backstage».

During the period between the two world wars Germany several times offered Poland to arrange the terms of exterritorial transit through its territory (i.e. visa regime and customs supervision of German cargos and passengers by the Polish side), but Poland refused flatly to work out the terms of such a transit. According to the recollections of the Germans who had to go from Germany to Germany through Poland in that period, the Polish officials were often ready to swagger while issuing visas and during passport and customs supervision. At last, after another refusal by Poland to settle this problem Hitler decided to get rid of it by means of force.

The repetition from history is seen in today's situation around the Kaliningrad region, which borders with the countries of European Union who are reluctant to arrange the exterritorial transit from Russia to Russia. *The fact that this problem has arisen means that the representatives from the European Union are as stupid and impudent as those of the bourgeois Poland in the period between the two world wars of the 20th century.* However Russia is different from Germany.

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

preserve historical capitalism and the global colonial system. For the sake of this they were determined in their effort to use German National Socialism to protect themselves from Marxism and Soviet Bolshevism, together with using Marxism and Soviet Bolshevism as protection from German National Socialism. Poland was made a sacrifice to this desire in 1939, as well as Austria and Czechoslovakia had been in 1938, whose fate nonetheless did not teach the “wise men” in Warsaw anything.

Thus the bourgeois democracies of the West fit the «world backstage's» scenario to initiate the war between Germany and the USSR in 1939 (or in 1940 at latest).

As the following events proved, it was right of Stalin to refuse Franco-British treaty of alliance. France and Great Britain were perfidious to Poland when Germany assaulted it. Poland fell under the attack of Wehrmacht because France and Great Britain violated their treaty by not initiating the military actions against Germany to the extent and within the period stipulated in the treaty. This conduct of Poland's allies allowed Wehrmacht to rout Germany's enemies one by one: first concentrating all its forces against Poland and after its defeat — against France and expedition forces of Great Britain on the continent. This led to the partial occupation of France with the creation of a puppet pro-Hitler regime there, while Great Britain was put on the verge of military and economic catastrophe in 1940.

There was no reason to suppose that the **bourgeois** governments of France and Great Britain should have been more conscientious at meeting their obligations to the Union of Soviet **Socialist** Republics than they were at «meeting» them with **bourgeois** Poland.

The Soviet non-aggression treaty with Germany, which was ripe for aggression against Poland, excluded the possibility to automatically involve the USSR into the war with Germany and her allies given the position of observation of France and Great Britain. This really postponed the war by almost two years and gave the opportunity to rearm and reorganize the Soviet army. The Soviet-German treaty of 1939 was a shame for the USSR if we pretend that the «world backstage» does not exist. However, if we keep in mind the global supra-government political scenarios of the biblical «world backstage» then it was justified, for it was

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

the first step to liberate the humanity from the tyranny of the biblical «world backstage».

The most important point for the USSR is that thanks to the Soviet-German non-aggression treaty the Western bourgeois democracies happened to be at war with Germany earlier than the USSR. That is why with the beginning of the war between the USSR and Germany, the USSR automatically turned out to be a de-facto ally of all states at war with Germany and its allies, no matter whether the ally relations with each of them bore the juridical character.

If the Second World War had begun as the war between the USSR and the Germany repeating the scenario of the First World War, the «world backstage» would have had a chance to choose at what time and on whose side to join the war of bourgeois democracies of the West, since it had its own view of the future and because both the parties at war were loyal to them. Thus they would exert their decisive influence upon the completion of the war and on the postwar system of international relations.

Another sign — ominous as well from the viewpoint of the «world backstage» — happened in a short while after the capitulation of Germany. It was the Parade of Victory on Red Square in Moscow on June 4, 1945.

From the viewpoint of a simple soviet person who is not acquainted with the Masons' addiction to the rituals and the legends, it would be logical if the Parade of Victory would had taken place on June, 22 for the German invasion began on June, 22. It would be very symbolic: you wanted June 22? — Fine, here's the June, 22, the Parade of our Victory.

However, the parade took place not on June 22, but on June 24, seemingly for no reason at all. But if we keep in mind the symbolism and the adherence to the rites of the Free Masons we will know that June 24th is John the Baptist Day, and one of the branches of the sjid-masonry bares the name of this saint. Every year June 24th is the day of the order in John's Masonry. Consequently, dating the parade to June 24th points at the real initiators of the war, which wished to achieve their own political goals through the help of the war.

Where did the initiative to date the Victory Parade to June 24th come from? From the «world backstage» representatives or from Stalin? This question is still open and we come across no publications on this account. However, it was significant that *Stalin withdrew from taking a salute at*

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

the parade on John the Baptist Masonry Day. There are two reasons proposed for his withdrawal.

The first one, as they say, was he wanted to take the salute of the parade himself, but when getting ready for this he fell from his horse in the riding-hall. They could not provide him with a calmer horse. Supposedly, under these insuperable circumstances Stalin would grit his teeth because of the lost opportunity to parade himself, but nonetheless would hand the honor and glory of taking the salute at the Victory Parade over to the Marshal of the Soviet Union, Georgiy Zhukov. The latter was originally a cavalryman in the army¹.

¹ This version is very much to the liking of the anti-Stalin intelligentsia. The attempts to create the cult of marshal G.K. Zhukov are caused by hatred of Stalin by the will to explain to the crowd the reasons of the victory in the Great Patriotic War. They want this cult to overshadow the truth about Stalin and that epoch: as though Zhukov is the main, and almost the only, creator of the victory who was unjustly suppressed by Stalin in the post-war years.

Those who believe in this delirious thesis forget that Zhukov was only a professional officer and the victory in the Great Patriotic war required a pre-war preparation in both global and internal politics, preparation of the country's economy and coordination of the actions at the fronts and in the back areas during the war. It was Stalin who controlled all this ever since the late 1920's, during the war and till the end of his days. It was Stalin who controlled the activity of Zhukov too. Later, during the «denunciation of the cult of personality of Stalin», this aspect was enveloped in lots of legends and historically inadequate lies (especially concerning the early stages of the Great Patriotic War). Zhukov was one of those who contributed to the creation of this myth.

It was not an end in it self for Zhukov to become a legitimate successor to Stalin or a usurper like a soviet Bonaparte after the Great Patriotic War was over. But there was a trend for intrigue and anti-bolshevism among the post-war generals. Due to his self-conceit and ambitions Zhukov was a good figure to be placed as the head of the state at least for the initial period of the new regime in case of a successful conspiracy by the generals against Stalin. Stalin actually saved Zhukov by sending him away from Moscow and intimidated other generals by repressing some of the top officers for abuse of their positions and breach of Bolshevist ethics (which manifested itself in the «love of trophies»).

As far as the post-war activity of marshal Zhukov is concerned, his personal and business qualities (taken alone his complicity in badgering the former People's Commissar of the Navy N.G. Kuznetsov is very speaking) proved him to be incompetent in commanding anything bigger than a district. The

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

The **second version** was proposed by Victor Rezun during an interview on «Svoboda» radio station in 2002. The essence of it can be rendered as follows.

Since the USSR could not occupy all the Europe, the plans of the world socialist revolution were ruined, which in Rezun's view destined the USSR to decay and downfall¹. As he claimed, Stalin was of the same opinion and believed that *the USSR lost the war, in which Stalin intended to include all the European states into the USSR*. At first, Hitler's «preventive» strike on the USSR did not allow Stalin to carry out this scenario. After that, the presence of the allies in Europe in 1945 deprived Stalin of the chance to include even the East-European countries that had been freed from Hitlerism.

Supposedly reluctant to admit this personal loss in public, Stalin withdrew from taking the salute at the Victory Parade and allowed Marshal Zhukov to please his ambitions. Since Zhukov did not understand anything in global politics and in the «world revolution», just as none of the narrow specialists or general public did.

If Stalin felt that he won the victory in the sense he expected to, he would have taken the salute himself. Even if there were no quiet horses for him, he would have taken the salute from a jeep, from a tank or from a limousine (which became normal in the following epochs when less and less military men could ride horses).

Along with this, Rezun draws one more sign that in his view speaks of the failure of the global idea of establishing the Soviet power and

maximum for which he was suited was the position of the Commander-in-Chief of the Land Forces because neither before the war, during the war or after it did he find an opportunity to inquire into the matters of aviation and the navy. That is why he could not professionally control the combat training, development and usage of the whole armed forces of the USSR in the times of war and peace.

Zhukov was exactly what he was and he deserves praising for all the good that he has done. But it is unacceptable to exaggerate his merits and to build false myths making him a cult — but, in fact, a caricature — figure in history.

¹V.B. Rezun gives readers the idea that the USSR was a parasitic social system that was incapable of developing using only its internal resources. Thus it was destined to break-up in case of failure of further expansion. According to Rezun that is why in trying to preserve his dictatorship till the end of his days «bandit» Stalin was in favor of conquests under the slogans and ideas of the world socialist revolution.

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

socialism worldwide, which resulted from World War II. After Christ the Savior Cathedral was demolished in 1935, the Palace of Soviets was being built on its place until 1941. It was supposed to become a skyscraper with a gigantic figure of Lenin on its top several dozen meters tall.

In this Palace the last remaining state was supposed to join the USSR as a socialist republic, concluding the world socialist revolution and give the USSR worldwide statehood status.

With the beginning of the Great Patriotic War the construction was temporarily closed down and not long before the victory over Germany the decision was made to abandon it. After the war the swimming pool “Moscow” was built in place of the destroyed Cathedral and the might-have-been Palace of Soviets. In its turn, swimming pool “Moscow” was liquidated in the reforms years and an operating model of the former Christ the Savior Cathedral¹ was erected and sanctified by 2001.

¹ We do not recognize this building in the status of Christ the Savior Cathedral because it was built with budget money by a regime that robbed the people under the guise of reforms unlike the genuine cathedral built on the people’s donations.

Besides, the new building is slapdash from the point of view of building culture. Especially catching to the eye is the careless finish of the lower room as compared to the upper room in the cathedral. But even the demonstratively stately upper room, which everyone knows from the solemn worship services broadcast on church holidays, is not blameless and these defects suggest the negligence and inability to work.

In the original cathedral the paintings were directly on the walls. In the reconstructed model there is steel lining along the walls, approximately 10cm removed from them. The paintings are placed on this lining and thus are removed from the walls and are not subject to the temperature difference. In theory this surface must consist of planes and smooth patterns, which all together repeat the inside of the cathedral. But the steel jacket deformed during welding and it distorted many lines and surfaces designed in the project.

Deformations are natural no matter what technology of welding you use. But the scale of them in the model-cathedral goes beyond any aesthetic norm because they are visible with the naked eye, cause undulations and distort the ideal lines and surfaces. If such deviations from the designed position and configuration took place while assembling a ship hull at a shipyard (several centimeters inaccuracy!) such *savage* imprecision would not pass through the inspection department.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

But there is **the third version** as well.

If on June 24th, the Day of John the Baptist's Masonry, the Head of the state and Commander-in-chief Josef Stalin observes the parade from the outside, then objectively this is at least a demonstration of disloyalty to the biblical «world backstage». Or else it means that Stalin, as the leader of the Bolshevik government of the USSR, possesses the same or even a higher inter-social rank than the «world backstage» leaders, while being opposed to them (as his postwar activity shows).

This version is also supported by the fact that the Victory Day became a national holiday only in 1965 when the state and the party were lead by the imitators of Bolshevism. But for the real Bolsheviks the victory over the puppet, artificially nurtured Hitler's Nazism, which was gained in alliance with the puppets of the «world backstage», was only a victory in one of the battles. It was not yet *the grand total* victory in the struggle for liberation of the global civilization from the tyranny of the «world backstage». The struggle for the opportunity to establish a global civilization of humaneness was not over yet. That is why:

We still have to do a lot of things to make May 9th holiday a real Victory Day of the peoples of the USSR in the imposed war of 1941 — 1945, which became the Great Patriotic War. We won this war *in terms of the sixth priority of the basic social control means*, but in terms of higher priorities the Great Patriotic war against the tyranny of the «world backstage» is still going on.

* * *

EXPLANATION OF THE LAST PARAGRAPH

The rather «The Sufficiently common theory of control» observes a society in the historically long periods of time and distinguishes the following means of influence on a society, which if applied with skill are able to control its life and death:

1. Information of the *worldview* character. The methodology which helps people to build (individually and socially) their «standard

This is one of the many facts speaking of absolute lack of conscientiousness while building the model of Christ the Savior Cathedral. This model building embodies the pretense of the epoch of stagnation and self-seeking.

6.6. The «World Backstage» and Soviet Bolshevism ...

- automatic mechanisms» of recognition of the particular processes in the unity of Life and which specifies their hierarchy rank *in the perception* of the complex events. This information plays a key role in *the culture of thinking* and in the management activity, particularly in the extent of *inter-social power*.
2. Information of annalistic, *chronological* character from all the branches of Culture and Knowledge. This one allows to see the trend of the processes and to correlate particular branches of Knowledge and *Culture on the whole* with each other. Together with *the worldview*, conformable with the Life and based on *the sense of proportion*, this information allows one to distinguish particular processes by directing the «chaotic» stream of facts and events through *the worldview sieve — the subjective human measure of recognition*.
 3. Information of *Fact-descriptive* character. The description of particular processes and their interrelation is the essence of the third priority information. Religious cults' dogmas, secular ideologies, technologies and factologies of *all scientific branches* pertain to this kind.
 4. *Economic processes*. Economic processes as a means of influence are subordinate to the purely informational means of influence through the finances (money), which are an ultimately generalized type of economic information.
 5. Means of genocide, which strike not only the living people but also the following generations. These destroy the *genetic potential* of the people to learn and develop the cultural inheritance of their ancestors. These means include: nuclear blackmailing — threat of its usage; alcohol, tobacco and other narcotic genocide, food supplements, all ecological pollutants, some medications, cosmetics perfumery — real usage of it; «genetic engineering» and «biotechnologies» — potential threat.
 6. Other means of influence (mainly of force influence). The *weapon* (in the traditional understanding of this word), which kills and cripples people, destroys material and technical objects of the civilization, objects of culture, and the bearers of the spirit.

There is no unequivocal differentiation between the means of influence because many of the possess qualities which can be related to different

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

priorities. But nonetheless this hierarchy structured classification allows one to distinguish the domineering influence factors which can be used as management means in particular for the purposes of suppression and destruction of the social phenomena which are unacceptable from the point of view of managing conception.

When used within one social system these will function as its generalized management means. However, when they are used by one social system (or social group) towards others, in the case when the systems' managing conceptions differ, these function as the generalized weapons, or the weapons of war in the general sense of this word. In case the managing conceptions of both the systems coincide, these function as the means of self-government support in the target social system.

The order specified depicts the class priority of the above-mentioned means of social influence. The society condition changes to a much greater extent under the influence of the higher priority means than under the that of the lower priority means, although the changes caused by higher priorities means are slower and go without "sound effects". Thus, in the historically long time intervals the operating speed of the means grows from the first priority to the sixth, while the irreversibility of their results — which is significant in solving social problems for one and all — decreases.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

Stalin's whole life proves that he did not belong to the anthropoids who live by the principle «after us the deluge». Those who live by this principle and interpret *this principle in their own personal ways* through the facts of history have distorted the conception of life. This concerns both the history of our country (including Stalin's epoch) as well as the history of mankind. That is why to understand the epoch of Stalin's Bolshevism we need to plan and to take active steps to make life *definitely* more righteous than it was in the past and in our times. If we become definite about it and thus get rid of *abstract humanism, which is supposedly addressed to everyone but in fact — to no one*, then the events of the epoch of Stalin's Bolshevism will acquire another meaning, different from that ascribed to them by the *abstract humanists (psycho-Trotskyites of bourgeois-democratic or of internazi-socialist branch)*.

* * *

Many of Stalin's contemporaries say that he was rather ironic about the cult of his personality dominating in the society. In private talks (all of which were talks on the vitally important issues for the country) he encouraged people to take on initiative and the responsibility for this initiative, encouraged this kind of initiative responsibility¹. One can see it in his written inheritance. In publications as well as in the texts of speeches addressed to various audiences over the years (gathered in his Collected Works) he repeatedly calls for taking on initiative, care and responsibility in the people's common Life. He also repeatedly notices that simple people's respect and love of the Party and State leaders is one thing and worshipping the chiefs is a different thing and it should be rooted out in the socialist society.

Neither in Stalin's oral speeches nor in his written works may you find anything even partially similar to Hitler's discourses on the chief-Fuhrer and crowd relationships (like, for example, in "Mein Kampf", for nowadays you may find it in Russian translation without any problem).

¹ See the memoirs of aircraft designer A.S. Yakovlev, artillery designer V.G. Grabin, former People's Commissar of the Navy N.G. Kuznetsov.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Nor will you find Lev Gumilev's discourses on the relationships between chiefs — «people with drive» and the rest of the society¹.

But for anti-Stalinist this only proves that Stalin was much more sly, guileful and hypocritical than Adolph Hitler (together with Lev Gumilev and other sociologists who propagated in other terms the doctrines of leaders and the weak-willed crowd). Nothing can persuade this kind of psycho-Trotskyites that Stalin was against cults of personality, his own cult inclusive. He longed for the society to live on the basis of different morals and comrade ethics, which excluded crowd-“elitism”.

It does not matter what the person subject to this cult worshipping in the crowd-“elitist” society thinks of it. The crowd-“elitist” society by its nature craves for a cult, looks for idols, creates them, *gets disappointed in the former idols and sometimes even shifts to the cult of their condemnation*, and **constantly** craves for new idols.

For the society not to be under the cult of any person there should not be any internal or external preconditions of its emergence.

To avoid them the crowd-“elitist” society should stop being crowd-“elitist” and should be based on comrade morals and ethics. The process of transfer from **idol-creating morals and ethics of irresponsibility and parasitic smugness** to the morals and ethics of initiative comrade care and responsibility for the fates of all and sundry takes historical time. This transfer can happen only through practical activity in solving various

¹ The only difference between the «leadership» views of Hitler and Lev Gumilev's “Theory of Drive” is that Hitler saw himself as a candidate for that leadership and he fulfilled his wish, but Gumilev, not being a candidate for that, just gave an opportunity to other candidates for leadership to ground scientifically their claims with the help of his “Theory of Drive”.

This circumstance arouses the following questions:

- Is Anna Akhmatova, the great poet of the «Silver Age» and the mother of Lev Gumilev, personally responsible for bringing up such a man who scientifically grounded the necessity of the «leadership» modification of Fascism?
- Was it wrong to send Gumilev to GULAG although it did not prevent him from creating the “Theory of Drive”? Maybe it prevented him from writing something even more dangerous than the “Theory of Drive”?

On the inconsistency of the “Theory of Drive” read the corresponding chapter in the first volume of the work “Dead Water” by the Internal Predictor of the USSR.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

problems of life of the society coordinated with solving global problems. This transfer cannot happen through idleness, abstract contemplation and moralizing in churches, at public meetings (including party and trade union meetings), mass manifestations and table talks.

From this viewpoint, the fact that the next 19th regular Congress of the Communist Party took place only in early October 1952 (after the 18th Congress in mid March 1939) does not prove or illustrate that Stalin suppressed democracy in the Party and in the country on the whole. Although in times of Lenin and Bronstein (Trotsky) the Party Congresses took place every year (from the extraordinary 7th Congress in 1918 to 14th in 1925) and even during the Civil War (which anti-Stalinists like to repeat very much to prove the suppression of intra-party democracy), in fact the intra-party democracy did not exist even in those times (though it looked like it was formally maintained).

First, the Party was initially created to perform the political will of the narrow circle of its leaders or of one leader. For this purpose in its Charter there was a special principle of the so-called «democratic centralism»¹, which implies the submission of the minority to the majority and all regular party members' unconditional execution of the decisions taken by superior party bodies. More and more sundry matters captured the attention of the Party and thus, various projects and their handling were carried out by the machinery under the guidance of a narrow circle of leaders. Maybe Stalin did liquidate the so-called intra-Party democracy but it was the *mafia «democracy»* of this circle of leaders acting behind the scene of the Central Committee and the rest of the Party, which he liquidated first. After this he liquidated the *«leaders» themselves, whose convictions and self-discipline were incompatible with Bolshevism as well as with each other*².

¹ On the inhumane principle of «democratic centralism», which makes people resemble zombies see the work “On Imitating And Instigating Activities” by the Internal Predictor of the USSR.

² The entire history of the Party before Stalin became its leader in the late 1920-s was the history of struggle between personal ambitions of the leaders of the narrow circle, each of whom pretended to give the only true interpretation of the texts by Marx and Engels and to assure the veritable development of their ideas in the environment of Russia. This struggle of the leaders for

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Second, by the year 1917 the Party was a party of leaders and the Party mass who followed the leaders. As a result of this all the following, Congresses of the Party bore the crowd-“elitist”, but not democratic character. This circumstance was beyond Stalin’s control.

Third, while the Party was becoming the structure to manage the social and economic life of the state, it demanded more and more professionalism and various knowledge from a delegate to start new serious proposals and to soundly criticize the draft projects prepared for the Congress by the Central Committee, which worked on a professional basis *and was consulted by the leading specialists in any field of science and technology when necessary*. Not to speak of the possibility to write a Five-year Plan of Social and Economic Development of the USSR in the free time as an amateur personal or group initiative.

In these circumstances the Congress was no longer performing the function of *collective social creative work, which is the essence of democracy regardless through what procedures it is implemented*. As a result of this and of the crowd-“elitist” character of the Party and society on the whole regular Congresses could perform only two functions:

- support the cult of the Party leaders in the Party and society;
- provide the Party leaders and members of the Central Committee with the information on the opinions of the Party members and non-Party people in the provinces.

While the first function was antidemocratic for the Party and the society on the whole and thus detrimental, the second function of the Party Congresses lost its urgency after illiteracy within the population had been overcome and the structures of the state administration were established. Those who trusted the Soviet statehood would write to the Central Committee, administration organs and to particular Party and State leaders on the issues they considered vital¹. The opinions of those who did

personal or corporate domination had nothing to do with selfless work of implementing the ideals of communism into life.

¹ As a result of the better literacy and skills level of the population, some of the numerous people’s letters to the Central Committee, the People’s Commissariats (ministries), and personally to the Party and State leaders were really of big social significance. They would concern important issues of social life and would offer rather a professional set of measures to solve the problems. One can see it even from the «filtrate» of letters that A. Strelyany reads with ironic sorrow on Svoboda radio station from time to time.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

not trust the regime or was its opponent were known to the Party and State leaders either from the letters of those who trusted the Soviet statehood or from the reports of special services and other State and Party bodies.

In other words if the Party Congresses did not supply the information from the provinces any more and did not represent the collective social creative work there was no managerial need in them for *creation of real socialism and communism*¹. However the emotional and excited atmosphere of the Congresses facilitated idol making and thus supported the crowd-“elitism” based on misunderstanding of the events and prospects by both the Congress delegates and other Party members. This provoked passivity, unconcern, and irresponsibility. Such a party cannot be the ruling party to build the society of just community because through its activity it substitutes the genuine democracy with formal democratic procedures.

Lev Bronstein (Trotsky) and others declaim their adherence to the ideals of socialism and communism and blame Stalin for destroying the intra-Party democracy and that of the Soviet government and replacing it with the power of red tape machinery, which supposedly prevented the ideals of socialism from coming to life. But their pathos about it may sound convincing only to those who either do not know Marxism or, knowing it, do not see the incompatibility of its conceptions and categories with real life. This incompatibility does not allow us to discover and solve social problems with the help of Marxist philosophy (which is also due to the incorrectly formulated «key question of philosophy» and to the defective wording of the dialectic laws²). The real business accounting has nothing to do with political economy and, thus, the national economy cannot be based on it³. Consequently, **Marxist philosophy and political**

¹ Besides, sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and its republics were held regularly. And the members of Soviets of all the levels were a better representation of the society than the Party activists who would be sent as delegates to the Congresses.

² See the work “Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences” by the Internal Predictor of the USSR

³ See the works “Brief Course ...”, “Dead Water” by the Internal Predictor of the USSR.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

economy can only serve as a cover for a mafia tyranny, which will present itself as a model of formal democracy to its people but will never become a scientific and theoretical basis for real democracy, socialism and communism as the society of just community of free people. Therefore it is completely out of place to blame Stalin for «perverting» Marxism because Marxism itself is a fruit of perverted morals, intellect and psyche on the whole.

Taking into account these characteristics of Marxism and those of Lev Bronstein (Trotsky) and his successors, it was not democracy or its beginnings that Stalin destroyed (and for which the society and Party was not ready yet anyway). He suppressed the attempt to establish the *besotting mafia tyranny* under the cover of plausible lies of Marxism. The masters of the Trotskyites could (**but not necessarily would**) have observed the formal democratic procedures in case if they had preserved their power in the USSR.

That is why in the epoch of Stalin's Bolshevism the USSR did not need the regular Congresses of the ACP (B.) (Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and constant intra-Party disputes which only excited the emotional state of the Party and of the non-Party society. What the country needed was a good policy to overcome such gregarious psychological effects which are characteristic of crowd-“elitism” and which replicate it over and over again¹.

¹ Refusal to finish the construction of the Palace of Soviets is also part of the policy to overcome the leaderism, which is a modification of crowd-“elitism”. The Palace of Soviets was necessary for the masters of Psychical-Trotskyites as an instrument of social magic. First, it was an instrument to support the personality cult of the current leader and his associates. Second, it would help to govern the society moved by gregarious instincts effecting in the crowd. The more delegates of the common people from provinces can be present in the conference-hall and the bigger is their emotional excitement in expectation of such an assemblage, the deeper is the personality suppression by the herd and the heavier is the person loaded with the idea to subdue to the leader, which he can transfer to the surrounding people upon his or her return home.

In recent decades the police got acquainted with the destructive force of the herd psychological effects from the football fans in all the countries. Only the direct communication between people can produce such powerful effects. It cannot be caused by the television (at least not at the point of its development

→ → →

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

Thereafter a lapse of 13 years in the calling of congresses, that was also a period of the Great Patriotic War and a period of the after war recovery of the peaceful life and the economy of the country, objectively was useful. If not for the society as a whole, at least for the members of the leading communist party of Bolsheviks, so they could have time to digest the morals and ethics that for decades had been reigning in the soviet society after the Great October Revolution and gather for the next congress with a different attitude to the life of the country and the world, with a different attitude to the leaders of the party and the state, and the party comrades and non-partisan citizens.

Besides, any sovereignty of the people is a demonstration of freedom of the spirit of the people that belong to the society, demonstration of freedom of their feelings and comprehensive attitude to life. An individual acquires these qualities in the process of upbringing, starting from infancy, and also in the process of the individual personal development, maturing during his life. That is why it is impossible to introduce freedom and democracy by means of law or order and spread it with the help of force measures of the government: freedom and democracy should ripen, grow in the society and make itself known in the politics of the state.

But state measures may defuse pressure of many factors that pervert and suppress the process of attaining freedom of spirit and therefore

on the verge of the 21st century): there are very few cases of mass football fanaticism leading to destruction of people's own domestic surroundings.

But the very same herd psychological effects can turn *«productive» if they are evoked by a special policy* and the audience is specially selected and ideologically prepared. Then these people from the audience can be used to govern the life and activity of the crowd-“elitist” society. This was the goal of the Psychical-Trotskyites from Communist International when they began the project of the Palace of Soviets. A similar function was performed by a complex of buildings, which Hitler built in Nuremberg, Germany, to mesmerize the crowd in the direct communication with it under the guise of the Congresses of the NSDAP.

But the Bolsheviks did not need the building to perform such kind of social magic in. That is why the Palace of Soviets project was stopped as soon as the circumstances allowed. First, the beginning of the war in 1941, and later the dissolution of the Communist International in 1943 left nobody to insist on the construction of the Palace in 1945.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

— national spirit of each nation. This matter is very important for understanding the history of the USSR and the perspectives of the nations of Russia and other states that originated on the territory of the USSR.

Internazi character of the revolutions of 1905 — 1907 and 1917 wasn't a secret for J.V. Stalin. He knew many facts of the czarist history of the RSDPW (Russian Social Democratic Labor Party) and other r-r-revolution parties and of the post-revolution history of the USSR, facts from the history of foreign countries that were not published neither in papers nor in the textbooks on History, but that witnessed that this is the way it was.¹ Besides commonality have been experiencing everyday and countrywide oppressive **influence of the Bible internazism upon the life of the USSR people** during the whole history of the USSR existence. **It still can be felt after the state downfall that happened as a result the bourgeois reforms of the next years.**

That is why the whole history of the czarist Russia, history of the USSR and the modern Russia has an epiphenomenon that some people, *dependent on this understanding*, during the last couple of years prefer to call «anti-Semitism». They explain its existence in the society solely by the flaws of the «anti-Semites» themselves: ignorance, reluctance and inability to think and be organized, drunkards' and idlers' envy of Hebrews that are considered to be in the majority geniuses, just talented, hardworking, highly proficient, united and supportive to each other. In reality this symbolic frothy word «anti-Semitism» that characterizes neither people personally nor a community as a whole is used due to the introduction in the culture stereotype to define natural people's reaction to the doctrine that we describe in the Appendix at the end of the book,

¹ Anecdote that was imprudently and proudly told by a Hebrew-student in the end of 70-s:

Volodarsky and Sverdlov walk along the hall of the Smolny Palace and all of the sudden Volodarsky pushes a not tall, bold, reddish man with a pointed beard. The man darkly smiles and passes by...

Sverdlov: «Hey, man?! That was Lenin!!!»

Volodarsky: «Look, Yasha, I am fresh from the States, who is this Lenin?»

Sverdlov: «Hush...!!! The whole gesheft is assigned to him ... »

Being a contemporary and the participant of the events Stalin knew much more about it than a Soviet Hebrew student in the end of 70-s.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

although they keep silent about the doctrine itself and ask for no definite attitude of Hebrews or non-Hebrews to it.

This reaction of a man and society to the enslavement at the realization of the Bible doctrine in life may be put in a very wide range:

- It can be purely personally-emotional, that does not express itself in the social theories by rejection of Hebrew (and/or Jews), each of who is “guilty”¹ firstly in the fact that according to the principals of the structure of the Bible doctrine he is destined to be a tool in its implementation and to be a means of its insinuation into the cultures of the non-Hebrewish national communities.
- Or it may be conceptually powerful all covering-alternative in respect to the Bible doctrine.

Just because of the wide range of the reactions to *the Bible doctrine of enslavement of all*, the word «anti-Semitism» is highly symbolic² and frothy in its essence. This allows to use it in advocating internazism, cultivating in society absolutely negative emotional tone in the vision of its meaning, depending on the circumstances.

According to this specification of the role of the word «anti-Semitism» and the spectrum of the phenomena in the life of society it describes, J.V. Stalin cannot be an «anti-Semite». But he was one of those, who not only knew many facts of the czarist history of the RSDLP (Russian Social Democratic Labor Party) and other r-r-revolution parties and of the post-revolution history of the USSR, facts from the history of foreign countries that revealed the demonstration of the Bible internazism, but had a system of the interpretation of the world that was rather congruous to life and

¹ But after this or that Jew is informed about the guilt, the inverted commas are not needed anymore, because starting from that moment of notification about the assigned to him by the «world backstage» mission he is free to make a conscious choice: to continue backing up this meanness or actively oppose to it. In this choice there is a key to the solution of the problem of «anti-Semitism», first of all the Jews themselves.

² The following shows how out of place this word is: Arabs — Semites, in spite of many Jews whose ancestors are obvious non-Semites — Turks, Khazars, Ethiopians and other at some point accepted Judaism as their religion. According to this historically real circumstance, opposing to the creation of the Arab state in Palestine, Israel manifests anti-Semitism.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

also included a peculiar understanding of internazism. His reaction to it was conceptually powerful and alternative in respect to the Bible doctrine.

But it wasn't alternative-all covering, because it was expressed in words, in terms of the historically formed Bible culture of the Russian empire and in terms of the frank international Marxism¹.

In them internazism has no *unique* name and connected with it characteristics of its demonstrations in life. That is why penetrating in other social phenomena that have more or less unique names and to which society has formed or was purposely induced to form consciously respectful and emotionally appealing attitude, internazism easily protected itself and is still protecting up to now, taking up their names.

Exactly according to this principal internazism in history is Christianity; and Communism; and Freedom and the rights of people in spite of national and social and class origin; and globalization as the structuring of culture, that peacefully unites all the nations and national cultures of humanity in tune with each other and Objective reality; and Zionism as an aspiration of the part of the Hebrews to settle in Palestine and live there their normal life as a state as all other people do, not being

¹ In order to be all covering alternative it was necessary for the alternative to operate a wider majority of terms, and, therefore, definitions, than did those who were against it.

But if to remain in the frames of the historically formed at that time cultural terminology all the actions of J.V. Stalin that were not commented by him, could and can be interpreted by different people as mutually exclusive, depending on their understanding of the character of the global historical process and management in it. Because of this point of view for some people Stalin is a contemptible marionette of zid-masonry; from another point of view he is an «anti-Semite» more artful and dangerous than Hitler; the third think he is an ignorant, sly and cruel power-loving man who managed to manipulate almost all (only Hitler was able to deceive him in 1941), including zid-masons, «anti-Semites», due to this and in spite of his mean essence he undeservedly appeared in the first lines of the list of the outstanding politicians and statesmen of the XX century. One see him as a Satanist, others — as a lost son of the Orthodox church who all his life looked for ways to come back to its bosom, etc. But all the commentators of his deeds in the majority are too lazy to read and understand the written heritage of J.V. Stalin and correlate it with the common to us all history.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

an international mafia¹ anymore; and emancipation of the Hebrews as the aspiration of the other part of the Hebrews not to be an international mafia and to become familiar with those nations that they live among and to consecrate their personal creative potential of a man to the service of their homeland — which is usually a multi-national society; and «internationalism» in Marxism where it is taught in the meaning of concord and agreement of all people no matter of their national and lineal origin; and cosmopolitanism as a recognized by every normal person concern for the future fates of all human beings and the Earth...

It is very difficult to name at least something in the history of the present global civilization that wouldn't be perverted or defaced the Bible internazism once entering it. The only thing it definitely could not pervert and deface is the ideal of life of the humanity in the God's Kingdom on the Earth. Although internazism could cut out practical implementation of the ideal of the God's Kingdom on the Earth from the life of society and states' politics for a historically long period of time (according to the present parameters).

What was said — is a minimum of the political backgrounds, that is necessary to know and to understand, because without it after-war period in the history of the Stalin's USSR can be viewed either as inscrutable nonsense or as the history of politics that expresses the will of the ill psycho who decided that he is an almighty immortal god on the Earth. But J.V. Stalin was neither a fool that aimlessly «ruled» the state to nowhere², nor a psycho that decided that he was an almighty immortal god on the Earth.

¹ This is one of the reasons why J.V. Stalin contributed to the creation of the Israel state, which in perspective was suppose to be a bulwark of the multinational Bolshevik socialism in the Far East

² «Party! Let me rule!» — is the slogan that thoughtless masses screened the coming of the bourgeois democratization to the power during the Gorbachev's perestroika. The slogan goes back to the words of one of the famous festive songs «Party is our — man at the wheel». People holding a mass meeting under that slogan did not relies that man at the wheel is an ordinary subordinate, a sailor on board and that the course is laid by a navigator, it is a task given by a captain (in the marine) and by a captain of the ship in Navy. In other words, man at the wheel makes little difference. If «Party is our man at the wheel», then it is not party that is responsible...

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

In the society of that time not all were viewless trimmers supporting any politics of the «upper crust» out of fear for themselves or out of career ambitions: they backed it up because they felt its practicability in connection to the aims that they considered theirs.

* *
*

Indeed J.V. Stalin knew that he gave much of his health to the victory in the Great Patriotic War. He knew that he went through his first (not serious according to their consequences) apoplexies actually not being out of control over the state and party matters. Indeed he knew that his surrounding — an internal party mafia — for several decades simply let no young Bolsheviks in, one of whom with the time could get into the swing of general party and state work and impose the highest party and state authority on himself, letting J.V. Stalin retire as any of the citizens of the USSR. That is why he used some means of screening of his true intentions from his closest surrounding that he had a right not to trust, justly seeing in them either executers of the will of the leader or viewless trimmers, but not initiative thinking creatively Bolsheviks, his comrades, servants of the ideal of Communism.

It would be a vile slander and absurdity to state that J.V. Stalin did nothing so that after his death the Bolsheviks' work on the transfer to the true Communism — a society of the righteous common living of free people on a global scale — was continued and strengthened. But what he did does not get along with the dependant ideas of the communist crowd about what the true leader of the communists should do before passing away.

A crowd, consumptively non-initiatively disposed towards their leader, imaging the delegation of authority to the follower-successor in the light of a historically formed monarchy tradition:

- In one of its variants the leader while alive should appoint a successor, teach him and bring him up, let him into the different secrets of his work and then delegate his duties — this is the way the authority is delegated in the monarch dynasties, with the only difference that they prepare for that from babyhood only one elder son of the leader, not the stranger;

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

- The other variant is when after the death of the leader or after his resignation, «conclave» of the fellow-fighters chooses the next leader — as cardinals choose the Pope.

But here it is necessary to stress that in both variants of the succession of leadership not entire authority is passed, but only the duties¹ that are usually *acclaimed* by the rest of the society or by its large powerful part on the basis of the written laws and unwritten traditions. **But once authority is delegated, every successor places on himself the concern and the responsibility for the work — according to his morally conditioned understanding and self-discipline.**

If to put outside the brackets the accompanying historical circumstances, then all crushes in history monarchies (hereditary and non-hereditary dictatorships) failed only due to the only reason, common for all of them — placing the duty and authority upon himself for the work he is the head of, according to his duties, the successor of the leader turned out not to be ready for the full circle of the concern and the responsibility that correspond with the entire intrasocial power. Thereupon the error of the management accumulated in the actions of the succession of the leaders changing each other and then the system collapsed.

The core difference between the crowd-“elitism” and bolshevism is in the following: in the crowd-“elitism” for the deed actualization duties,

¹ The problem of a successor of J.V. Stalin in the so-called «conjunctive mood of the history» and in the vain dreams about the future of the politically dependant part of the society is still so vital that the authors of the version of «Memories» of J.V. Stalin that are under the power of the aggregator that was formed on the basis of the teaching of E.P. Blavlatskaya and the Rerikhs took their understanding out to the cover of the book «... I want to tell about the main sin against the people. And I am to ask my people for forgiveness because I did not stand the test; I did not left a trustful man after myself». (A.G. Karpova, N.I. Siyanov-Starodubtsev, “Memories of J.V. Stalin. Recollections of Russia”, book 3, Moscow, 2000)

In our opinion such views about the succession of the upper power in society, that are arrogated to J.V. Stalin later, only express the understanding of this matter by the aggregatoriously possessed authors of «Memories». With such a primitive and not objective conceptions about the power in society J.V. Dzhugashvili would not have been J.V. Stalin: the history would have known nothing about these names.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

acclaimed by more or less wide layers of society on the basis of the law or tradition, is significant and therefore primary. In Bolshevism initiative placing upon oneself the concern and the responsibility for work is **significant and therefore primary**, as for the duties, they are secondary in respect to this voluntarily chosen autocracy in the common work. The duties are formed and *acclaimed by the rest of Bolsheviks* depending on how well the candidate for the post of the leader suits the aims of Bolshevism.

Consequently in Bolshevism a man shouldn't engineer himself in all cases to the formed structures of the duties and algorithmic of their functioning, but the structures of the duties, pretty much, if not completely, engineer according to the interpersonal delegation of the concern and the responsibility for the common work between the participants. This delegation is formed on the bases of the acquired by each of them skills and knowledge. That is why the architecture of the structures of the duties should be flexible enough and be purposely engineered by the participants for the possibilities of the specific people to answer their personal development and changes in the personal structure, that equally entails the change of the character of the delegation of the concern and the responsibility for the common work between the people.

In other words it means that J.V. Stalin could delegate his authority to the one he chose as a follower-successor or it could be taken over by his «fellow-fighters» — candidates for power, — which actually happened.

But somebody was to voluntarily lay the concern and the responsibility for work that J.V. Stalin served to, independently of the procedure of the delegation of authority by J.V. Stalin to someone else. By his actions J.V. Stalin could only create conditions for the successors to take upon themselves the concern and the responsibility for the Bolsheviks' idea, not less than Stalin's.

All this said about the delegation of authority in the form of concern and responsibility for work and about the delegation of duties and the difference between the real power and duties, J.V. Stalin himself experienced, partly knew from history and somehow understood it in his peculiar system of conceptions. Because in the period of 1945 — 1952 he actually created the conditions when his followers-successors could take

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

upon themselves the concern and the responsibility for the Bolsheviks' idea, not less than Stalin's and accordingly could change, if necessary, the architectural structure of the duties and algorithmic of their functioning. He passed away only after creating all these conditions.¹

Let's start with the fact that the post-war period of the history of the Stalin's USSR is characterized by the Hebrew (Jews indeed) commentators and non-Hebrew commentators that lost the perception of complicity to the fate of the simple people as a period when the politics of the «state anti-Semitism» was pursued. It is the time when many Hebrew public organizations² were shut down; it is the time of struggle against cosmopolitanism and groveling before the West, against Zionism that affected many Hebrews and non-Hebrews. The exposure of the pseudonyms of the cultural workers that uncovered their true last names that in majority were Hebrewish. «Doctor's Case» that preceded the elimination of J.V. Stalin by the scared «associates» and the rumors about the resettlement of the Hebrews to the Jewish autonomic region³ at the Far East that was never realized due to the Stalin's death.

But essentially it was a politics of the «state anti-Semitism» that was carried out only to suppress the rights and the freedoms of people on the basis of their Hebrewish ancestry. It was the first (after the victory of internazis in the state take-over of 1917) *open*⁴ try of the state to suppress

¹ Only it appeared that «it is caviar to the general»: in the party and in society morality and expressing it ethics still reigned that constantly created crowd-«elitism». That is why during the «palace revolution» in the end of February — beginning of March of 1953, the power was taken over by the lovers of the powers of office; they are also careless and irresponsible self-seekers-«elitists», those who perverted the Bolsheviks' work on building a society where the fair worker would be free from any parasitism on his work and life.

² That acted in majority at the expense of the state, as any other public organization in the USSR.

³ So-called, though based on the word «Hebrew».

⁴ The 1st try of the suppression of the internazism took place from the middle of 1920-s up to the beginning of the second world war of the 20th century under the name of «fight against Trotskyism» and in its essence it took place by default. It suppressed the activity of the structurally perfect, organized by mafia internazism of the true Marxists in the party and in the state.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

the activity of the consciously purposeful and spontaneously unconscious internazi in the Soviet society.

It was as effective as it was possible in terms of the historically formed at that time culture and Marxist sociology to single out internazi in the general flow of events of the past and present history of the humanity on the whole and particularly in Russia. It was as effective as it was possible for the society to comprehend such an interpretation of the Marxist and intercultural terminology. As effective as the people of the society and first of all administrators of the governmental authorities were self-disciplined in questions of abuse of their possibilities and staying away from the participation in the gregarious effects of the political activity of *the crowd that live according to the traditions and thinks according to the authority*¹. It was as effective as the Hebrews were able to reveal in themselves and in others internazism so typical for their culture and in this or that way for each of them, as a consequence of the influence of the culture, since without the revealing of the essence of the internazism in the culture and in people, it is impossible to part with it and liberated from its power.

It was not the politics of the «state anti-Semitism», that was carried out only to suppress the rights and the freedoms of people on basis of their Hebrewish ancestry and giving others some privileges on the basis of the absence of the Hebrews among their ancestors.

It was the state measures of reducing pressure of the internazism which for decades after the state upheaval in 1917 had been suppressing the spirit of people with all its power of the Marxist ideology and state, at this abusing the power of the punitive bodies of special services. It suppressed the national spirit of all the nations of the USSR, but also the Hebrewish Diaspora, preventing the spiritual emancipation of the society and formation informal freedoms in it and sovereignty of people that is typically for the humanity.

Although the word «internazism» at that time was not introduced in the political vocabulary and in the culture of the society, but the words «Zionism», «cosmopolitanism», «groveling before the West» in official Stalin's propaganda were interpreted exactly according to the features of

¹ We'll remind you once again that it is the definition to the sociological term «crowd» given by V.G. Belinsky.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

the demonstration of this global historical phenomenon, which in the terms of the IP (Internal-Predict) of the USSR is called **internazism**.

So under the term «Zionism» they saw not the aspiration of the Hebrews to settle in Palestine and create their state, but the exploitative ideology of the large Jewish international bourgeois, enslaving in the essence in respect to others, including Jews. Under the term «cosmopolitism» they saw not the concern of a man for the fates of the human beings and the Earth, but the refusal of the concern and the responsibility for the fates of the people of their homeland and other countries, that in fact made such kind of “cosmopolites” common to the local “elite” anti-national periphery of the «world backstage». The same is true about the «groveling before the West»¹.

¹ The fight against «groveling before the West» in its essence was directed exactly against the Bible doctrine. «Groveling before the West» in reality expressed that the Russian bearers of the servile psychology envied fed slaves of the Bible internazi doctrine of buying the world on bases of Jewish upper state usury and that they were physiologically ready to betray the work on the building a new global civilization for the sake of illusion of the possibility easily have a full belly and a comfortable life.

«Groveling before the West» sprung up during the liberation campaign of the Red Army in Europe. There during that campaign many soldiers — servile bearers of the crowd-“elitist” mentality — saw a highly consumer welfare of the population of the West countries.

These people who did not root out in themselves the servile psychology were not interested in the fact that the consumer welfare of the West population historically really was provided by nothing else but means of internazi conception of management: usury that whipped up the development of the technology and the level of education, parasitism of the metropolises on colonies, etc. This consumer welfare was reached in several centuries in the condition of the undivided reigning of the Bible culture in the West counties that lost their gentile constituent part. It was typical for Russia where the trust was on the way of the development of the technology, techniques and education overtaken the development of morality. Contiguity of the soviet bearers of the servile physiology with the «leading» culture of consumers of the West evoke in many envy and caused a wave of looting, including the one organized in the form of the «trophy campaign».

In the conditions of the post-war USSR this envy of the unrighteous welfare of the West stood on the way of deliberation of our own creative potential and, consequently was an obstacle in the work of the building of a new civilization on basis of the anti-crowd-“elitist” morally-esthetic principals of the humanity.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

But even these peculiarities of the interpretation of the sense of the mentioned words of Stalin's propaganda are regarded by anti-Stalinists, internazis and the slaves of anti-Nazism as another demonstration of Stalin's hypocrisy and ideological screen of anti-Hebrewish racism of Stalin's regime. But it would be just and therefore better for them to address their claims not to J.V. Stalin but to the mentioned in one of the footnotes of Chapter 6.3 Yu. Larin, (M.A. Lurie) — the author of the book «Jews¹ and anti-Semitism in the USSR» and such like «researchers» and «enlighteners». He and others like him, seeing internazism through the phenomena that it could penetrate through and the form which it took, avoid and still do the true reasons and the algorithmic of the coming into existence of the so-called «anti-Semitism». This contributed and contributes to the *anti-Hebrew racism remaining in society — which is the hostile attitude towards other people, emanating from the true or false supposition of belonging to Hebrews and being part of them*. Such kind of anti-Hebrew racism was spread out due to the implementation by J.V. Stalin of the state measures on suppressing internazism, and put on a mask of the latter.

All that are afraid of the so-called «anti-Semitism» in all its manifestations should know:

The so-called «anti-Semitism» appears not where Hebrews are, but where the Bible doctrine of the enslavement of all is being implemented in the form of the tradition of taboo on the discussion of the essence of the «Jew problem» or where it is presented as a Providential good.

What you call «anti-Semitism» in its foundation has the righteous denial of the Bible internazism. Only under the pressure of internazism that you bear, or under the pressure of Nazism that is born by the national “elites” this tendency to freedom and humanism is being perverted and presented as anti-Hebrew racism, fruitless and cruelly antihuman² as any other racism, including yours — internazi.

¹ Precisely, Hebrews, since on Russian here stands Hebrewish “nationality”.

² About this see the work of the Internal Predictor of the USSR “On Racial Doctrines: Unfounded, but Plausible”..

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

The politics of the state suppression of internazism in the post-war period of the history of the Stalin's Bolshevism was a background for the whole public and political life of the country. One of the important events of the public and political life of the Soviet society, that is forgotten by many contemporaries of those events now, was the discussions of different problems of life in the soviet society and the development of its culture that were published. These discussions are also referred to by the anti-Stalinists as demonstrations of Stalin's hypocrisy that provoked the illusion of freedom of words and thoughts in the opposition to the regime to be openly expressed so that later cruelly to be done away with.

At this, critics of the post-war politics of Stalin's Bolshevism prefer not to get into the essence of the opinions expressed during the discussion, in spite of the fact that they are the cores of those public discussions. The opinions stated by different people were the criteria that characterized the development of the *culture of the comprehension of the world* in the soviet society. The culture of the comprehension of the world in the depths of its subcultures represents what in many ways anticipates the further fates of the society. That is why anti-Stalinists, who did not get into the essence of these opinions stated during the discussions of that epoch, are being also hypocrites or show their narrow-mindedness, which is actually the same.

These discussions where the first manifestations of the cruel fight that took place between Bolshevism and local "elite" mafia periphery of the «world backstage» for the state power in the multinational Russian regional civilization.

One of the discussions of those years was devoted to the problems of the sociology on the whole, that nevertheless were viewed through the problematic of the development of the economical science as theoretical basis for managing the development of the national economy of the soviet society. Since everybody wants to eat, live comfortably, have healthy children, get an education, be well-to-do when old, etc. and this is provided exactly by the economical bases of the society, then the economical problematic is able to raise a wider interest than purely philosophical, that is considered by many to be remote from real problems

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of life by simple abstraction.¹ According to this understanding of the priority of the economical conditionality prevailing in society (under the pressure of the historical materialism and the cult of Marxism on the whole), J.V. Stalin himself drew the bottom-line of the discussion of the economical problems.

All what in his opinion was necessary and what he could say in that summery and assessment of the potentials for the further development of the socialism in the USSR and in the world was in 1952 published in the collection of the articles and answer letters to the participants of that discussion under the common name “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”, which was many times cited here and mentioned in the above chapters and that we are specifically going to analyze in the next chapter. The last of the letters of J.V. Stalin inserted in this book is dated September 29, 1952. In a week 19th Congress of the ACP (B) (All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks) was held and the party was renamed as CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union). This abbreviation remained ambiguous. The history proved the competence of the following interpretation: Capitulator Party of the Self-liquidation of Socialism.

19th Congress took place in Moscow in October 5 — 14, 1952. There a new membership of the Central Party Committee was elected. To understand why the history proved such a competence of the abbreviation CPSU we need to turn to a not well-know episode of the work of the Central Committee that was elected at the XIX congress.

After the Congress held on October 16, a Central Committee plenary session took place. J.V. Stalin spoke at the plenary session. His speech was a surprise for the participants: the surprise was not that no one expected it, but its contents. This Stalin’s speech benumbed the plenary session.

There were two reasons for it:

- First, J.V. Stalin bluntly warned the plenary session participants about the fact that those who are regarded his closest faithful associates, and if necessary — successors, were ready for betrayal of justice, bourgeois degeneration and joining in a conspiracy with

¹ Not without reasons: see the work of the Internal Predictor of the USSR “Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences”.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

imperialism. Thus J.V. Stalin openly expressed his distrust to V. Molotov and A. Mikoyan.

- Secondly, J.V. Stalin reported to the Central Committee members, — what they could have guessed themselves: that he had already become old and tired, therefore soon the time would come when he wouldn't be able to rule the country, hence they were to think about and elect in advance another person to be the ruling party Central Committee Secretary General.

One could content oneself with this information about J. Stalin's speech and go on to the further consideration of the problems. But it's better to turn to one of the plenary session participant's evidence, otherwise someone could consider our conclusion concerning attitude of the participants of the plenary session a groundless slander.

K. Simonov, who was a famous and influential writer and poet, respected in the Soviet society for decades, — became a candidate member for C.P.S.U. Central Committee, elected by the 19th Congress. In his memoirs, which he recorded on a tape-recorder not long before his death, and which were deciphered and published under the name “With the Eyes of a Man of My Generation” after he had passed away, he reports about the plenary session held on October 16, 1952, the following:

«In the March 1953 record¹ I didn't expatiate on the plenary session for many reasons. Nevertheless first I'll cite the short recording of that time, and then I'll decipher some points, to decipher which now, 27 years after, will be a less sin² than to consign them to oblivion.

Here is the record in the original form:

«Of course, I have no right to record everything what happened at the Central Committee plenary session³, but I still want to

¹ Here K. Simonov means one of his diary's records.

² Though the sin was to keep this plenary session secret during all the Khrushchev-Brezhnev era.

³ When the USSR existed there was such a notion as a «party secret». Some issues concerning the state and society life were examined at the so-called «closed» party meetings, plenary sessions and Congresses. Non-party people couldn't attend «closed» meetings, and the materials of the «closed» meetings, plenary sessions and Congresses were not published in the mass media.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

record some details not touching upon the issues of the plenary session.

*When the plenary session began precisely at the appointed time, everyone was in his place. And when Stalin together with the other Politburo members came out from the back door and approached the presidium table, the people gathered in the Sverdlov Hall applauded him. Stalin came in, his face being very serious and concentrated, and casting a quick glance at the hall he made a gesture with his hand — from his chest towards us. **And in this gesture he expressed that he understands our feelings to him and that we should understand that this is a Central Committee plenary session, where we should work** <bold type supplied by the authors>.*

One of the Central Committee members speaking from the rostrum said in the end of his speech that he was Stalin's faithful disciple. Stalin, who had been listening to the speech very attentively sitting in the presidium behind speakers, shortly remarked: «We are all Lenin's followers»¹.

In his speech talking about need for steadfastness and intrepidity Stalin began to speak about Lenin and the intrepidity he showed in 1918, about the incredibly hard situation of that time and how strong enemies were.

And what about Lenin? — Stalin asked. — And Lenin — reread, what he said and wrote then. He thundered in that incredibly hard situation, thundered, wasn't afraid of anyone. Thundered.

Stalin repeated this word «Thundered!»² twice or thrice.

Then in connection with one of the questions³ emerged at the plenary session talking about his duties Stalin said:

As far as I am entrusted with it, I am doing it. It doesn't mean it's just meant for me. I'm brought up in another way, — he said the last phrase in a very sharp way» (the italics is supplied by the authors in order to separate the diary record of 1953 given by K. Simonov from the memoirs of 1979).

¹ This concerns the question how during decades cult of J. Stalin's personality was created.

² J.V. Stalin reminds of the time when the conflict of «bolshevism and socialism in a separate country — «world backstage» and the world revolution» was the most acute one. The situation of 1918 was in many respects similar to the situation of 1952.

³ The question of relieving J.V. Stalin of a part of his functions. K. Simonov talks about it further in detail.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

So, what happened and what did I mean by that short record made in 1953? I'll try to remember and explain in the way I can.

(...)

I don't want to take a sin upon my soul and try to recollect the details of the plenary session, which I remembered but didn't record. I'll just talk about what is really etched in my mind, what is a hard and even tragic recollection¹.

I think, the plenary session lasted for 2 hours or a bit more time, from which Stalin's speech took half an hour and Molotov's and Mikoyan's speeches and elections of the Central Committee executive office in the end of the plenary session took the rest of the time. As far as I remember while Stalin was speaking Malenkov presided over the plenary session, the rest of the time Stalin himself presided over it. Almost after the beginning Malenkov gave Stalin the floor, and the latter walking behind the presidium table descended to the rostrum, which was several stairs lower than the table, in the middle as respects to it. From the beginning to the end he was talking in a harsh way without any humor, there were no sheets of paper in front of him². During his speech he intently, tenaciously and somehow severely peered into the hall, as though he tried to penetrate into the thoughts of the people who were sitting in front and behind of him. The tone of his speech, the way he was speaking grasping the hall with his eyes, — everything benumbed the sitting, I also experienced that torpor. The main idea of his speech (if not textually, then according to the train of thought) was that he was old, and the time was coming when others would have to continue what he had been doing, that the situation in the world was hard and the struggle with the capitalist camp would be very difficult, and that is the most dangerous in that struggle was to waver, take fright, retreat, capitulate. This was the main idea he wanted not only to express, but also to inculcate into

¹ It's distressing to die being a psychical-Trotskyite who hasn't done his duty to the future.

² I.e. J.V. Stalin thought it necessary to speak **without any pre-arranged text or thesis of his speech**, *which could become known beforehand to some of his «guardians» from the Central Committee staff.*

This could entail frustration of Stalin's put-up speech to the extent that he could die suddenly during the plenary session or before it and have no chance to speak.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

the present¹, which in its turn was connected with the theme of his own old age and probable departure.

All this was said in a tough and at times more than tough, almost fierce way. Probably in some points his speech included elements of game and account, but still one could feel true alarm² not without tragic hidden motive. It was in connection with danger of concessions, fear and capitulation, that Stalin appealed to Lenin in the phrases, which I have already quoted in my record of that time <the one of 1953, with which we began citing K. Simonov's memoirs>. Now, in fact, the speech concerned Stalin himself, who could leave, and those who could stay after his departure. But he wasn't talking about himself; instead he was talking about Lenin and his intrepidity in the face of any conditions.

The main peculiarity of Stalin's speech was that he didn't consider it necessary to talk about courage or fear, resolution or defeatism. Everything he said about it he connected with two certain members of the Politburo, who were sitting in the same hall two meters behind him. As for me, I never expected to hear about these two people something Stalin was talking about them.

First he assailed Molotov with all these accusations and suspicions, accusations of unfaithfulness, suspicions of cowardice, defeatism. It was so unexpected, that fist I just couldn't believe my ears, I thought I had misheard or misunderstood. But it proved to be just so. From Stalin's speech it was evident that the most suspicious man who was capable of defeatism, and the most dangerous one for Stalin that evening, that plenary session was nobody else, but Molotov. He was talking about Molotov grimly for a long time. He gave some examples (which I don't remember) of Molotov's erroneous actions³ mainly connected with the time when Stalin had been on leave, and Molotov had deputized for him solving some problems incorrectly, which he had had to solve in another way. I don't remember what the problems were, probably

¹ This is admission of the fact that they realized Stalin wasn't power-seeking, but cared for succession in the work of Bolshevism.

² This is one more admission of the fact that Stalin was sincere in his concern for the future and wasn't power-seeking.

³ This oblivion of the fact of the matter resulting from reluctance to understand the matter is a characteristic feature of psychical-Trotskyism: neither the content nor the form, nor the meaning of the given information is remembered, but the emotional impression of the event, which is *first of all caused by personal morals* rather than the events themselves.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

partly for the reason that Stalin spoke to the audience, which was conversant with the political cobweb connected with the problems better than me. I didn't always understand what he was talking about. Another reason for it could be the fact that his accusations were somehow reserved, vague and dim, at least I perceived it in that way.

I never understood what was Molotov's fault. I just understood that Stalin accused him of a number of actions he had done in the after-war period. Stalin accused him in such a towering temper, which seemed to be connected with a direct danger for Molotov, with a direct threat to make final conclusions, which could be quite expected from Stalin, as the past proved. In fact, the main part of his speech, all the accusations of cowardice and defeatism, and the appeal to Lenin's courage and rigidity Stalin connected with Molotov's figure: he accused him of all the sins, which could not take place in the party, if the time had its effect and Stalin would no more be the leader of the party¹.

For all Stalin's rage, which sometimes smacked of incontinence, in what he said there was the iron structure peculiar to him. The same structure was also present in the next part of his speech dedicated to Mikoyan, which was shorter, but more angry and disrespectful².

¹ If J.V. Stalin had been mistaken in V. Molotov's personality, then several years after Molotov wouldn't have appeared to be a member of the «antiparty group» which included «Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich and Shepilov, who joined them», that supposedly opposed Khrushchev's policy directed at resumption of «Lenin's standards of the party life» and who wanted to resume the order existed in the party and in the state under Stalin. *K. Simonov doesn't remember about it though.*

² In 1962 in the town of Novochoerkassk of the Rostov region mass disorders broke out caused by the rise in foodstuff prices (meat in particular), which followed immediately after the increase in output quotas at the Novochoerkassk electric locomotive producing plant. People gathered on the square demanded meeting with A. Mikoyan. A. Mikoyan was secretly in the town at that time, but he didn't speak to the people. *K. Simonov doesn't remember about this as well (though it's possible that he didn't know about Mikoyan's whereabouts).*

Everything came to the end with military units introduction into the town for «pacification» and burst of sub-machine gun fire: there were victims; after the meeting dispersal its «ringleaders» were arrested, prosecuted and shot.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

It was dreadfully silent in the hall. I didn't look back at my neighbors. But I saw all the four Politburo members sitting behind Stalin, who stood at the rostrum and spoke. I saw all of them having hardened, strained, motionless faces. They as well as we didn't know where and when Stalin would stop, whether after Molotov and Mikoyan he would pass on somebody else. They didn't know what they were to hear about others or probably about themselves. Molotov's and Mikoyan's faces were white and lifeless. Their faces still were white and lifeless when Stalin finished, came back and sat at the table, and they — first Molotov and then Mikoyan — one after the other descended to the rostrum. There — Molotov for a longer time, and Mikoyan for a shorter one — they tried to explain their actions and conduct to Stalin, justify themselves, tell him that they had been neither cowards nor defeatists and wouldn't fear new collisions with the capitalist camp and wouldn't capitulate¹.

After the cruelty and rage, which sounded in Stalin's speech when he spoke about them, both the speakers seemed to be defendants taking the final plea and pleading no guilty in all the points, but could hardly hope for a change in their fate, which had been determined by Stalin. I had a strange feeling, which I remembered then: they were speaking and it seemed to me that they were not the people whom I had seen so often not very far from

A. Lebed being a teenager was sitting on a tree during the meeting. When the first bursts were fired, other teenagers like *Sasha (then)*, who had been sitting on the same tree a branch upper and a branch lower, fell from the tree lifeless. Sashe fell down safe and sound, but he remembered this episode for all his life. He remembered about it in August 1991 what Muscovites should be obliged to him for.

As for the rise in prices in post-Stalin period, **prices are reduced in national economy as the industry spectrum as well as the consumer satisfaction increase, the way it was done under J. Stalin.**

In the antinational economy prices rise independently of the industry spectrum dynamics, as the rise in prices depreciates salaries, pensions, savings and thus makes everyone living by his own labor dependant on the system masters. According to this circumstance E. Gaidar and the «Union of the Right Forces» on the whole, A. Chubais, V. Chernomyrdin, A. Livshits and many-many others would better to hold their tongues and not to say they are true exponents of the democratic idea.

¹ These Molotov's and Mikoyan's attempts to justify themselves are just usual servility.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

me, but white masks put on their faces and which looked very much alike with the faces, and at the same time they were somehow absolutely different, lifeless¹. I don't know whether I've expressed myself precisely enough, but I had this very feeling, and I don't exaggerate it antedate.

I don't know why Stalin in his final speech at the Central Committee plenary session chose Molotov and Mikoyan as the two main objects for distrust. It was doubtless that he obviously wanted to compromise both of them, humble them, bereave ones of the most important historic figures after him of aureole. He wanted to make them small; especially he wanted to humble Molotov, to bring to nothing the aureole Molotov had², in spite of the fact that in the recent years he had been removed from the work to a great extent, in spite of the fact that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was already run by Vyshinsky, in spite of the fact that his wife was in prison³, — in spite of all this many-many people said or remembered Molotov's name right after Stalin's one. This was probably what Stalin didn't want. This he tried to bring home to everyone who had gathered at the plenary session, to all the old and young Central Committee members and candidates, to all the old and new members of the Central Committee executive office, which was to be elected yet. But for some reason he didn't want Molotov to stay

¹ This is a description of a zombie, which is most likely to fit their psyche formation. Every person is responsible for his/her psyche formation him-/herself (and not anyone else): if both of them are zombies, then this is their own and not J. Stalin's fault.

² If the cult of his own personality was disagreeable to Stalin, why should he like the «smaller» cult of Molotov's personality blossoming under the shade of the cult of Stalin's personality?

³ Molotov's wife's surname — Pearl — sounds in Russian translation as Zhemchuzhina, which became her party pseudonym and then turned into her surname; she was a Jew by birth. If Molotov knuckled under to his wife, she was imprisoned for revealed anti-bolshevist internazi influence she had upon her husband — a member of the CPSU Central Committee, Politburo and the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs.

About bed-political women and *sex-bombs as weapons of mass destruction* see the work “From Human Likeness Towards Being a Human” by the IP of the USSR (first published under the heading of «From Matriarchy Towards Being a Human...”).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

after him the first figure in the state and the party. And his speech excluded such an opportunity.

(...)

And there's one more thing. I don't remember exactly whether in this speech before giving the floor to Molotov and Mikoyan, or after it, in another his speech, which preceded the elections of the Central Committee executive office — I'm even afraid to affirm that the second speech took place, probably everything was said in different parts of the first one, — standing at the rostrum and looking into the hall Stalin began talking about his old age and that he was unable to fulfill all the duties he is entrusted with. He could act as the chairman of Council of Ministers; he could also hold Politburo sessions as he had used to; but he was unable to hold Central Committee sessions as the Secretary General. That's why he asked to exempt him from the latter post, comply with his request. I reproduce it almost in the way it was said. But this is not the matter of the words he said. Saying them Stalin was looking into the hall, and behind him the Politburo was sitting, and Malenkov, who hold the session while Stalin was speaking, was standing at the table. And I saw a horrible expression at Malenkov's face — that was not fright, but such an expression that showed that the man had realized the mortal danger, which threatened everyone, and which the others hadn't realized yet: one mustn't agree with comrade Stalin's request, one mustn't let him resign from the last of his three commissions. Malenkov's face, his gestures, his significantly raised hands were an outspoken entreaty to all the present to refuse Stalin's request immediately and decidedly¹. And then the words: «No, please, stay!» (or something like that), which sounded behind Stalin, were drowned by the buzz in the hall: «No! No! Please, stay! We beg you to withdraw your request!» I don't presume to cite all the words and cries, but on the whole the people understood something, and probably, most of them had understood it before I did. In the first moment² all this

¹ Later on Malenkov overlooked, didn't sense something, thus he found himself in the «antiparty group» together with Molotov. But it's possible that Khrushchev's neo-Trotskyists, who knew him very well, didn't take him into their team and preferred to get rid of him including him into the «antiparty group» of Molotov, Kaganovich and Shepilov, who joined them.

² The first impression coming out of the depth of mind, as statistics shows, is in most cases very close to the impartially true one. Everything subsequent is an attempt to justify oneself, an attempt to justify the following Khrushchevism

→ → →

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

seemed quite natural to me: Stalin would be the politburo chairman and the chairman of the council of Ministers, and somebody else would act as the Central Committee Secretary General, the way it had been under Lenin¹. But what I didn't understand at once, many others understood immediately or almost immediately, and Malenkov, who was responsible more than others as he was presiding at that moment, realized right away that Stalin wasn't going to resign the post of the Secretary General, that it was a test, reconnaissance of the attitude to the problem posed by him — whether they, the sitting behind him in the presidium and in front of him in the hall, were ready to let him, Stalin, resign the post of the Secretary General because he was old, tired and wasn't able to fulfill this third duty of his.

When the hall began buzzing and crying that Stalin had to stay at the post of the Secretary General and hold the Central Committee Office, Malenkov's face (I remember it very well) was the face of a man who had escaped a direct, real mortal danger, as this was he who had made the summary report at the party Congress, who had been holding almost all the Central Committee Office sessions and who was presiding at this plenary session. This was he who in case of another reaction to Stalin's request would have been the only candidate² to the third post of comrade Stalin, who said he wanted to resign from it because of his old age and fatigue. And in case Stalin had felt that behind his back or in front of his eyes there were people who could agree with his request, I think, Malenkov would have been the first to pay for it with his life. It's difficult to imagine what it would come to» (K. Simonov, «With the Eyes of a Man of

and Brezhnevism, whose nomenclature treated K. Simonov in a quite benevolent way.

¹ I.e. loyal lyric poet K. Simonov was an adherent of the monarchical variant of the power succession provision: where the leader gets a new one *inter vivos*.

² Unlike K. Simonov Malenkov understood that was not necessarily so. And unlike loyal K. Simonov the intra-system mafia was for the second monarchical variant: the «conclave» of «associates» proposes a new leader according to their interests. At the same time they could probably decide when they should bury the former leader. This became apparent in Malenkov's reaction to Stalin's suggestion, which would have made the intra-system mafia's scenario impossible, if there had been Bolsheviks instead of lackeys at the plenary session.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

My Generation. Reflections on J. Stalin», Moscow, News Agencies publishers, 1988, p. 239 — 246 minus the parts of the text, the sites of which are marked with omission points in brackets).

In fact, this episode shows that J. Stalin's initiative — to delegate his commission of the party Central Committee Secretary General to a successor on the basis of open nomination of candidates, their discussions at the plenary session and election of a new Secretary General in a quite democratic way, - was carelessly and irresponsibly rejected by the Central Committee members, who had been elected at the 19th Congress, and who let one of the state machine leaders — G. Malenkov, who was presiding the plenary session, — push themselves around. This is uncontradicted evidence that even 13 years after that crowd-“elitist” 18th Congress, the crowd-“elitist” character of the party and its Central Committee members still remained¹. Though as K. Simonov wrote in 1953, he understood that the Congress and the plenary session were summoned for work and not for their participants to express their feelings to J.V. Stalin (this confession of his we set off in bold type when citing).

Anti-Stalinists, whose impudent resourcefulness of their “astuteness” and “intellectual might” has no limits, affirm in their commentaries to this episode (as well as K. Simonov) that the plenary session presidium members sitting behind J.V. Stalin and the Central Committee members sitting in the hall suspected at once that guileful Stalin was looking for the next «party favorite», who could take his place with time — the place of the «mundane god» (*i.e. as if immortal*) — the post of the leader of the state and the party. And what's more, anti-Stalinists affirm that Stalin was looking for that «party favorite» in order to begin a new wave of «unjustified» repressions.

We believe that everything was simpler: **J.V. Stalin was the only Bolshevik in the hall**, the rest were cowardly, self-seeking, and thus shameless and careless frightened time-servers, lackeys by their

¹ I.e. J.V. Stalin faced the same problem H. Ford had faced, but unlike H. Ford's problem — Stalin's one was at the national level:

«But the vast majority of men want to stay put. They want to be led. They want to have everything done for them and to have no responsibility. Therefore, in spite of the great mass of men, the difficulty is not to discover men to advance, but <to discover> men who are willing to be advanced» (H. Ford, “My Life and Work”, chapter 6. «Machines and Men»).

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

psychology, who after the Great October Socialistic Revolution formed a new *haughty class* and considered themselves the true “elite” of the soviet society.

This lackey-careless attitude to the Motherland with claims on haughtiness is not only seen in K. Simonov’s description of the plenary session, but is also obvious from his personal attitude to life during the post-Stalin period. In fact we have cited such a huge extract in order make our assertion not unfounded, and for readers to feel the spirit of the frightened party-nomenclature servility conveyed by K. Simonov, which became apparent at that plenary session.

What J.V. Stalin thought about the results of the plenary session only he and God could know. The intra-system mafia members frightened of Stalin’s first illegitimate (as they thought) attempt to delegate his commission of the Central Committee Secretary General, decided not to wait for further initiative demonstration of Stalin and the party in this course and «eliminated» J.V. Stalin in less than half a year, carrying out «coup d’etat».

But as a result of such a conduct of the plenary session — of its every participant-bolshevism deserted the CPSU organizational structures during the next decade, the way it had deserted the hierarchy structures of the Russian Orthodox biblical church before.

Bolshevism really deserted the CPSU organizational structures, but didn’t disappear from the society. And it won’t appear in the organizational structures of any other party, construction organizational principles of which prevent personal development of a man.

J. Stalin’s speech at the Central Committee plenary session in October 1952 was published neither when he was alive, nor after his death. Due to this fact in many respects the myth about J. Stalin’s dictatorial absolute power and about his thirst for power for the sake of power could exist. Someone may think that J.V. Stalin didn’t want to publish his speech himself. But such a supposition would mean that J.V. Stalin was a defeatist, coward himself, i.e. it’s controversial to K. Simonov’s evidence concerning the events at the plenary session.

Many things indicate that during all his activity as the party and the state leader J.V. Stalin was surrounded by the system mafia, which used

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

his name and Socialism and Communism slogans as a cover for its self-seeking activity¹. This situation still remained in 1952, that's why *the speech without any prepared text delivered at the Central Committee plenary session* was unexpected for the State machinery and the «guardians» present at it. This speech was nearly the only opportunity for J.V. Stalin to run the informational blockade and let *the rest of the society*² know (through the Central Committee members and candidates) his true opinion, which he expressed directly and not with the help of hints or by implication.

But as for opportunities to publish his speeches, there existed a multilevel system of self-censorship of the crowd-“elitist” society: from direct official bans and direct collusion of the «world backstage» periphery to the pressure upon the minds of individuals and gregarious effects begotten in the society by the cult of Marxism and cult of

¹ On this subject see the book: Yu. Mukhin “Murder of Stalin and Beria”, Moscow, «Crimea bridge-9D», «Forum», 2002.

² But K. Simonov was the only one of several dozens of participants of the Central Committee plenary session in October 1952 who did it, though 27 years after. However he did it on his deathbed, as he didn't want to go to a better world with a sin upon his soul: with the sin of concealment of the truth in his lackey silence. He knew the truth, but it was concealed from the rest of the society by the mafia power.

Besides, we should understand, that at the Central Committee plenary session in October 1952 J.V. Stalin didn't just want to express his ideas supposing that delegates would take them round all the USSR. He really wanted to rely on the inner-Party democracy, but the plenary session participants appeared to be incapable of it. He wanted to see an irreversible result in the life of the party itself, and not only delegates to take his words round the USSR, where they would have no consequences and would soon be forgotten because of the flow of everyday events.

That's why a similar speech by its matter at one of the sessions of the 19th Congress (which, as it may seem, could have solved the problem of the information expansion in the society in a better way due to a greater number of the participants) didn't do for J. Stalin's attempt to rely on the real inner-Party democracy: suppression of the personality by means of psychological gregarious effects would work better in a larger audience. A relatively small plenary session audience could better do for exciting people's political will - thus in the party there would eventually appear the informal (coming from the people) bolshevist power of simple Party members over the State machinery. But unfortunately it didn't happen.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

J.V. Stalin's personality, owing to which false ideas about him were developed. J.V. Stalin had no power over this multilevel censorship system, thus he had to adapt himself to it and evade it, as well as all other ones in his public activity.

The difference in this timeserving between J.V. Stalin and the majority of other time-servers to the system was in the fact that J.V. Stalin adapted himself to it directing his efforts to the strategy of transformation of the global civilization life on the basis of the ideals of the righteous liberal society — communism. And the majority of time-servers pursued their selfish ends of the present day and near-term outlook: their minimum aims were to survive in the system and the maximum ones — to join to the system “elite” by way of repressing other people's lives¹.

The story concerning the *cessation* of the edition of his collected works also confirms the fact that J.V. Stalin had no opportunity to be published. From 1941 through 1951 the first 13 volumes including his books, articles and speeches up to 1934 inclusive were published. But the edition of the 14th — 16th volumes took so much time that it can be considered that edition of J.V. Stalin's collected works was actually ceased in 1951 — when the supposedly «all-powerful dictator» was still alive. There were no announcements about the cessation of the editions of the works of the soviet people leader. There was just an inexplicable delay in the edition of the regular volumes of *the subscription publication*². The only

¹ «Righteous society made up of rascals», — a proactive characteristic by V. Kluchevsky, which warns about the attempt to introduce a majority of bearers of the crowd-“elitist” psyche algorithmic model into the organizational forms of Socialism. It's desirable to think of it every time when the matter concerns various abuse of power at the time of Stalin's Bolshevism.

² Subscription publications were distributed almost in the way newspapers and magazines are distributed now by means of subscription. The only difference is that one part of subscription publications was delivered to the customer's place by post, and the other part was distributed through a network of bookshops, where they took stocks of the subscribers and the receipt of the editions they ordered. Correspondingly, a more-than-one-year delay of the regular volumes edition of the subscription publication of J. Stalin's works couldn't but go unnoticed and evoke perplexity in rather large sections of the public in all the USSR cities.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

explanation of the delay is that the work at the edition was ceased by retardation and corrective action as though to improve it¹.

J.V. Stalin impeded the «world backstage», because he was an authoritative politician-Bolshevik who acted conceptually beginning from the after-war years². After the Great Patriotic War the course of political life in the USSR acquired a stable trend toward irreversible liberation from the power of the «world backstage» internazism. Thus the «world backstage» had to begin curbing the USSR and solving the problem of minimization of the damage caused by J. Stalin's bolshevist activity during several decades. One more **hindrance for the «world backstage» to carry out its political scenarios would be further publication of his works, which were to be included into the 14th — 16th volumes of the collected works. They could bring Stalin's view of the flow of events in 1934 — 1952 home to contemporaries and descendants in a concentrated form**³. Publication of J. Stalin's speeches, articles and letters referring to these years would have essentially impeded and even made neo-Trotskyite policy of N. Khrushchev's regime impossible, *in case the edition had been published in 1951 — 1953 and included 14th — 16th volumes of the collected works.*

¹ Is it possible that the «all-powerful dictator» didn't understand what was going on? or he was going to live forever and thus postponed the publication of the final version of his collected «revelations» to chronologically uncertain «next time»?

² «We've endured too much during the last 15 years», — in this way the US National Security Council directive 20/1 of August 18th, 1948 characterizes the period beginning from 1933, when Trotskyists-internazis' undivided power in the USSR was broken off by Stalin's Bolshevism. Extensive extracts from this US National Security Council directive under the name «Our Aims Concerning Russia» are cited in the book «The CIA against the USSR» by N. Yakovlev.

³ Though a greater part of these works was published in the periodical press, the historical experience proves that books and especially collected works are more effective means of information transmission to descendants than separate periodical editions due to two circumstances: first, books are statistically better preserved on library bookshelves (and first of all in home libraries) than newspapers and magazines; secondly, the concentration of significant information is substantially bigger in books and especially in collected works than in longstanding periodicals filings.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

Correspondingly, having taken the decision to annihilate J. Stalin¹, the «world backstage» gave the instruction to slow down the edition of his works, having assumed that if it had established under its control a new regime in the USSR after his removal, the crowd wouldn't have dared to demand to continue edition of his collected works. They believed that as far as the crowd would have been conceptually powerless, it wouldn't have been able to assure the continuation of Stalin's political course. Indeed it happened so: the composed type of the 14th — 16th volumes and sample copies were destroyed when the new N. Khrushchev's psycho-Trotskyist anti-Bolshevist regime came to power in the USSR. And as it's well known the question of continuation of edition of J. Stalin's works never arose at plenary sessions and Congresses of *the defeatist party of Socialism self-destruction*, and was never raised by the broad «masses»²: in the USSR only «dissidents» of probourgeois-individualistic trend belonging to the class of *grovellers to the West* were active.

¹ “St-Petersburg vedomosti” of the 10th of March 1992. The article “The CIA Planned to Kill the Father of Peoples” said (with reference to the book “Old Friends: American Elite and the CIA Origins” by historian Burton Hersh) that the CIA director Allen Welsh Dulles approved of the plan of Stalin's assassination in 1952. From this we can understand that J. Stalin's influence upon the global policy was a very significant hindrance, as far as such an operation was planned concerning an old man (On the December 6th, 1952 J.V. Stalin was 74. His real date of birth, which is confirmed in church records, is the December 6th, 1878), who, taking into account the state of his health and way of life, had just several years more to live.

² The 14th, 15th and 16th volumes of J. Stalin's works were edited in 1997 in Moscow by the publishers «Writer».

R. Kosolapov prepared and organized the edition of the volumes. During Gorbachev's reconstruction he *filled the post* of the chief editor of the theoretical organ of the Central Committee of the CPSU — the magazine «Communist» (we can't say he «worked at his post», if we correlate what was going on in the country with what was published in the magazine «Communist» when R. Kosolapov was at the head of it). The matter of the 14th — 16th volumes, which continue the edition of J. Stalin's works, was formed with some additions according to the edition of his works published in the USA for «Sovietologists'» needs. It included 14th — 16th volumes published on the basis of the sample copies of the might-have-been soviet edition, which were found in the USA.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

That's why nothing really says that in 1952 omitting the hierarchical multilevel self-censorship of crowd-"elitism", which was beyond his control, J.V. Stalin could say directly to the society through the USSR mass media and scientific press what he thought. Nothing really says he could give instructions to publish his speech at the October Central Committee plenary session or any other one, which would overstep the limits of the society's capacity for perceiving its meaning adequately¹. Discussions concerning different problems, which were held in the press during after-war years, letters, which were addressed to the Central Committee, to the Government and to his name, gave a good idea of the society's worldview and ideology, of what it could accept and understand, and what it would reject taking no trouble to re-comprehend the life and the said. This is clearly seen in the "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".

Judging from the reconstruction of the algorithmic model of the soviet society's collective mentality of that time (including the analyses of the contemporaries' evidences), only his single works and speeches could escape the censorship (which was beyond J. Stalin's control) in the press and in other mass media. These works and speeches were to be done in such a linguistic style, that *even formally according to the Marxism linguistic culture dominating in the USSR*, they were not apprehended as a danger by the State machinery mafia. And even if the «world backstage» could understand the danger of the said to its policy, its periphery just had no time to respond to separate «leakages» of conceptually alien information (for it) into the society.

In such conditions succession of the Bolshevism conceptual power was ensured: "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." is J. Stalin's report about achievements during his leadership of the party and the state;

¹ K. Simonov was one of the USSR most erudite cultural workers, and in most cases a man, who had independent and not trite thoughts. However even with such qualities he appeared to be psychologically unready to apprehend that little bit of the social truth, which J.V. Stalin stated in his speech at the Central committee plenary session. His example is one of numerous indices that there are statistically objective limits of information perception by any audience (from one person to the whole mankind). No one who brings information home to people can transgress those limits without causing psychological breakdown of this or that kind: depression, stupor, hysterics directed towards the audience itself or towards other people.

6.7. How to Protect the Future from the «World Backstage»

it's a report about unsolved problems and a farewell speech to Bolsheviks. These collected works were published in 1952 as a separate edition.

And though after J. Stalin's death his works were withdrawn from library stocks of common access, and from school and college curricula of philosophical and social sciences, still copies of the small brochure outlived Khrushchevism and the depression on the shelves of family libraries and were called for by successors-continuers, who belonged to new generations of Bolsheviks.

«Stalin hasn't become a thing of the past, he has dissolved in our future»¹ — however sad it may be for many people, who are lackeys at heart, even if they pretend to be slave-owners and masters.

¹ Pier Courtad's epigraph to the book «About the USSR's Nature. Totalitarian Complex and a New Empire» by Edgar Moren (Moscow, «Science for the Society», 1995; French edition — Fayard-1983).

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

6.8.1. Refuse Marxism

The contents of the book “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” also suggest that this Stalin's work became the common property of the people; and it managed to escape the motley self-censorship of the crowd-“elitist” society. Thoughtless and industrious functionaries (of the State machinery) didn't understand and let it be published¹; and more

¹ As an example of presuming «know-all»' attitude to the «leader» and his works — *people who forgot that due to God's mercy every nation lives a bit better than it deserves according to its temper and ethics* — here is an extract from the article «Goebbels' Creative Development» by B. Khazanov, published in «Oktyabr'» («October») magazine, № 5, 2002:

«Indeed, a great abasement of our time was that the roles of omnipotent rulers were played by mean, unscrupulous, narrow-minded people with primitive way of thinking and poor cultural background. As Goebbels once said — «Leadership has very little in common with education». He was right. One can talk about Stalin's striking guile as much as he/she likes, one can wonder at his instinctive understanding of methods and machinery of absolute power — but it's enough to read the leader's works to evaluate his closed mind. One can admire Hitler's ability to hypnotize the crowd — but his chaotic book produces the same lamentable impression as Stalin's works. There's nothing common with greatness — it's a question of remarkable meanness.

Power corrupts its bearer; power lets his vile instincts expand in plenty. But there's power's charm. Power — and especially omnipotent power — throws reflection on everything that the ruler does. Platitudes from a tyrant's lips seem to be insight, vulgarity transforms into profundity of thought, coarse humor turns into sophisticated wit. Harshness, meanness, immorality are interpreted as dictates of the highest necessity. Omnipotence aura makes slaves romanticize the ruler, worship his divine boots. This explains the wish to see the dictator as a great man, in spite of obviousness, or at least imagine him as a demon, raise him to the rank of Antichrist. The thought that we were ruled by a pygmy is unbearable».

— Change the Past Tense onto the Present one in this quotation and you'll get a text, which would be signed by many representatives of Stalin's Bolshevism soviet “elite”. But in that epoch they hid such thoughts even from themselves, as they were afraid to fall victims of denunciation from «high-moral know-alls» like themselves. But due to such kind of evaluation of Stalin's personality and works by Bolshevism opponents the publication of the “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” became possible: «What's there? — Ooh... new platitudes from the tyrant's lips... — to be published».

→ → →

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

thoughtful «world backstage» acting through its periphery didn't manage to prevent publication and distribution of the work in the society.

The characteristic feature of the work is that ideas of the book are beyond one's comprehension without *understanding of the global history course*. In other words, understanding of the global history course influences the reader's understanding of "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".²

There are many people who dream about Communism, but haven't released from power of Marxism over their worldview. They make reference to "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" as to an example of the *Marxist theory development by Stalin, which is directed toward Communism building*. They don't realize that this work is capital sentence for Marxism, *which is though expressed by linguistic means of Marxism itself*. They don't realize this fact as well as Stalin's «guardians» from the State machinery mafia and from the «world backstage» didn't realize it in 1952, and thus let the collected articles and reply letters to the economic discussion participants be published.

Such a faulty opinion arises from two circumstances: **first** — people's unwillingness and inability to realize the course of life on their own; **second** — in "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" there are many phrases, which make the impression that Stalin is Marxism's man Friday. Here is one of the most impressive phrases of the kind:

And those who really were ready to lick Stalin's boots devoutly didn't care for his thoughts, but for the chance to lick his boot at least once in life — it's such a good after which you could die happy. Such kinds of moral-psychological types are at enmity with each other just because of the disputes about problem whose boots to lick and about the queue and frequency of licking their idols' boots.

² If there's no understanding of the global history course, then Stalin's mentioned work is a collection of platitudes and senseless Marxist jabber — this thought is emotionally expressed by B. Khazanov in the extract from his article, which is cited above.

In order to show vivid consistency of our understanding of the «Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR» and absurdness of different opinions about Stalin's intellectual primitivism, we had to premise parts 6.1 — 6.7 devoted to the USSR history and global politics history of the 20th century, to the present part, in which we analyze Stalin's work.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

«To describe Comrade Yaroshenko's opinion in a couple of words, it should be said that it is un-Marxist -- and, hence, profoundly erroneous». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yaroshenko”, part 1. “Comrade Yaroshenko’s Chief Error”).

In other words, only Marxist approach to emerging problems leads to their solution, and thus enriches the Marxist study:

«Marxism regards laws of science — whether they be laws of natural science or laws of political economy — as the reflection of objective processes which take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover these laws, get to know them, study them, reckon with them in his activities and utilize them in the interests of society, but he cannot change or abolish them. Still less can he form or create new laws of science» (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 1, “Character of Economic Laws under Socialism”).

And of course, in order to succeed in Communism building it’s necessary to bring up the young generation in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism:

«Hence, the laws of political economy under socialism are objective laws, which reflect the fact that the processes of economic life are law-governed and operate independently of our will. People who deny this postulate are in point of fact denying science, and, by denying science, they are denying all possibility of prognostication — and, consequently, are denying the possibility of directing economic activity.

It may be said that all this is correct and generally known; but that there is nothing new in it, and that it is therefore not worth spending time reiterating generally-known truths. Of course, there really is nothing new in this; but it would be a mistake to think that it is not worth spending time reiterating certain truths that are well known to us. The fact is that we, the leading core, are joined every year by thousands of new and young forces who are ardently desirous of assisting us and ardently desirous of proving their worth, but who do not possess an adequate Marxist education, are unfamiliar with many truths that are well known to us, and are therefore compelled to grope in the darkness. They are staggered

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

by the colossal achievements of Soviet government¹, they are dazzled by the extraordinary successes of the Soviet system, and they begin to imagine that Soviet government can «do anything», that «nothing is beyond it», that it can abolish scientific laws and form new ones. What are we to do with these comrades? How are we to educate them in Marxism-Leninism? I think that systematic reiteration and patient explanation of so-called "generally-known" truths is one of the best methods of educating these comrades in Marxism». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 1, “Character of Economic Laws under Socialism”).

Reading the given extracts from “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” — *without going into the sense of some details* — we get the impression that this is a type of agitation for Marxism study and propaganda for Marxism as for the theoretical basis of Communism building.

But what is shown in the extracts cited above is a model of perception palmed off *by the Marxism believers who don't know it and who don't understand Life*. This model of perception lets them easily place Stalin among Marxists and thus allow this work be distributed in the society where cult of Marxism dominates. And there are even more such models of perception, which unambiguously characterize “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” as a Marxian work. That's why everyone who wants to believe in it, but doesn't want to think or be responsible — do believe that Stalin is «a genuine Marxist who constructively develops the Marxian heritage with reference to the new historical conditions», or is «stupid, as all Marxists are, and that's why he tried to solve emerging problems on the basis of Marxism without going outside its scope».

But if we, being acquainted at least with the main Marxism principles, try to realize the «details» dispersed in “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”, we'll see that this work *by its matter is nothing but relentless antimarxism*, which penetrated on the sly into authoritative classical Marxism literature of that time and used its common language.

¹ During a generation's life the nation made its way from almost overall illiteracy, plough and splinter to the best education in the world, to industry based on advanced constructions and technologies, was getting ready to the first space flights.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Its anti-Marxist essence is one of the reasons why the book is neither criticized nor praised by Marxists of the following generation. If they don't realize, then they feel that: **discussion of it in public is Marxism's public death penalty.**

Indeed, as Marxism teaches, every problem of every philosophy is *«the problem of relation of consciousness to existence, thinking to substance or nature; and the problem has two aspects: first, what is primarily — spirit or nature¹, substance or consciousness — second, how knowledge about universe relates to universe itself, or, in other words, whether consciousness agrees with existence, whether it can correctly reflect universe»* (“Philosophical Dictionary” edited by academician I.T. Frolov, Moscow, «Politizdat», 1981, p. 266).

These problems can be raised to the rank of «the main issue» only by customers of the philosophy aimed at tearing people away from life and making them dependant on life events flow interpreters, which are guided by some other philosophy, *concealed by them from the rest of the society.*

Such is the case, as without any mental tricks and logical proves and historical-philosophical erudition most people, who have to solve everyday big and small problems in their life, instinctively know the following:

- Independently of the answer on the first aspect of the question: either «spirit (i.e. God) is primarily, nature — fruit of spirit (God) is secondary»; or «nature is primarily — human consciousness is secondary», — the man can't change the existing reality. And answer on the question: which of the two opinions agrees with the objective truth? — lies out of any logics proof area. This is confirmed by the millennial interminable dispute of logical and quotation-dogmatic philosophical schools of “scientific” materialism and occultism — “scientific” idealism.
- As for the second aspect of «the main issue» of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, one doesn't need any logical tricks to understand instinctively that knowledge about universe may agree with universe

¹ In other words whether God — Creator of Nature (Universe)— exists, or not, and there is just fiction about Him?

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

itself or not. When people act according to the knowledge that agrees with universe, they are success. If they act according to the knowledge or pseudo-knowledge (false notions), which doesn't agree with the living conditions, they get worse results than they expected down to a complete failure, what may entail many human victims and natural disasters.

And that's why only the philosophy, which can answer questions in the real life, such as: whether the results of work will be worse than expected; or they won't be worse (i.e. they will be just like they are expected or even better) — has practical value in everyday life of most people.

In other words, the main issue of practically useful wisdom is the problem of detailed consequence predictability, which can assist people in their activities (including circumstances control) both by oneself and collectively in real living conditions.

And according to this practically useful worldly wisdom that has nothing in common with far-fetched logical and schizophrenic constructions of *Marxism, which considers problems of control neither on the whole, nor in particular aspects*. J.V. Stalin undermines domination of Marxism and its philosophy's «main issue» over people's mind in the given extract:

«... the laws of political economy under socialism are objective laws, which reflect the fact that the processes of economic life are law-governed and operate independently of our will. People who deny this postulate are in point of fact denying science, and, by denying science, they are denying all possibility of prognostication — and, consequently, are denying the possibility of directing economic activity».

Since Marxism doesn't handle the problems of foresight as well as different processes control and their self-management organization, and Marxian philosophy and Political Economy are formed to prevent understanding management processes on the basis of foresight as a whole, and in economics particularly, — this extract concerns neither Marxism nor its so-called «creative development as applied to new historical conditions».

Still, it's well known, that it's possible to grub up a lot of quotations from a big text touching upon a wide range of different problems; put the quotations in a definite order, comment upon them and thus prove practically any predetermined conclusion. Nevertheless the demonstrated

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Stalin's non-Marxian approach to the problem of the society economic life control is not the result of such a fact selection and understanding abuse.

In accordance with our target setting concerning the society economic life control, Stalin shows his aversion to Marxian Political Economy, as one can organize the society economical activity control on its basis neither practically nor theoretically¹. This was mentioned in many works beginning from 1994. But the corresponding extract from "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." was reduced in them to a great extent. Here we cite it in full:

«Absolutely mistaken, therefore, are those comrades who allege that, since socialist society has not abolished commodity forms of production, we are bound to have the reappearance of all the economic categories characteristic of capitalism: labour power as a commodity, surplus value, capital, capitalist profit, the average rate of profit, etc. These comrades confuse commodity production with capitalist production, and believe that once there is commodity production there must also be capitalist production. **They do not realize that our commodity production radically differs from commodity production under capitalism** (put in bold type by the authors).

Further, I think that **we must also discard certain other concepts taken from Marx's *Capital*** — where Marx was concerned with an analysis of capitalism — **and artificially applied to our socialist relations. I am referring to such concepts, among others, as «necessary» and «surplus» labour, «necessary» and «surplus» product, «necessary» and «surplus» time** (put in bold type by the authors). Marx analyzed capitalism in order to elucidate the source of exploitation of the working class — surplus value — and to arm the working class, which was bereft of means of production, with an intellectual weapon for the overthrow

¹ The head of state and ruling party leader while during a quarter of the century personally considering almost every project of five-year or annual USSR social and economic development plan, setting tasks for the authors of the plans and projects, he can't but notice and understand that Marxian Political Economy is a separate entity, and is neither connected with plan working-out process nor with the control process of the plans carrying out.

But if the leader just poses problems «in general» and signs documents worked up by others, putting signature where clerks show, he won't it even during several decades, as all following USSR leaders didn't realize that.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

of capitalism. It is natural that Marx used concepts (categories) which fully corresponded to capitalist relations. But it is strange, to say the least, to use these concepts now, when the working class is not only not bereft of power and means of production, but, on the contrary, is in possession of the power and controls the means of production. Talk of labour power being a commodity, and of «hiring» of workers sounds rather absurd now, under our system: as though the working class, which possesses means of production, hires itself and sells its labour power to itself. It is just as strange to speak now of «necessary» and «surplus» labour: as though, under our conditions, the labour contributed by the workers to society for the extension of production, the promotion of education and public health, the organization of defence, etc., is not just as necessary to the working class, now in power, as the labour expended to supply the personal needs of the worker and his family.

It should be remarked that in his “*Critique of the Gotha Program*”, where it is no longer capitalism that he is investigating, but, among other things, the first phase of communist society, Marx recognizes labour contributed to society for extension of production, for education and public health, for administrative expenses, for building up reserves, etc., to be just as necessary as the labour expended to supply the consumption requirements of the working class». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 2. “Commodity Production under Socialism”).

We'll let the issue concerning commodity production and the market in the socialist state planned economics pass. Instead we'll concentrate on the sense of the rest of the extract. If we cast away from Marxian Political Economy such notions as «necessary» and «surplus» labor, «necessary» and «surplus» product, «necessary» and «surplus» time as Stalin bluntly suggests, it ... will fall to pieces. As a result of it Marxism will collapse as well, because its Political Economy is a product of its philosophy. As a consequence Political Economy break-up will inevitably entail the philosophy revision, and hence — sociology revision on the whole as well as revision of the system of representations of global civilization history and its outlook.

But on the whole socialist society needs Economic Theory and Sociology. Beginning with as though accidental suggestion, which is actually murderous for Marxism, to cast away all the Marxian Political

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Economy conceptual categories he enumerated, Stalin finishes the part we have cited giving direct instructions to scientists — to work out a completely new economic theory, which would be in line with life and social wants of economics control:

«I think that our economists should put an end to this in congruity between the old concepts and the new state of affairs in our socialist country, by replacing the old concepts with new ones that correspond to the new situation.

We could tolerate this incongruity for a certain period, but the time has come to put an end to it (put in bold type by the authors)». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 2. “Commodity Production under Socialism”).

But there may arise the question: how must we understand Stalin’s direct references to K. Marx, which are situated between the suggestion to cast away all the Marxian Political Economy conceptual categories and the suggestion to scientists to work out an economic theory, which would be in line with the real life?

In this connection it’s good to remember that J.V. Stalin used to be a seminarist, and in the seminary he studied quotation-dogmatic philosophy, which works on the principle «if there arises a question — look for a pertinent quotation in authoritative sources»¹. In order to be a good dogmatist-quotationist it’s necessary to know and remember well works by philosophical school founders and their pupils — commentators and successors, who by tradition are recognized as legitimate authorities.

But if classics raised to the rank of infallible authorities are mistaken in something or haven’t examined some question, then quotation-dogmatic philosophy fails to solve problems emerging in life. But already in his youth Stalin surmounted this quotation-dogmatic philosophy scantiness. This becomes apparent in his works — he could easily express his thoughts in the form of succession of quotations from universally recognized texts, joining different quotations with *his own words, giving his words the mission of control over the sense of the composite text containing quotations.*

¹ I.e. besides people of authority there may be authoritative sources including ones without any definite authorship (for example, the Bible).

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

The given extract from Stalin's work with references to K. Marx and to his works, where K. Marx examined something and came to some conclusions, won't lose its sense minus references to K. Marx and just with the narration left. In other words it is *the sense that is important and not the fact whether K. Marx or somebody else made any conclusions regarding some certain questions or not*. This also concerns the first cited extract speaking about objective character of laws of science and subjectivism of their application including society economic life control. But the fact that Stalin cites K. Marx gives the impression that "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" belongs to Marxian literature.

Though on the whole it's anti-Marxian propaganda. The point is that understanding of such kind of texts depends upon the reader: ones who just read and memorize words without thinking about their connection with the real life — don't care what the words are about. And those who honestly want to understand the life, but under conditions of Marxism cult domination over society face with obtrusion of Marxian viewpoint model, are statistically fated to come to the question: **«Why have the notions (categories) named by Stalin become out of place in Political Economy?»**¹ And if they are unshaken in their purposefulness and find the answer — they won't become Marxists, but liberators of the society from Marxism power and its backstage masters.

And the answer to this question is simple and has its origin in the *natural up to childish naivety* practical question, which once a thoughtful student of some natural-scientific or technical faculty will inevitably ask himself or his teacher of Marxian Political Economy: **«How can one measure «necessary» and «surplus» labor time in real production activity, how can one distinguish and separate a «necessary» product from a «surplus» one in a warehouse?»** — there are no answers to such questions neither in Marxism nor out of it.

Absence of answers to these questions means Marxian Political Economy metrological groundlessness: there are no objective phenomena

¹ On the other hand, Marxism teachers also didn't like this question, which had no answer in Marxism. As far as they didn't know the answer, they automatically found themselves in the opposition to Stalin's version of life interpretation through Marxism.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

at the heart of its notions¹, or characteristics chosen for objective phenomena description defy identification and measuring in the real life. All true sciences are metrologically valid: the phenomena they study do exist, and objective phenomena characteristics confronted with their conceptual mechanism can be objectively identified and measured. Only pseudo-sciences including Marxism are metrologically baseless.

If Stalin had said directly that Marxism was pseudo-science, the society stupefied by Marxism cult would have hardly agreed with him²; most members of the society, who didn't want to take care and responsibility, who didn't want to think themselves, would have rather agreed with loyal Marxists-psycho-Trotskyites, who would have palmed an explanation, which wouldn't oblige to re-comprehend life, off on them. For example, something like: *comrade Stalin has overworked himself, he's got a nervous breakdown, as a result of it his conceptions have become inadequate, therefore he should be relieved of his work, treated medically, and then taken to a cosy country cottage to have merited rest where «the best doctors» will take care of him.* But Stalin said Marxism was a pseudo-science «between the lines»: in the stream of figurative notions present in the text. Someone didn't notice that, and those who did, didn't take pains to explain that to others. But this shows that:

“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” is the work, which can be read only by those who feel the life, and whose right-brain (responsible for figurative notions and creative thinking) functions well, and not by itself, but in harmony with the left one (responsible for linguistic forms and logic).

So, in one phrase about Marxian Political Economy conceptual categories Stalin programmed Marxism's collapse; and since «nature abhors a vacuum» — he also programmed elaboration of

¹ «Value transfer from means of production to produce» — this is a Marxist Political Economy notion. There's no such an objective phenomenon in the real life, but there is an accounting procedure of attribution of amortised deductions, which are a legal part of means of production value, to the production price.

² Even now, 11 years after the USSR break-up, when Marxism is no more the dogma, many economists and ordinary people support Marxist Political Economy conceptual mechanism: how come there's no «necessary» labor time? How come there's no «surplus value»?

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

original ideology in Russia, which would meet the needs of Bolshevik global civilization building.

In other words he actually destroyed Marxism as an ideology. One shouldn't think that Stalin destroyed Marxism by accident, through his ignorance and intellectual primitivism not realizing the meaning of his own words and not foreseeing consequences of this work publication, as well as many Stalinists and anti-Stalinists of the past and the present didn't and don't realize the meaning of his words. Stalin hit Marxism's underbelly¹; his blow was aimed, concealed from the enemy and merciless. Ever since Marxism exists as a corpse-zombie: overt Marxists haven't realized it, and Marxists-«esoterics», who are guided by a different ideology from the beginning and just use Marxism as a cover for their actions, don't hurry to share this bad news with their «flock».

In “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” there's the following extremely important part:

«8) Should there be a special chapter in the textbook on Lenin and Stalin as the founders of the political economy of socialism?

I think that the chapter, «The Marxist Theory of Socialism. Founding of the Political Economy of Socialism by V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin», should be excluded from the textbook. It is entirely unnecessary, since it adds nothing, and only colourlessly reiterates what has already been said in greater detail in earlier chapters of the textbook». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 8. “Other Questions”).

In our opinion, fussy contemporaries just drove Stalin to such a state when he could write without sarcasm neither about the present «Marxian study of socialism» and «Socialism Political Economy» as a science, nor about Lenin's and his role in the creation of this intoxicating verbiage, distribution of which in the society he couldn't openly prevent alone. But in traditional understanding this work is a gibe at the people who were involved into Stalin's cult of personality creation. And we believe, people, whose sense of humor and literature style hasn't grown numb, will agree with our understanding of the given extract.

¹ Underbelly — due to the fact that the issue concerning the conceptual categories he named is comprehensible for the most general strata of society without any special education.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

But there are direct evidences of Stalin's uneasiness about absence of sociological theory in the USSR, which would meet demands of Socialism and Communism building. A quotation from an interview of R. Kosolapov, published in «Zavtra» («Tomorrow») newspaper № 50 (211), December, 1997, confirms this:

«From the end of 50-s till the beginning of 70-s I had to collaborate with Dmitry Chesnokov, a former member of the Central Committee Presidium¹, who was exiled to Gorky in 1953. Khrushchev couldn't explain him the reason for that: this is the opinion — and that's it. This is Chesnokov whom Stalin had told by telephone one or two days before he died:

«You should take up the theory's further development as soon as possible. We can mix something up in the economy. But we will improve the situation somehow. If we make a mess of the theory, we'll ruin everything. Without the theory we are dead, dead, dead!» (put in italics by the authors).

As a matter of fact, if Stalin recognizes Marxism as a theory of Socialism and Communism building, he has no reason to convince D. Chesnokov that without the theory Bolshevism's deed will collapse — «Marx' study is omnipotent because it is correct» — as comrade Lenin used to say. But if Stalin is sure that Marxism looks crooked, then his appeal to Tchesnokov is a direct instruction to work out an alternative sociological theory, if we remember what is said in “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”: **«We could tolerate this incongruity <of Marxism conceptual mechanism to the real life> for a certain period, but the time has come to put an end to it»**. We should understand that if «Marx' study is omnipotent because it is correct»², then *the words «we'll ruin EVERYTHING» when Marxism dominates the society* are out of place. But if Marx's study is nonsense, which dupes people's minds, then *without the theory's further development and release of people's minds from Marxism domination over them — all the deed of change to the righteous society will be inevitably ruined, and we'll*

¹ This institution replaced Political Bureau. Central Committee Presidium was established by the 19th convention and was to control the party in the interim between conventions and preliminary sessions. It was abolished by the Khrushchev regime after J.V. Stalin had been murdered.

² One of Lenin's utterances.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

have to start it from the beginning under hard pressure of objective conditions, though in another historic period¹.

Besides “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” also includes “Reply to Comrade Alexander Ilyich Notkin”, “Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yarochenko”, “Reply to Comrades A.V. Sanina and V.G. Venzher”². All the works *by their implication* follow the main idea of the book: **Bolshevism needs a sociological theory, which can release the society and all the humanity from the domination of Marxism and its masters’ mafia**. But as far as the works are not uniform by their subjects and *significance (according to the hierarchy of generalized controlling means priorities*³), we’ll examine them according to the significance hierarchy of the problems touched upon by Stalin.

¹ This is real and is happening in Russia now (2002).

² Those who think that in Stalin’s epoch there was terrible tyranny should admit that all the named comrades wished to express their views on this or that problem themselves without fear of falling under the article 58 for counter-revolutionary actions, if the «tyrant» didn’t agree with their opinions. None of them was exiled to the concentration camps. L. Yaroshenko, who lived till the Reorganization (Perestroika), even was interviewed and said that Stalin hadn’t understood national economy and economic science problems.

This fact as well as evidences of those who really had worked with Stalin solving different country problems proves that the following Khrushchev’s statement is lie and slander: «*Stalin didn’t act by persuasion, explanation and patient cooperation with people, but by thrusting his ideas on them and demanding strict obedience to his opinion. Those who opposed his opinion or tried to prove their point of view and correctness of their line, were doomed to be dismissed from the office...*» (from N. Khrushchev’s «secret» report at the 20 Congress of CPSU convention, which 6 months after was published in the USA, but was concealed from the USSR peoples until Perestroika when «struggle against stalinshchina» (the Stalin’s heritage) began).

But if Khrushchev and the like were ignorant and so pusillanimous, that fear bound their minds to such a degree that it was impossible to convince them of something; and if Socialism and Communism ideals provoked in them subconscious abhorrence and unmotivational aversion, which were directed towards his decisions’ implementation, it’s mean to lay the blame on Stalin for their own ignorance, moral perversity, cowardice and stupidity.

³ See the «Explanation for the Last Paragraph», which finishes part 6.6.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

6.8.2. To Overcome the Atheism

That is why we are going to continue the analysis of “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, starting with Stalin’s opinion about the mistakes that were made by comrade L.D. Yaroshenko:

«Some time ago the members of the Political Bureau of the C.C.¹, C.P.S.U.(B.) received a letter from Comrade Yaroshenko, dated March 20, 1952, on a number of economic questions which were debated at the November discussion. The author of the letter complains that the basic documents summing up the discussion, and Comrade Stalin's «Remarks», «contain no reflection whatever of the opinion» of Comrade Yaroshenko. Comrade Yaroshenko also suggests in his note that he should be allowed to write a “Political Economy of Socialism”, to be completed in a year or a year and a half, and that he should be given two assistants to help him in the work». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yaroshenko”).

As it was said earlier, «to describe Comrade Yaroshenko's opinion in a couple of words, it should be said that it is un-Marxist -- and, hence, profoundly erroneous». But if J.V. Stalin really wanted the USSR to come up with a non-Marxist social-science theory, including Political economy, then there is a question:

Why in “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” he openly opposed the suggestion of comrade Yaroshenko of «allowing him to write «Political Economy of Socialism» in a year or year and a half time-period with the help of 2 assistants»?

In other words:

What are the mistakes of comrade Yaroshenko, which have no bearing on the matter of his adherence to Marxism?

Having this key question formulated, let’s turn to the text of J.V. Stalin:

«Under socialism, Comrade Yaroshenko says, «men's production relations become part of the organization of the productive forces, as a means, an element of their organization»² (“Comrade Yaroshenko's letter to the Political Bureau of the Central Committee”).

¹ Central Committee

² But if to recollect what H. Ford wrote about the organization of «Ford Motors», it was all the same at his company.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

If that is so, what is the chief task of the "Political Economy of Socialism"? Comrade Yaroshenko replies: «The chief problem of the Political Economy of Socialism, therefore, **is not to** investigate the relations of production of the members of socialist society, **it is to** elaborate and develop a scientific theory of the organization of the productive forces in social production, a theory of the planning of economic development» ("Comrade Yaroshenko's speech in the Plenary Discussion").

That, in fact, explains why Comrade Yaroshenko is not interested in such economic questions of the socialist system as the existence of different forms of property in our economy, commodity circulation, the law of value, etc., which he believes to be minor questions that only give rise to scholastic disputes. He plainly declares that in his Political Economy of Socialism «disputes as to the role of any particular category of socialist political economy — value, commodity, money, credit, etc., — which very often with us are of a scholastic character, are replaced by a healthy discussion of the rational organization of the productive forces in social production, by a scientific demonstration of the validity of such organization»¹ ("Comrade Yaroshenko's speech at the Discussion Working Panel").

In short, political economy without economic problems.

Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that it is enough to arrange a "rational organization of the productive forces," and the transition from socialism to communism will take place without any particular difficulty. He considers that this is quite sufficient for the transition to communism. He plainly declares that «under socialism, the basic struggle for the building of a communist society reduces itself to a struggle for the proper organization of the productive forces and their rational utilization in social production» ("Comrade Yaroshenko's speech in the Plenary Discussion"). Comrade Yaroshenko solemnly proclaims that «Communism is the highest scientific organization of the productive forces in social production».

It appears, then, that the essence of the communist system begins and ends with the «rational organization of the productive

¹ But the reasons can't be of common sense if there is no definiteness in understanding the terms and in their interrelation with life and with each other, which are the basis for reasoning. And defining the terms is exactly what L.D. Yaroshenko evades.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

forces». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yaroshenko”, part 1. “Comrade Yaroshenko’s Chief Error”).

The last two paragraphs clarify that:

- the statement that «communism, bolshevism is in denuding the property of others and dividing it among ourselves» is a vile slander of fools that is a systematic propaganda of Russian mass media and public politicians (including B.N. Eltsin) since 1985 and especially after 1991.
- J.V. Stalin was not of the opinion that if *the productive spectrum per capita* reaches some rather high point, it will automatically bring all-out welfare, prosperity in communism (this remark is for those, who consider communism and bolshevism an earth-fed aspiration of primitives to fill their maw and grab tricks).

Further by the text, Stalin continues taking a more detail view of L.D. Yaroshenko’s ideas and formulates his thought by means of the suitable quotation from Marx’s heritage:

«Marx said:

“In production, men not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by cooperating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their action on nature, does production take place”». (Karl Marx, “Wage Labour and Capital”, *Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1951, Vol. I, p. 83.)¹.

Revealing himself with the help of this quotation to everyone willing as a true Marxist, J.V. Stalin pursues his thought and readdresses the ideas of L.D. Yaroshenko:

«Consequently, social production consists of two sides, which, although they are inseparably connected, reflect two different categories of relations: the relations of men to nature (productive forces), and the relations of men to one another in the process of production (production relations). Only when both sides of production are present do we have social production, whether it be under the socialist system or under any other social formation.

¹ Footnote to the edition used by Stalin.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

Comrade Yaroshenko, evidently, is not quite in agreement with Marx. He considers that this postulate of Marx is not applicable to the socialist system. Precisely for this reason he reduces the problem of the Political Economy of Socialism to the rational organization of the productive forces, discarding the production, the economic, relations and severing the productive forces from them.

If we followed Comrade Yaroshenko, therefore, what we would get is, instead of a Marxist political economy, something in the nature of Bogdanov's «Universal Organizing Science».

Hence, starting from the right idea that the productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary forces of production, Comrade Yaroshenko reduces the idea to an absurdity, to the point of denying the role of the production, the economic, relations under socialism; and instead of a full-blooded social production, what he gets is a lopsided and scraggy technology of production — something in the nature of Bukharin's «technique of social organization». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yaroshenko”, part 1. “Comrade Yaroshenko’s Chief Error”).

One comes to a conclusion that Yaroshenko’s addressing to non-Marxist views in his “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” for J.V. Stalin is only a convenient occasion to warn against mere declamation on the topic of so-thought enough replacement of a conceptually defined theory by «a common-sense reasoning about rational organization of the productive forces in the social economics, scientific underpinning of such organization», and against *nisus* to take purchase on something *qualitatively similar* to “Universal Organizing Science” of A.A. Bogdanov in the development of the theory.

As for the first point — the so-called «common-sense reasoning» regarding organization of the processes of management and self-management in society in the pace of arising problems — Stalin during decades of his party and state work (especially after 1923 as the party and state power was being concentrated in his hands) has mastered in such kind of common-sense and amiss reasoning, that ran in lexical forms of Marxism and economical science, that conceptual expressed Self-focused mentality of the “elite” of the before-socialist formations. And when this reasoning was of common sense and this was demonstrated in the successes of the USSR economics, they hid actually full and desperate practical and theoretical inequality of Marxism from people who were not

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

in management. J.V. Stalin was obviously not content with such a situation. And he very convincingly showed in his answer if not to comrade Yaroshenko, then to many readers of his work, that having pretensions to soundness of reasoning, that free from «scholastic argues» (i.e. from the necessity to define the meaning of each of the used definitions and their interrelations with each other and life¹), comrade Yaroshenko in fact is not capable of such reasoning.

It becomes clear, if you understand that Stalin was not a Marxist, and Yaroshenko, understanding neither this fact, nor Marxism in its essence, pretended to creative development of the Marxist theory in the context of new historical circumstances. Accordingly, at the example of comrade Yaroshenko, in the form of criticism of non-Marxist viewpoints J.V. Stalin showed the sterility of attempts of the «creative development of the Marxist theory in the context of new historical circumstances» and turned the laugh against the leaning to «common-sense reasoning», that pretend to change the conceptually defined sustainable theory.

Generally, as the historical reality shows, the so-called «common-sense reasoning»:

- either turns into creation of *sustainable* scientific theories, which do not reject common-sense reasons, but become their backbone in tackling the problems that arise before the society, revealing to the people the possibility of comprehending the problems and their reasons and also the ways and methods of their solving;
- or stays a Self-focused schmooze, that is the source of life for, at times, rather large social groups, but is of no good for creation, and therefore can destroy a lot of things if to hang on it in the politics on the state and society².

¹ In other place Stalin gives the following quotation of Yaroshenko: «Comrade Yaroshenko declares that in his "Political Economy of Socialism," "the categories of political economy — value, commodity, money, credit, etc., — **are replaced** by a healthy discussion of the rational organization of the productive forces in social production» ...»

² But there is the third possibility: there are experts of the “common-sense” reasoning whose speeches are intended to confuse others, forming false figurative conceptions about Life phenomena, as a result, those people find themselves dependant on these experts of the “common-sense” reasoning

→ → →

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

One of the following examples of such kind of the «common-sense» reasoning is academic A.D. Sakharov (under *the physiological dictate* E. Bonner) and the whole dissenting movement that took place in the last decades of the USSR existence¹: if to suppose that their goal was to destroy the USSR **in order to drain million people dry and rule over them, and be parasitic on their labor and life**, then A.D. Sakharov and his companions are just scoundrels; but if they hoped that after the downfall of the bureaucratic regime in the forms of nationality of the Soviet power all in the social life will go on «on its own» to the pleasure of everybody (i.e. there would be neither homeless, beggars, living at dump piles², nor seats of Civil War, and such social intestine calamities that took no place on the USSR, at least in the periods of its peaceful life) then they are fools, that were «deceived» and used by scoundrels, who stayed at the backstage of the following events.

However, in the foundation of such kind of foolishness is abiding ethics. **In other words if academic Sakharov is someone's conscience,**

whose figurative conceptions in spite of their words are still consonant to the objective Life phenomena.

¹ At this time in the USSR one could be discontent about one of the two things:

- either that socialism was being built in the country;
- or that the process of building socialism proceeds along with barbarism and abuse of citizens and authorities, that pervert the essence of the socialism.

The first dissidents destroyed the USSR and started reforms of a bourgeois character. The second wave of «dissidents» finishes the reformatations and draws the bottom-line.

² Out of the window there are trashcans. In the summer flies skit around them. This anti-sanitary is the built-in part of the architectural-urban style of «khrushchevki» (blocks of tiny low-cost flats that were erected during the time of Khrushchev), it represents the «concern about people» of psychical-Trotsky Khrushchev and Brezhnev's regime.

The fact that now from sunrise until sunrise these trashcans are watched and investigated by «free» «proprietors» is an accomplishment of Gorbachev's regime and reforms of Yeltsin and Gaidar. Of course, the tertiary treatment and reprocessing urban ore branch is necessary but we cannot agree that it should be organized in such a way by means of forcing people out of life to the scrap-heap.

In the USSR there was no such a majority of people who were decayed to the life on scrap-heap because of the state politics, neither in its high time, nor in the time of its degradation.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

then it is a very sick and perverted one. An earlier but a matter of record example of such «common-sense» reasoning on the topics of history and sociology is «Mein Kampf» by A. Hitler. In all appearance J.V. Stalin *actively desired* to see the nations of the USSR free from the power of such kind «common-sense» reasoning that ruled them and their fates.

Therefore a question about “Universal Organizing Science” by A.A. Bogdanov touched upon by Stalin is more significant, than just *non-Marxist ideas of comrade Yaroshenko and his tendency to «common-sense» reasoning, that pretend to change the conceptually defined sustainable theory, becoming a matter of allusion of problematic of universal organizing science as such.* And this is also a question of «conspiracies»¹ in the general context of “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”.

A.A. Bogdanov — Malinovsky (real last name) Alexander Alexandrovich (1873 — 1928) is an economist, philosopher, natural scientist, political leader, and fantasist; since 1896 until 1903 — a member of social-democratic party, joined the Bolsheviks. His views in many ways were of a non-Marxist character. In 1909 he dropped out of the party. In the following years linked up with different party groups. After the Great October social Revolution he gradually drew back from the politics and devoted himself to the scientific work (his basic education was medical). He is the organizer and the director (since 1926) of the first in the world Blood Transfusion Institution, that later was named after him. Malinovsky died on April 7, 1928 during the experiment on blood transfusion that he tried on himself (biographical background is based on the article about A.A. Bogdanov from the “Big Soviet Encyclopedia” (BSE), 3 edition, book 3, p. 442, 443).

Among the scientific inheritance of A.A. Bogdanov during all this time “Universal Organizing Science” or according to its other name “Tectology” is the most interesting point. As the aforementioned encyclopedia article runs, A.A. Bogdanov was one of the «pioneers of the systematic approach in the modern science. In the series of the latest research works of soviet and foreign authors it is noted that some of the

¹ Though some contemporary supporters of «Conspiracy» do not go deep into it.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

statements of Tectology anticipated the ideas of cybernetics (the principle of the feedback, the idea of modeling, etc)).

“Universal Organizing Science” — is a huge in volume ideological tractate, many educated people have heard about it, but only few read it, among all because it contains non-Marxist ideas and in the Soviet times it was not republished¹, and it could be found only in the special storages of the leading scientific libraries or few in number in the family libraries. It represents an attempt to fetch away from the power of Marxism over the man's understanding of the world, **its essence** being based on the version of *The Sufficiently common theory of control in the terms* of A.A. Bogdanov.

But J.V. Stalin found this attempt unsuccessful and was right². Those who do not agree with Stalin on this point may find all three books of “Tectology: Universal Organizing Science” and start to study and apperceive them. They are not the first ones: after the downfall of the cult of Marxism in the USSR, many take this way, those who understand that the **science about management is the key to everything**. But before taking this way it is worth seeing what those who have already studied and learned some things from «Tectology» have to say.

In the Internet there is a paper work titled «48 Thesis of “Tectology” by A.A. Bogdanov»³. As the author of this paper says, his goal «*includes*

¹ As a result of searching the Internet we found references only to the following editions:

1. Bogdanov A.A. “Tectology. Universal Organizing Science”, book 1 — 3, S-Petersburg, Moscow-Berlin, 1913 — 1922.

2. Bogdanov A.A. “Tectology. (Universal Organizing Science)” — second edition in 2 books: book 1 — 304 pages, book 2 — 351 pages — Moscow «Economica», 1989.

² If it were successful, then after publishing in 1913 the first chapters of this work of A.A. Bogdanov there would have been algorithmic reconstruction of the neo-sphere of the Earth and the problem of overcoming the Marxism would have been solved in some way in the first half of the 20th century. The history of the 20th century would be different.

³ The author is A. Kitashov, biological department of the Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov, the paper work dated by the year of 1995. The address of the paper in the Internet (June 2002): <http://1.cellimm.bio.msu.ru/people/cetum/bogdanov.html> (in the address “1” — Latin letters, but not the graphical signs for number “1” instead of the first symbol which is “one”).

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

brief representation, in tabloid form of the essentials of Bogdanov's work, which he considered his lifework — "Tectology. Universal Organizing Science" (1913 — 1922)». Let us turn to the paper work:

«1. "Any human activity objectively is of an organization or disorganization character" (p. 19)¹. and it may be viewed as a material for organizational experiment. Organizational activity of a man directed on rearranging the surrounding world according to his needs. Mankind however, are not united in their organizational activity, which creates disorganizational activity that is the result of the clash of different organizational processes.

This is the organizational view of the world.

2. "Nature — is the first great organizer" (p. 22). The last achievements of natural sciences make the view that all the natural phenomena, alive and static, are organizational and well-founded. From this the understanding of organizational experience expands to the world total combination of organizational and disorganizational processes.

3. Similarity of the organizational arrangement, that is inherent in different natural systems and the possibility of a man to adopt this principals in his activity bring us to the thought about the entity of the organizational methods, that are inherent in the world in all its displays, monism of the world arrangement.

4. The entity of the organizational methods brings us to the necessity of creating a new science for their summarizing. The organizational experience should be investigated and used for the benefit of the humanity» (the aforementioned paper work, thesis 1 — 4).

Although we are not familiar with any commentaries of J.V. Stalin about «Universal Organizing Science» of A.A. Bogdanov, as the first four theses of the "Tectology", given by the author of the paperwork, show that objectively Stalin was right in his rejection of such kind of morally diluted «scientific and theoretic» basis for development of the socially needed social theory, including its economical component².

¹ The author of the paper gives references to the page numbers of the Berlin edition of the "Tectology", 1922, with the original punctuation, where possible.

² Yu.I. Mukhin in the aforementioned book «Murder of Stalin and Beria» (Moscow, «Crimea Bridge-9D», «Forum», 2002) on page 484 cites the lists of the books from Stalin's library. Among them there are 2 books of A.A. Bogdanov «Brief course of Economics» that were published before the Revolution are mentioned.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

Those theses of the “Tectology” that are given by the author of the paperwork express Self-focused (anthropo-focused¹) atheism of the material kind². And this is a rather sufficient reason for not accepting “Tectology” of A.A. Bogdanov as a sustainable standard of understanding the universe. This understanding should be achieved by all intellectual people in their development by the time of their maturity.

If to judge according to what we know about the life of A.A. Bogdanov, he was a sincere man, who didn't accept any oppression against individual (that is why he had conflict in his inner party hierarchy in Russian Social Democratic Labor Party and had to leave the politics), he was ready to sacrifice his life for the life of other people (and he proved this readiness by the way he died during the medical experiment). But justly refusing the leading in Russia cultic forms of idealistic atheism, A.A. Bogdanov however could not dramatize in Life and comprehend the manifestation of All-power of God. That is why he could not overcome atheism as such, which he absorbed with culture. As the result of this circumstance, accusations in mechanistic, which in fact is an accusation in the moral petrifying (immorality: mechanisms have no morals, though they reflect the morals of their creators) that is voiced by many in this or that form against his version of universal organizing science as such is also fair.

A man as a person and humanity in the whole is a barer of this or that but rather definite, objectively native to him, moral. But besides this, he is free to re-comprehend his existent moral and having this re-comprehension as a foundation he is free to create his future moral. This is about personal and panhuman moral that is fixed by neosphere as a **present bottom-line of life of mankind; every person**

¹ I.e. such, where Self-focused conception pretensions to express world-view positions and interests of all mankind.

² Those who think that this argument based on the paperwork is not convincing, may turn to the works of A.A. Bogdanov. In particular Self-focused (anthropo-focused) atheism of a material kind is expressed in his article «A Mystery of Science», which may be found in the Internet and which is included in the catalog «Other authors» in the Information base of the USSR that is distributed on CDs.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

makes a contribution to it in the form of a thought-over well-directed or inane input.

Just because “Universal Organizing Science” of A.A. Bogdanov is morally petrified, and as a result it may present evil morals and immorality of a subject and communities as an objective fact that is free and independent on their intentions and will; it is so attractive for Self-focused outlook that is a characteristic of many central figures of the modern science. *In their opinion what important is the scientific result that is acclaimed in the «scientific communities» and which in its essence is the only characteristic of the human virtue of the personality of the researcher, and as for all the other characteristics and his morals, they are not other people’s business and they do not concern the science as the process of study and managing the circumstances of life of the societies and people*¹. The fact that the scientific result and the

¹ *«There is no need, let say, to limit goals and subjects of the scientific researches by ethical demands. Ethics accumulates experience of the past life, including (may be even in the first place) experience of past failures. And science is always a search of new possibilities of society development and its adaptation to the surrounding conditions. In seeking (of course, not in use) there shouldn’t be any restrictions!»* (From an article of academician N.N.Moiseev and professor of physics and mathematical science I.G.Pospelov «Set of Evolution and Mind», magazine «Priroda» № 6, 1990)

Though the authors write that «the main attribute of evolution process is its unpredictable character», but on the foundation of all the historical experience of crowd-“elitism” self-destruction of humanity is guaranteed, if crowd-“elitism” will still coincide with the absence of ethical restriction for goals and subjects of researches.

Since it is impossible to limit the investigation and use of the knowledge in the society and evil morals of the society will turn into evil any knowledge, then the only protection from this destruction is ethical, and morally conditioned in their essence, restrictions for **goals** and **subjects** of the researches that are applied by researchers themselves: **scientific knowledge can’t be used for evil until it is not investigated**; that is why barbarism of society, that decline the moral and ethical progress is the virtue for itself and for environment.

Let’s continue looking at this question about interrelation of morals and “Tectology” and turn to the edition of «Gorbachev-Fond» (creation of his starting capital is a special matter of moral and ethical and criminal and legal

→ → →

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

possible practice of its appliance are most of all conditioned by the morals of the researcher is a fact (this is true about all the other activities of every person and a collective: trivial or professional). Comprehension and understanding of this is especially difficult for flourishing in the historically formed circumstances scientists (and the leaders of other branches) — bearers of Self-focused conception.

Because of being morally petrified «general» organizational science in the version given by A.A. Bogdanov is absolutely not general and therefore is unable to tackle the problem of overcoming *estrangement of*

character) “Perestroika. 10 years later” (Moscow, “April-85”, 1995, circulation 2500 copies, i.e. the edition is under the secret classification “For elite only”). Page 159, art critic Andreeva I.A. says the following in a **confused** way (her self-rating, see p. 156):

«Moral basis — it is high-flown and complicated. But the elements of ethic are quite available to us». It is said after the words of the «physicist» — mathematician and say «ecologist», academic of Russian Academy of Sciences Moiseev N.N., went by the art critic («lyrist»):

«On the top (in the context he speaks about power structure) there may be a scoundrel, a rotter, a place-hunter, but if he is a clever man, many would be forgiven to him, because he would understand that what he does is useful for the state» (p. 148).

— No one said anything against it, in spite of the fact that academic actually identified morally conditioned interests of a clever scoundrel with the interests of the whole country. But it does not scare neither the academic, nor his listeners, because they have become just as immoral or of evil-moral as the scoundrel that are hypothetically in their attention. What scares them? — The academic gives an answer:

*«What we were afraid of? We were afraid of what A.A. Bogdanov wrote in his “Tectology”: when some system (organization) **appears** it brings forth, desirably or not, its own interests. This is what happened with our system. There **appeared** a certain elite group that practically usurped the property of the great country».*

— The academic is lying, because «this certain elite group» did not **appear** from nothing, it was generated by the principle that was earlier formulated by the academic: *It is true that there was a day when clever scoundrels and rotters organized on the basis of Self-focused demonical atheistic moral and expressed their own low and dirty interests in the biblical doctrine of all-enslavement and the development of science that sees no Higher moral, expressed in the life of Creation, cover them up just as N.N.Moiseev did by referring to “Tectology”.*

In this way N.N.Moiseev proved the point of J.V. Stalin in his rejection of «tectology» and of relatively similar in quality to it morally petrified atheistic organizational-managing theories to which «cybernetics» belongs as well.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

specialization of sciences, which is a characteristic of a presently ruling culture, though this aim was in his times put up by

A.A. Bogdanov, and the author of the paper in question made it his 5th thesis:

«5. Different forms of common mentality in this or that extent are inhere the organizational view of the world. Largely what is said refers to Philosophy, which is nonetheless “did not realize its dependence on the reality of life” (p. 64). Impediment to the true learning of the organizational experience is the specialization of sciences that prohibits “integral formulation of the question” (p. 65). It is high time to overcome this impediment. “New, universal organizing science we are going to call «tectology», its ... translation from Greek means «discipline about building»” (p. 66)» «48 Thesis of “Tectology” by A.A. Bogdanov»).

The thing is that in the morally petrified “general” organizational science there is no place for Psychology, that directly or indirectly deals with morals of people and collectives and changes of morals under the pressure of circumstances and under the influence of will of the people themselves as a result of their reconsidering the life and in their applied appendix — with the adjustment and disorder of algorithms of peoples mind, collectives, societies and the global civilization in the whole. As an addition to this case — in «tectology» there is no place for History as well, because historical science, insensible to moral-esthetic changes, turns into a senseless in its nature, closed-up «bookkeeping» of archeological memorials, texts, facts. Thereof:

Universal Organizing Science may be only *relatively right moral-conditioned theory of social control*, which has ways out, connections with Psychology in entity of specific life of psychological theory and psychological practice, and with History, and consequently (and this is the main thing) *with the political script-writing for future*.

Only in this case knowledge and skills, that make up the essence of the private sciences and crafts, become an attachment to the single for all *human core* of any personality and do not change the core of the personality, which dissociate the society, sciences, crafts and all kinds of people’s activities in the social life, including family, generating many conflicts. But «tectology» due to being morally petrified is not able to overcome this dissociation; otherwise those scientists who were morally

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

petrified would not have referred to it as the deceased academician N.N. Moiseev.

Stalin thinking of comrade Yaroshenko's ideas as of the kind of «tectology», accuses him basically for the same — for rejecting the role of the productive, economical **relations of people**: «intellectuals» that do not use right-brain always forget that political economical theories always deal with the interaction of people, with their morals and ethics. Exactly in the result of such obvious and unobvious putting people's moral and God's righteousness¹ beyond the scope of research instead of *political economy and sociology in the whole, that are clearly morally conditioned*, we get a lopsided and fleshless technology and mechanical organization of production and consumption. It is expressed in a more broad way in the phrase:

How many of these beasts do we need and how much do these beasts need so that we could have all to our hearts' content?

But this anti-humane nature of morals and ethics of sociologists, economists, public and backstage politics may be veiled for its evident foolishness or hypocritical cynicism by rather goodly speculations on «human rights», «socially-oriented market economy», «civil society», etc.

Some may still think that due to his intellectual primitivism and ignorance (that are assigned to him by permissively-individualistic, so-called «liberal» tradition of interpretation of the world) Stalin was not able to comprehend the heights of the tectological thought, that is expressed in such a literary language:

«17. Desingression is something opposite to ingression. “In the ingression of activity, those that were not connected before — connect, forming ‘a bond’ of conjugating complexes; in desgression they are mutually paralyzed, what leads to the establishing a ‘border’, i.e. separation” (p. 121, footnote). At the full neutralization of activity there is a full desingression that is accompanied with the establishing of tectological border and dissociation of complexes. Medium elements are implanted on lines

¹ It is expressed in the life of Creation and due the power of its all-embracing character is identified by atheism with «immorality» of Nature. But righteousness is one for all. The difference is only in attitudes to it: it expresses the subjectivism of God and for all the rest, righteousness, as an ideal of their possible morality, is an objective from of Above-predetermined entity.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

of cyclic resistance between the complexes»¹ (aforementioned paperwork «48 Theses of “Tectology” by A.A. Bogdanov»).

But Stalin’s evaluation of different kinds of morally petrified «tectological» approaches to the economical life of society is the case when *morally-conditioned*, **right in its essence result** is important; no matter whether it is accomplished as a bottom-line of long accumulation and study of facts, formulation and apperceiving of terminological conceptual and on their basis reasoning in the course of some intellectual activity culture or it is accomplished momentarily as an effulgent flash of intuition.

As any person in all his activity Stalin had a border that limited what he understood clearly and what were beyond his understanding and were conditioned by interaction of his mentality on the subconscious levels with aggregors² with the mentality of others subjects, guidance from Above¹.

¹ We express hope that freedom-loving intelligentsia (if any of them is reading this text) has understood right away what is said in this thesis, even without reading “Tectology”.

But in our opinion, this terminological conceptual, the sense of which words was clear almost only to the author of “Tectology” — to A.A. Bogdanov himself, — represents expression of the fact that his understanding of the general organization of Life as such was blurred, fragmentary, kaleidoscope-like. Exactly because of this unclear understanding of laws that were immanent to the analyzed by him «object = object» — Life as such — the volume of the «Tectology» turned out to be of 3 books and its terminological conceptual is rather «exotic» from the point of view of many even educated part of the society. As such «Tectology» of Bogdanov is not more than of a historical and textological interest, since it is easier and more effective to formulate all from the beginning rather than correct its different inaccuracies and errors and add something.

Our practice shows that relatively general theory of management may be formulated in 10 pages with the use of the commonly used terminology of a mathematic and engineering character with some broadening of the meanings of terms, it includes only 9 conceptions that are interconnected and that can always be connected with reality of life. The full text of the constructive materials of the study course of the Relatively general theory of management takes in the book 112 pages, including the 10 pages of its brief description, which are given in details in the full version. See «The dead water» in the editions, beginning from 1998 and separate publishing of «Relatively general theory of management».

² **Aggregor** (*from aggregate*) is a collective mentality formed by people with similar parameters of their biofields and some senses. Thus to form an

→ → →

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

This deals with accomplished events (including the evaluation of «tectology»), as well as present events and providence.

But no matter where was the boarder in the Stalin's activity, he expressed God's Providence² supporting Bolsheviks in a couple of phrases in the pseudo-Marxist text where he preprogrammed the end of the Marxism and in a matrix way excided the possibility of the future need of Bolsheviks of some morally petrified atheistic «general» organizational science.

6.8.3. To solve the problems.

Having cleared out these principal worldview issues, let us get back to the essence of Stalin's work in question. J.V. Stalin is precise about choosing its title "Economic **Problems** of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." avoiding phrases like "Guidance on Managing the Socialist Economy on the Way to Communism". This very subject-matter of UNSOLVED PROBLEMS including inappropriate Marxism and Tectology which prevent the further establishment of socialism and communism is the core of "Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion".

What J.V. Stalin in his "Remarks" says seems *enough if we base our world understanding on Marxism*. But having once stated his standpoint on the problem in the "Remarks" he repeats himself twice in his answers to A. Notkin's letter and A. Sanina and V. Venzher's letter. That is why if you aim at understanding economic procedures and their management while reading "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." it is inevitable that the following question arises:

aggregator one needs at first – the similarity of peoples power parameters of their biofields, and at second – the similarity of some their senses (professional, sense of being etc.) For example – the aggregator of smokers. They found their special sense in smoking and when one smoke he "tunes" his biofield by the special (similar for everybody) way.

¹ In the present work we are not going to consider the question about the sacred religion of Stalin, as a system of *his personal relations with God beyond any dogmas and rituals*. This topic is touched upon in the works of the IP of the USSR "Turn back in rage...", "The Brief Course..." and "It is Time I Should Start the Tale of Stalin...".

² In this respect anti-Stalinists and other opponents of bolshevism should to think about the nature of Providence and about their own relations with God.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

What was the purpose for Stalin's including his answers to the two letters into the book? He just repeats the ideas stated quite clearly in the «Comments on the Economic Problems...» often quoting himself.

The answer to this question which is of great importance nowadays can be given neither on the basis of Marxism with its restrictions nor on the basis of the I-centered proprietorial world understanding of Capitalism. It cannot be given without consideration of the text of "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" from a historical point of view either.

To answer the question one should exceed the bounds of Marxism, for on the ground of its "elitist"-Marxist «esoteric» world understanding, *the problems that J.V. Stalin writes about* seem detached from real economic life. They appear to be of any importance only for the system of propaganda as a system of suppressing members of society's mind and political will with certain opinions. That is the foundation of the ruling oligarchy in any crowd-"elitism". Based on the world understanding of a crowd sincerely believing in Marxism, these problems seem to be solved by J. Stalin, the great leader and wise teacher of the Soviet people. From the position of the I-centered world understanding and the worldview of proprietorial capitalist entrepreneurs, the things that Stalin calls *problems* can be taken as defeatism and impossibility for socialist ideals and later on for communist ones to come true. They might be *morally and ethically unprepared to solve such problems*. It is this possibility that Stalin's warning against risk of defeatism, made at the Central Committee plenum of October 1952, correlates with:

Without developing people's world understanding and worldview proper economic problems of Socialism, i.e. *problems of management and self-management organization in national economy, cannot be solved.* The statement has been proved by the subsequent history of the USSR and former Soviet republics including Russia.

We have showed that there are «beacons» in "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." that enable a thoughtful reader to define the direction of development of his/her world understanding and worldview and to correlate it with the world understanding and the worldview prevailing in society. This view is "automatically" reproduced in the succession of generations through culture and noosphere.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

Besides in order to get an answer to the question we have to get back to the historical reality of the period from 1930 to the early 1950-s.

Let us begin with the fact that J.V. Stalin knew well that the USA Capitalism was not **the free market capitalism of private enterprise in the field of production and trade** as described by *K. Marx in his "Capital"* and *F. Engels in his "Anti-Dühring"*, *without taking into consideration the banking system and stock exchanges*. It was not the Capitalism of state monopoly that Lenin tried to describe in his work "Imperialism as the Sublimity of Capitalism" either.

In particular it was not the freedom of private enterprise and market self-regulation that helped the USA fight the Great Depression, which began after stock market crash of 1929. It was limiting the freedom of market self-regulation while organizing state control of their multiindustrial system of production and consumption under the direction of president Franklin Delano Roosevelt (30.01.1882 — 12.04.1945). Following the state plan during World War II the USA met the demands of the population without restraining much their habitual mode of living, as well as the demands of the Armed Forces waging a cruel and costly¹ war against Japan over the Pacific Ocean. Besides they provided military and industrial equipment, foodstuffs and transportation for the Anti-Hitler

¹ For the USA the war was really costly, from the point of view of investment costs, rather than bloody or expensive on the ground of damage caused. During the period of war US armed Forces had the death toll of about 500 thousand people. There was no destruction on the territory of the USA.

US navy at the end of the war can be considered as a showing of the investments costs. It became the most powerful navy in the world and almost every unit of it was built within three years of war (after 1941), including dozens of heavy ships i.e. battleships and aircraft-carriers, and a few hundreds of light ships, i.e. cruisers, destroyers, convoy aircraft-carriers, and a number of ships with other functions. In times of piece shipbuilding programs of the kind including development of production facilities of shipbuilding industries, would take decades.

Due to the geographical location of the USA and US role in the war during that period production facilities of US national economy developed considerably and that distinguishes them from other countries that took part in the war. In other words investments in the war brought a good return while the death toll was not heavy regarding the number of population. It counted 500 thousand to 150 million people of the population, while in Belarus it was about 2 million to 8 million people.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Coalition allies¹. Moreover during the war the USA carried out a directory guided project of creating nuclear weapons. State and private companies of almost all industries participated in it, often unaware of it.

The same things happened in Germany and even to a greater degree. The planned beginning of action on a national scale was one of the factors to enable Hitlerism regime to lead the country out of the economic crisis that broke out in 1929 because of the «liberal» regime of «the Weimar Republic» including «liberalism» in economy. Without a planned beginning on a national scale, introduced into the economy by Hitlerism regime, neither Germany's preparation for the war with the reached military and economic power, nor its resistance to the Anti-Hitler Coalition (to the USSR mainly) during World War II could be possible. It had proceeded for almost four years beginning from June 22, 1941. The preceding events can be considered the period of Germany getting involved into the war.

At the same time Germany, unlike the USSR, suffered from lack of raw materials and almost complete foreign trade isolation during the war but for robbing Europe enslaved by Germany. Therefore the country had to work, to develop production facilities and up-to-date aircraft and tanks. Germany was just about to complete the program of rearmament air forces with jet-planes. The country added to its armory missile weapons of strategically tactical work range (cruise missiles FAU-1 and ballistic missiles FAU-2); they kept working at intercontinental ballistic missiles and enabling missiles to take-off from submarines. They carried out their own program of nuclear weapon making. It is a case for another investigation to find out the causes for their being late for the end of the war.

¹ Lend-lease expenses of the USA for the period from March 11, 1941 to August 1, 1945 amounted to \$46 billions (13 per cent of all the military expenses of the war and more than 50 per cent of their export). The USSR got \$9.8 millions out of the sum. No matter what they propagandized concerning the military supplies from the USA as compared to the USSR's own volume of production, and the quality of American tanks and planes, one should not forget the Studebecker trucks and other kinds of products needed at war. They probably were not the key needs but were important enough to lighten the burden of war for the economy of the USSR.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

These **well-known facts**¹ proved that a planned beginning on a national scale suits in a way market regulation of capitalist states, at least the most advanced of them, without breaking the rules of a crowd-“elitism” organization of Capitalism².

As everybody knows in the post-war period the USSR was mastering scientific and technical progress of the Third Reich and the USA the USSR copied the American bomber B-29 which is a nuclear weapon carrier, studied and put into practice their specimen of various electronics. The Soviet nuclear project was not accomplished without studying American achievements that became available due to L. Beria himself and intelligence services' work. The first post-war engines for jet-planes were copies and modifications of captured German materials. After the war Verner von Brown, German missiles' creator, moved to the USA and worked there, but some of his developments reached the USSR and were examined working out Soviet missiles, for German proving ground and leading plant were located on the territory of Poland. Both military and domestic products were studied and copied.

During the war Germany suffered from lack of raw materials and almost complete foreign trade isolation, from cessation of scientific and technical information exchange, from brain-drain because of the immigration of many scientists and engineers related to Jewry, and from sabotage organized by Hitlerism regime antagonists in Germany and subordinate Europe. Still many products of the kind appeared in Germany. Some of them excelled the progress of Anti-Hitler Coalition decades. It was evident for many people it was not only the consequence of the fact that the Nazi regime was based on the traditional German culture which had encouraged education, raising the level of one's skill,

¹ At that time you could even find it in newspapers that after the war had been finished capitalist countries began developing state economy intensively. It inevitably led to organizing a state system of economy management. In particular Great Britain nationalized several industries when the war was ceased.

² Some *scoundrels and lamebrains* (these words are not an emotional outburst but a reasonable characteristic of their morals and intellectual powers) tried and excluded the planned state beginning out of the economical activity of society. This attempt proved that advanced technology industries such as aerospace or abstract science could not survive without a planned state beginning and especially being suffocated by bank usury.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

inventiveness and conscientious industry for centuries. It was also the result of **the high quality of resources management provided by the Third Reich government**, *including uncovering and making use of diverse creative potential of its population.*

The system of economy management and self-regulation created by the Nazi regime was put to evil ends by this very regime. Nevertheless it was a very effective producing and distributing system that would not be less effective when set to realize other goals. *Its efficacy was achieved by a combination of **the state planned beginning** of defining the range of production and distribution of resources among projects first of all, and secondly among industries, and **the market mechanism** that kept the make-out of enterprises at the highest level due to reducing production expenses and costs.*

We have cited the quality evaluation of macroeconomic systems of developed countries of 1930 — 1940s by well-known facts, which characterize them integrally. One should bear it in mind that several Soviet intelligence departments also effected a detailed interpretation and analysis of global political and economic proceedings and the situation in other countries. Analysts of any high-leveled intelligence service do not depend on prevailing or promoted ideologies or «public opinion» that they sometimes form themselves. That is why in the inner world of secret services they touch upon issues that cannot be discussed by ordinary people without being afraid of punishment. Calling things by their proper names they go as far as terminology, mastered by society and secret services, and «self-censorship» of crowd-“elitism” permit. It is another question whether their opinions will be made public and in what way they will be expressed.

Some of the USSR secret services worked for J.V. Stalin in person. That is why Stalin knew facts; he read analytical reviews that reached him through the system of «self-censorship» and personnel guardianship of him. They made it clear that a planned state beginning penetrates economy management of developed capitalist countries keeping market mechanisms of economy self-regulation, and thus enhancing labor productivity. It increased stability of the capitalist system in general, without enlarging hugely the number of bureaucracy as a burden for the producing and distributing system.

Looking back we are not trying to present J.V. Stalin more clever and far-sighted than he really was. But in his works he did write about the

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

question of introducing a planned state beginning on a national scale into capitalist economy. In "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." we can find the following lines:

«4) Coalescence of the monopolies with the state machine.

The word "coalescence" is not appropriate. It **superficially and descriptively** (put in bold type by the authors) notes the process of merging of the monopolies with the state, but it does not reveal the economic import of this process. The fact of the matter is that **the merging process is not simply a process of coalescence, but the subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies** (put in bold type by the authors). The word «coalescence» should therefore be discarded and replaced by the words «subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies». ("Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", "Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion", part 8. "Other Questions").

In the given fragment J.V. Stalin does not seem to say anything about planning on a national scale under the conditions of Capitalism, but the following question arises:

What happens in the process of the so-called «coalescence of monopolies with the State machinery» or to be more exact, in the process of «submission of the State machinery to monopolies»?

If we imagine the activity of monopolies' management and the State machinery, we can easily find the answer to the question:

A planned beginning means culture of development planning and production organization, new products' development planning and organization, existing within intra-industry monopolies and multi-industry concerns in a capitalist society¹. When it exhausts its capabilities to enlarge capitalists' profits, it begins working in a new field that is production planning and organization on a national and transnational scale. Consequently monopolies' managements have to subjugate by any means the State machinery. Under the pressure of monopolies' managements the State machinery in its turn has to organize economic planning on a national scale for the sake of

¹ It was this culture that H. Ford wrote about s you can see in the previous chapters.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

monopolies, to be exact for the sake of capitalists, monopolies' owners¹.

Now this process has gone so far that nations under the pressure of transnational monopolies establish transnational planning bodies like International Monetary Fund, World Bank and others. They abandon their independence in national economy politics and finances more and more. But they prefer to avoid the term «planning» lest a number of private entrepreneurs and common people should think about the way the states

¹ Still they produce for the sake of profit. Production range extends due to scientific, technical and organizational progress and in developed countries finally it reaches the level of sufficiency according to the number of population. However it is not followed by a structural reforming of national economy, reducing daily working hours, encouraging creative work of the population in a field apart from the paid job.

Instead of discussing ways of solving these problems, western economists discuss the problem of artificial maintenance of employment under the conditions of the existing organization of producing and distributing system. They justify reduction of the technological lifespan of production and the cult of fashion. At the same time they admit that it is possible to create models of refrigerators, washing machines etc that approach the ergonomic optimum, i.e. so convenient to use that no drawbacks of the construction can make one change it for an up-to-date model. They can be in use for 20 — 30 years and satisfy a want of them within five years. But after that capitalism economy will cease functioning, the level of unemployment will rise that will lead to increase in crime and other problems. It cannot be tolerated.

Accordingly it is necessary for maintaining the existing system of social relations of the crowd-“elitism” to develop entertainment industry in order to busy the unemployed, to adjust the demand to constantly renewing fashion and to depreciate resources characteristics of production to maintain employment.

As you can see this strategy of economy management does not coincide with the one suggested by J.V. Stalin in “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”. The question is **which strategy is better? It is obviously Stalin's one because in the long run it is capable of getting in harmony with the Earth's biosphere and the outer space providing good living and working conditions, amenities of rest and meeting the needs of personality development.** While the strategy of the West exhausts more and more resources of nature and society aimlessly consuming everything for the sake of crowd-“elitism”. Most of the people in this society are just attachments to their working places or “dregs of society”, and the minority of the population is spongers.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

are made to realize the plans and control their implementation on a global scale, and about the objective purposes of it¹.

Those were the external economic circumstances of developed capitalist countries that J.V. Stalin correlated the Soviet social and economic life with, and thought about the prospects.

By the end of 1950s multi-industry producing and distributing system of the USSR *in general had been successfully developing*² for a quarter of a century. The management was effective enough for:

- Preparing the USSR for the war;
- Winning the Great Patriotic War that was one of the hardest wars possible;

¹ So the question of the meaning of the words «submission of the State machinery to monopolies» is a question of terminology and thoroughness of analyzing the processes that take place in monopolies and in the State machinery while it is submitting to monopolies.

If it were only about coalescence it would reveal itself in the State machinery as legitimization of bribery and exaction of state officers. It would make these crimes look decent as certain «democratisers» in Russia, G. Popov in particular, suggested. But submission of the State machinery to monopolies' management has a broader sense than legitimization of money and shares bribery within the bounds of «the legislation of lobbying» or in another way.

If one sticks to the ordinary meaning of words and rules of grammar, and relies only on the descriptions without getting to the point he/she can really get an impression that Stalin knew nothing about introducing a planned beginning to Capitalism economy, that he wrote one thing but we try to arrogate another thing to him. Let people who think so explain in detail what the manifestations of «submission of the State machinery to monopolies» are. Why does the planned beginning not permeate through monopolies' activity and reach the State machinery' activity?

Or probably this submission appeared in Stalin's dreams? Then Joseph Stieglitz, the Nobel Prize in economics winner of 2001, also dreamt of it and this loathsome vision appeared even more vividly. (See Supplement 2.)

The question of submission of the state to monopolies proves that it is no use to read Stalin's works with only one's left-brain in action, without referring to the real historic circumstances of the age. Commenting them on the basis of such «reading» is making a fool of oneself or a scoundrel and a swindler in front of all somewhat thoughtful people.

² It would be stupid to refuse the mistakes made and the abuse of power, but those were not numerous; as a consequence the first bolshevist state in the history of the global civilization did not collapse.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

- Repairing war damage and eliminating the USA monopoly in the field of nuclear weapons within five post-war years;
- Leading the world in education of the population.

It was possible because the pace of social and economic development in the USSR during the years of Stalin's Bolshevism was the fastest in the world, *in spite of the sabotage of Socialism adversaries, acts of which occurred all over this period.*

Consequently the USSR was the first country of Europe, that had been through the war, to abolish the rationing system of product distribution. The USSR was the first to repair war damage, though Hitlerists and later on our former allies hoped that it would take the USSR over 20 years. The fact that European countries were still supported by the USA on the ground of the «Marshall Plan», while the USSR restored national economy on its own did not prevent it. Moreover the USSR did everything possible to help other states that had chosen Socialism as their path of development. Just the assistance to the peoples of China with the initial industrialization and founding of scientific and technical schools cost very much.

At the same time by the end of 1950s industries determined by the number of population reached the level of maximum sufficiency in the USSR. Everybody could get education including higher education, medical care of high quality according to the standards of the time, food and clothing. There were no unemployed or homeless people, nobody boarding at garbage dumps. People had time for rest and personal development. The population of the USSR did not have a grievance against the range of supply and the quality of products, though it did not meet the “elite” consumer standards¹ of developed capitalist countries. It met the common standards of most of the people and was better than that of 1913 that they still remembered well. The level of social protection of a person was higher than in any capitalist country².

¹ When the matter concerns comparing quality of products, it is better to correlate with certain consumer standards of different social groups.

² It is so if we consider the reality of that time and the life of the working people, not libelous myths composed by loony Trotskyite politicians, i.e. Khrushchev's followers and «democratisers», and the intellectuals. Nowadays they are supposed to have created «unexcelled spiritual values» and to have

→ → →

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

But further development of quality and quantity of production came into question. It was the result of the fact that national economy management had been based only on personal and addressing distribution of directive and checking information.

The so-called “elitarization” of professional managers that was in many aspects influenced by noosphere and culture inherited from the past. Though it would be wrong to blame everything on the «automatic» impact of noosphere and culture. Owing to the “elitarization” state officers’ aspirations of personal and family wealth displaced objectives suiting social interests¹, in their behavior motivation at work. As a result of the orientation toward their selfish momentary needs the body of professional managers “elitarized” presently losing the understanding of the pint of those technological, organizational and general social matters that used to be under their control. They would become to them.

As a result of the decline in managers’ qualification and necessity to provide management the body grew in number faster than production. Presently *it turned into a gang of dumb bureaucrats* that parasitized on management processes and the life of society. It characterizes bureaucracy of the State machine as well as bureaucracy of other spheres of social life: spheres of the state organization, economy, education and science².

claimed the prior right for material comforts that were created mostly by others without any assistance of the intellectuals-abstractionists of science and culture.

¹ Which were «awfully far from people...» if we put it in V.I. Lenin’s words.

² Yu. Mukhin avoids speaking about the problem of conceptual authorities in the aforementioned book «Murder of Stalin and Beria». He concentrates readers’ attention only on mafia bureaucratic degeneration the Party machine alone, which corrupted and in the end brought up managers in the rest of industries. In spite of the fact that the author of the book shields specialists, production managers, it is management in general and leading specialists that showed their nonentity and anti-national nature during the years of Khrushchev’s rule and in the following age, especially during the perestroika and other reforms.

Therefore everybody who has read or just intends to read this book should not only know but also understand the following. The measures, J.V. Stalin took to change the status of the party and the state system, which Yu. Mukhin writes about were only the consequence of Stalin’s conceptual authority. Any

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

In the USSR both: abstract and applied science including design developments became the sphere of clannish mafia bureaucracy. It promised no good. J. Stalin also directly indicated the risk of clannish mafia bureaucratic degeneration of science:

«**Question:** Was “Pravda”¹ right to open a free discussion over the issues of linguistics?

Answer: It was right.

The way the problems of linguistics will be solved shall become clear by the end of the discussion. Now we can be sure that the discussion has brought much good.

First of all the discussion showed that in linguistics institutions both in the center and in republics there ruled a regime that in not characteristic of science and scientists. The slightest criticism of the present situation in the Soviet linguistics, even the most fragile attempts to criticize the so-called “new teaching” in linguistics were persecuted by the ruling linguistic groups. Valued researchers would be ousted or demoted for their critics of the heritage of N. Marr, for a slightest dissent with his teaching. Linguists used to be promoted not by their professional qualities, but by their implicit recognition of N. Marr’s teaching.

It is universally acknowledged that no science can develop and succeed without divergence of opinions and the freedom of critics. But this universally acknowledged rule was ignored and violated most impudently. There appeared a group of leaders without a sin that began to act willfully and outrageously, having secured themselves against any critics». — Here we cite the final pages of J. Stalin’s work “Marxism and questions of linguistics”² (“Pravda”, June 20, 1950), where he summed up another social and political discussion.

original conception of administration finds expression in broad function of administration, the function in its turn expresses itself in the architecture of administration structures. See the USSR IP’s work «The Dead Water» part II, the chapter «Representation of the broad function of state and non-governmental structures of the social self-administration system».

¹ A daily all-union newspaper, the gazette of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), later on of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

² This work is not about linguistics as many people think, but about miserable tendencies in science in the USSR, demonstrated by J.V. Stalin by the example of linguistics.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

So it would be a lie to argue that J.V. Stalin was admiring himself for the progress the state he governed had made or for his own progress in his career. It would also be wrong to say that he did not see the problem of management inefficiency of the growing and turning bourgeois bureaucracy or did not try to find means and ways of solving this problem.

Here in chapter 6.7 we cited K. Simonov's story about J. Stalin's speech on the plenum of the Central Committee of October, 1952. It was belated and contained some libelous estimations of J.V. Stalin in the spirit of Khrushchev's period imposing an idiotic «understanding» of history on everybody. The story was also one of the showings that J. Stalin was satisfied with neither anti-communist movements that grew stronger, nor with his personal position and his «associates» who belonged to parasitically regenerating¹ bureaucracy, inefficient from the point of view of management. Besides from the middle of 1920s till the end of 1930s L. Trotsky² constantly pointed to the bureaucratization of life in the USSR. No matter how Stalin treated Marxism in general, but being well-read in Marxism literature he knew that Marx was right giving his definition of *bureaucracy as a phenomenon of life of crowd-“elitism”*

¹ At that time it was called «bourgeois regeneration».

² Though one should not delude oneself. If Trotsky's wing of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party won, bureaucracy headed by L. Bronstein would come to power. In his «Letter to the Party Congress» V. Lenin accused him of «excessive enthusiasm for purely administrative aspect». It was accusation against L. Bronstein (Trotsky) of the “elite” bureaucracy: representatives of the upper stratum of bureaucracy misuse their right to express more or less good wishes. Without having mastered practical knowledge and skills they entrust their subordinate «specialists» who are to have these skills and knowledge, with all the work to realize these wishes (which may really be good). Actually the «specialists» may not have any knowledge and skills due to the bureaucratic management style. They are rejected the right to participate in the activity of the upper layer of the hierarchy, as well as the right to criticize the upper bureaucrats personally, let alone drawing conclusions or inferences for future.

Many pressmen and mass media in general claim for their sole right to express their more or less good wishes. They claim for the right to call to account by means of public denunciation for a real or imaginary abuse of power owing to pressmen's ignorance in matters they express their opinion about. Accordingly these claims are one of the gravest and most dangerous types of bureaucracy, for it is informal bureaucracy.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

but for the last phrase. Here is this *sociology term* definition given by K. Marx:

«Bureaucracy is a circle that nobody can escape from. Its hierarchy is a hierarchy of knowledge. The upper stratum relies in lower ones when the matter concerns knowledge of particulars. Lower strata rely on the upper one when it concerns general understanding, so they mislead each other mutually.[...] the universal spirit of bureaucracy is a *secret*, a sacrament. Complying with this sacrament is secured in its own environment by the hierarchic organization. Regarding the outward world <society> it is secured by its exclusive corporate organization. Therefore open mind of the state and national thinking seem to bureaucracy a betrayal of the secret. Thus *authority* is the principle of knowledge, and idolizing the authority¹ is the *way of thinking*². [...] **As for a bureaucrat, a state goal becomes his personal goal, his rush for ranks, his career making**». (bold type is supplied by the authors) (K. Marx. “To the Critics of Hegel’s Legal Philosophy”. K. Marx and F. Engels’s works. The second edition³, volume 1, pp. 271 — 272.)

However concerning a single bureaucrat K. Marx is not right. It is just on the opposite: it is not the goal of the state that becomes personal for a bureaucrat (that would be any state’s dream), but wants to present his personal or family clannish purpose as a national necessity. It can happen

¹ This way K. Marx explained in good time who created the cult of personality of J.V. Stalin in the Soviet society for what reasons and purposes.

² As if adding to Marx’s words V. Belinsky gave the definition of a crowd that we have already mentioned: it is a «gathering of people living by tradition and judging by authority». Accordingly bureaucracy is not *elite*, though it rules, but a crowd, «a senseless people». Belinsky is precise in his definition: he criticized «judging by authority», but did not touch upon the personal aspect of every single bureaucrat. Many people reproach the USSR IP for recognizing no authority. His is not true. The USSR IP acknowledges certain personalities impact on the history and recognizes their authority in this sense. But the USSR IP is against «judging by authority» on the ground that every person has to act according to particular features of the age. That is why the USSR IP suggests substituting the culture of thinking for «judging by authority». It would give everyone an opportunity to get rid of intellectual dependence.

³ In 1970 — 1980 it was the most widely used edition. It became the last one published in the USSR.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

because a bureaucrat is often a toady¹ or a subordinate to clans of high position in a certain sphere of society life. If he cannot do it he tries and does it as a secret to society. It is on the basis of this aspiration that **bureaucracy forms as a mafia corporation² that is «a circle that nobody can escape from»** alone and so on by Marx, except for his view on the essence of a bureaucrat activity as a phenomenon of the crowd-“elitism” society life that we have rejected³.

¹ This word is that of «intellectuals» and does not describe the point precisely unlike a coarse vulgar word. The point is that whatever name we give to this person a toady cannot overcome his sex instincts. Sex instincts of a Homo Sapience aim at maintaining vitality of the species in the biosphere. According to this function a woman is made unconditionally psychologically dependent on children, while a man is made unconditionally psychologically dependent on a woman. And women show their demonic character to misuse men's instinctive subjection to them. As a result men often reveal their mistresses will which in not always wit and socially responsible.

However in civilized society of crowd-“elitism” this unconditioned instinctive *subjection of men to women and subjection of women to children* is restrained by cultural factors. This problem is analyzed thoroughly in the USSR IP's works such as “From Human Likeness Towards Being a Human”, “Principles of Personnel Policy belonging to a state, an «anti-state», a social initiative”, and the Supplement to “The Sufficiently common theory of control” in separate editions beginning from the year of 2000.

² As mafia makes a hierarchy in real life of crowd-“elitism” society and biblical teaching dominates over society, bureaucracy inevitably falls into admiration of zids. In the end it serves «world biblical backstage» to the detriment of their own people and their development potential.

³ Referring to Lenin's definition of a social class well known in the Soviet period, it was clear even at that time that bureaucracy in the USSR was becoming a social class, an exploiter parasite antisocialist and anticommunist class.

«Social Classes. “Classes are groups of people, which differ in their place in a certain historic system of social production, in their relation to means of production (stated in laws), in their role in the social labor organization, therefore they differ in the ways they get their share of public welfare and its proportions. Classes are groups of people one of which can misappropriate the other group's labor due to the difference in their positions in a certain structure of national economy”. (V. Lenin. The Complete Works, edition 5, volume 39, page 15.)» (Cited from the “Big Soviet Encyclopedia”, edition 3, volume 12, page 280; reference to “The Collected Works” of V. Lenin, to “The Great Start”).

→ → →

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

As the saying goes, guilty conscience needs no accuser. So the Big Soviet Encyclopedia tries to justify the Soviet Party bureaucracy of Khrushchev and Brezhnev periods mainly to continue «explaining» the point:

«This definition was given by V. Lenin referring to classes of an antagonist society. Their relationship leads to class struggle inevitably. Yet classes still exist in socialist society that has eliminated exploitation of <people by parasites>...»

This was to be understood in the following way: there are only single manifestations of some officers' bureaucracy that make semblance of bureaucracy really existing. There is no parasitic bureaucracy but a body of managers who come of common people and who are still a socially useful working group of population.

V. Lenin made a vitally valid definition of the term «social class». Besides even before the Russian Revolution in his book «State and Revolution» he wrote (with G. Apfelbaum-Zinoviev as his co-author) openly that bureaucracy was hostile to the essence of the Soviet power. It was so fair and persuasive that during the period after Stalin's rule corresponding fragments were never discussed at party studies or within courses of social science in higher educational establishments. If anybody referred to them in the course of a seminar on his/her own initiative the leader would fall into tedium and try to change the subject immediately, to go on break or to close the seminar:

«By the example of the Commune <of Paris, 1871> Marx showed that under socialism officials are not «bureaucrats», «officers» any longer as any time replacement alongside with appointment by election is introduced, as WAGES RAE BROUGHT TO AN AVERAGE OPERATING LEVEL and parliament institutions are replaced by working ones <parliament: parler (Fr) — to speak, i.e. parliament is a speaking club, mostly speaking to no purpose>, i.e. making laws and carrying them into effect. [...] In practical measures of the Commune Marx saw THE TURNING POINT THAT OPPORTUNISTS ARE AFRAID OF AND DO NOT WANT TO ADMIT BECAUSE OF THEIR COWARDICE AND UNWILLINGNES TO BREAK UP WITH BOURGEOISIE...» (put in capital letters by the authors).

We would like to draw your attention to the fact that practical measures of the Commune of Paris are basic to their description by classics of Marxism, i.e. they also come from life, not from Marxism. From the standpoint of *the Sufficiently common theory of control* reducing managers' wages to the average level in productive industries the Commune of Paris tried to close feedback of social management on the working majority, turning them to high-yielding groups of “elite”, both national and transnational. The Commune crashed, because people who agreed to run the management on the offered conditions did not have the necessary qualification, while those who had it demonstrated arrogance of the “elite” and regarded Paris workers as rowdy crowd to be brought to their level. So they turned MORALLY UNREADY to

→ → →

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

According to this proactive warning J.V. Stalin knew that bureaucracy could not provide production management and distribution in society in compliance with the needs of Socialism and Communism building¹. He regarded bureaucracy and every single bureaucrat as enemies of the idea and mission that he carried out sincerely.

Even during the Great Patriotic War it became clear that the warning was correct, but «one should never swap horses while crossing the

manage society by concerns of the majority's life and at the same time to live as an average family.

Some people can argue that Stalin made no reference of the kind and never said openly that bureaucracy was an exploiter class, therefore we again attribute wisdom to him post factum. But crowd-“elitism” society is able to maintain a campaign with the slogan «Annihilate bureaucracy as a class!» that is similar to the motto «Annihilate the kulaks as a class!» They could be driven to that by Trotskyites and after that the USSR would be left again without any professional managers. J.V. Stalin did not want it to happen and hoped to solve the problem another way of social and historic development, as it is clear from “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”.

Besides in the USSR under Stalin and in the following years «State and Revolution» and Lenin's works that give the definition of the term «social class» used to be *cult works*. Thus nothing except indifference to the lot of Motherland or cowardice could prevent a schoolchild, a student or a Party member in the course of party studies from behaving according to real historic circumstances reform as Bolsheviks.

But bureaucracy in Russia is still a social class, a parasite exploiter class hostile to all the society and to itself. There is no place for bureaucracy in the future. Let the bureaucracy know and remember about it...

Fighting bureaucracy is always either “a funny game” called «hide-and-seek» the very bureaucrats or a class struggle of working people for introducing humanness into life. But one of the parasite classes of the crowd-“elitism” society prevents it.

¹ However the Soviet bureaucracy of 1920 — 1930's also deserves thanks. This thoughtless and weak-willed monster overridden by J.V. Stalin appeared good enough for stopping the open mafia pseudo-democratic absolute power of Marxist psycho-Trotskyism in 1920 — 1930's. But by the end of 1940's it stood in the way of the further development of the USSR.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

stream» but for emergency cases. According to this fact after the war officers of high rank of the air forces and aircraft industry stood trial for malfeasance in office during the war. Both the parties mutually agreed that the air forces got from the aircraft industry defective equipment¹; as a result many aviation accidents happened where pilots were injured and or died without being involved in operations.

Recent years this episode if the USSR history has been presented by mass media as an example of the supposedly «unjustified repressions» that took place in the post-war period. Yet it is not the only case of bureaucracy showing its anti-national essence. It just happened to be the most well-known one out of a great number of similar cases of the Soviet age that accompanied the bureaucratic management style in production development all over the history of Russia, from the rule of Peter the great to the present moment².

Slips made by the Soviet bureaucrats in the field of national economy management are also mentioned in “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”. We shall come back to it further on.

In order not to carry the yoke of the global biblical or another oligarchy of witch-doctors again the USSR peoples had to begin solving the *problems* of the unfinished building of *Socialism*. In life there is a certain correspondence in the system «*aims — problems that have to be solved to achieve the aims*». In other words «certain aims involve certain problems, other aims involve other problems». In “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” J.V. Stalin pointed out the aims of a regular stage of the USSR social development definitely and accurately:

«It is necessary, in the third place, to ensure such a cultural advancement of society as will secure for all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that the members of society may be in a position to receive an education

¹ It is not a question of adding badly constructed aircraft to the armory but of providing the troops with production bundle that does not meet the standards and approved technical demands.

² Bureaucratic management style of various products «life cycle» is one of the implicit mediate reasons of almost all the known man-caused disasters. It concerns both: great and slight ones, from spontaneous inflammation of color TV-sets (the «epidemic» of 1970's) to the Chernobyl disaster and the submarine «Kursk» wreck and *many other incidents that remain unknown or unrecognized as disasters*.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

sufficient to enable them to be active agents of social development¹, and in a position freely to choose their occupations and not be tied all their lives, owing to the existing division of labour, to some one occupation.

What is required for this?

It would be wrong to think that such a substantial advance in the cultural standard of the members of society can be brought about without substantial changes in the present status of labour. For this, it is necessary, first of all, to shorten the working day at least to six, and subsequently to five hours. This is needed in order that the members of society might have the necessary free time to receive an all round education. It is necessary, further, to introduce universal compulsory polytechnical education, which is required in order that the members of society might be able freely to choose their occupations and not be tied to some one occupation all their lives. It is likewise necessary that housing conditions should be radically improved and that real wages of workers and employees should be at least doubled, if not more, both by means of direct increases of wages and salaries, **and, more especially, by further systematic reductions of prices for consumer goods** (put in bold type by the authors)².

These are the basic conditions required to pave the way for the transition to communism». («Economic Problems of Socialism in

¹ «Becoming active makers of social development» implies conceptual authority of common people (called «lower classes» in terms of crowd-«elitism») and absolute subordination of the state organization to it. That is not what despots, tyrants and power-seeking people appeal to.

² J.V. Stalin virtually proved that macroeconomy of a state could work stably in the regime of systematic planned cut in prices. After the derationing of 1947 prices used to be cut every year demonstrating an incontestable increase in social labor productivity. Unlike H. Ford who carried out the policy of a planned cut in prices on the level of microeconomy in his company «Ford Motors», in the USSR the policy of a planned cut in prices was adopted within the state-super concern. As a result of this policy all people's wealth increased but *not only* of those who can settle themselves and live by some additional income differing a lot from the rest of society's standard of living.

That is what the «World backstage» and its henchmen (financial and stock-exchange tycoons and their tame pressmen and social «science») cannot forgive him for. On the other hand the present Russian «opposition» is either stupid or so coward that does not dare to make the demand for the regime «Long live Stalin's policy of a planned cut in prices!»

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

the U.S.S.R.”, “Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yarochenko”, part 1. “Comrade Yaroshenko's Chief Error”).

It appears from this that the USSR national economy was not to work for the man in the street to gorge himself, to get filled with beer and vodka and heaped up with clothes. It was not to give him time on account of reduction of working hours *for lechery that is as befuddling as alcohol and other drugs promoting showbiz, pornographic and gambling industry*. It was not to bear a new lordly “elite” that would become «cultivated» and detached from Life parasites, idlers of high society with the rest of people working like mules for them.

This is a well-grounded living alternative to that suicidal way of survival (not way of living) reached by developed capitalist countries having brought other countries to ruin, in the period after 1952. At the beginning of chapter 6.8.3 we talked about it in one of the footnotes.

National economy was to work for providing ALL PEOPLE with free time *that was necessary for them to feel, to realize and to understand themselves, to recognize their potential of personal growth, to help their children and grandchildren to recognize their potential of personal growth; for enabling all people to become active makers of social development.*

In other words if the level of social and economic development defined by Stalin as far back as the middle of the 20th century were achieved within the period of two or three generations, i.e. about 70 years, a new Man and his civilization could be born. If compared with it all present regional civilizations and the global civilization in general would come out in their true colors: in their inhuman savagery and anti-human demonism, in their underdevelopment, perverse morals and personality essence.

If this change happened it would exclude the very possibility of any tyranny towards society and any of its members.

Therefore «world backstage» did their best not only to prevent this level from being achieved, but to make everybody forget about it and to make the USSR society that was still crowd-“elite” to diminish the achievements made under J. Stalin.

If J.V. Stalin had not written “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” where he killed Marxism and pointed out a valid living prospect of development, if he had not spoken against the State machinery

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

“elitarization” at the Central Committee plenum of October, 1952, «world backstage» would have added his name to history as an outstanding Marxist and Communist and would have begun propagating to developed capitalist countries the USSR achievements in curbing the race for consumption¹. But all the achievements were connected with the name of Stalin, so they had to extirpate the spirit of Stalin's Bolshevism out of society². That was the reason why their periphery suppressed and perverted the processes started in the age of Stalin's Bolshevism.

J.V. Stalin lived in society where materialistic worldview prevailed and many people did not think culture development and personal growth to be the most important things; therefore he began the cited fragment with the word «thirdly». But this word is preceded by two more conditions that secure practicability of this «thirdly» under the rule of materialistic worldview:

«1. It is necessary, in the first place, to ensure, not a mythical “rational organization” of the productive forces, but a continuous expansion of all social production, with a relatively higher rate of expansion of the production of means of production. The relatively higher rate of expansion of production of means of production is necessary not only because it has to provide the equipment both for its own plants and for all the other branches of the national economy, but also because reproduction on an extended scale becomes altogether impossible without it.

2. It is necessary, in the second place, by means of gradual transitions carried out to the advantage of the collective farms, and, hence, of all society, to raise collective-farm property to the level of public property, and, also by means of gradual transitions, to replace commodity circulation by a system of products-exchange, under which the central government, or some other social-economic centre, might control the whole product of social

¹ In this case Stalin *per se* would not have been in history, there would have been a more successful person than L. Bronstein, another «Trotsky» *by spirit, i.e. by his mind and morals.*

² Referring to the aforementioned anecdote, we can say that «world backstage» has made a mistake in their attempt to charge «the bargain» to Stalin. They did it but the «bargain» became the national property owing to Stalin and together with him dissolved in the future where there was no room for «world backstage» ...

Sjids of all nationalities really have reasons to feel angry with Stalin.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

production in the interests of society». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yarochenko”, part 1. “Comrade Yaroshenko's Chief Error”).

The first point in essence means that it is necessary to create technological basis of production in a short space of time by standards of history. The production basis would secure meeting all the demands of society conditioned by the number of population including cultural needs while daily working hours would not exceed 5 hours. It would satisfy the major law of socialism formulated by J.V. Stalin that we cited in part 4.4.

Creating the production basis demands development of new generation means of production. They must be produced up-to date *instead of obsolescent means of production*, so that in all industries of national economy equipment, up-to-date organization and technologies would prevail. Accordingly production of new effective means of production should prevail over production of consumptive use¹.

The second point in essence means that this process should be accompanied and provided for by founding a national system of development management, production and distribution, because it is impossible to reach the new level of social development determined by Stalin without it.

According to the three conditions public enemies *hiding behind place-hunters who do not suit their posts because of their imbecility and behind know-all's subjected to pressure did the following:*

- They began fighting against the impact of Stalin’s Bolshevism ideas on people’s worldview under the pretext of fighting «the cult of personality of Stalin» that they had created and supported themselves. For that reason they withdrew all Stalin’s works including “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” from libraries, excluded them from the course of political science and launch a libelous campaign against J.V. Stalin personally and all the age of Stalin’s Bolshevism.

¹ Correspondingly Khrushchev and Brezhnev’s policy (with N. Baybakov running the State Planning Committee of the USSR) of «production equipment instead of production of consumptive use» was a distortion of Stalin’s course by means of running to an absurd extreme. What is more the production equipment was out-of-date and imperfect due to bureaucratization of science, research and development, the State Planning Committee of the USSR and the republics.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

- They supported bureaucratic mafia in the field of science, research and development and encourage it to persecute and deprave creative talented people, to suppress pioneer developments, to reject application of the achievements of science to production, to squander resources and intellectual potential for dead-ends. That was why by 1980 the USSR had one of the most out-of-date production bases in the world though possessed a number of world-recognized inventions and applications rejected by the Soviet patent agency that Japan was ready to buy wholesale.
- They prevented all fields of activity from organizing effective systems of public administration. For that purpose most of higher educational establishments had to exclude the subjects forming a general idea of management processes in life, enabling students to solve practical problems in the field of engineering, agriculture, science and politics as management problems. Such subjects as dynamic programming, linear and nonlinear programming, automatic control theory for the lack of a more general theory, they were unknown for the majority of alumnae in the USSR and Russia.
- They continued pressing on people, the young generation mainly, with the cult of Marxism, perverting their world understanding and idea of life prevailing in society.

Neither the crowd-“elitism” party, nor the crowd-“elitism” society of the USSR rebuffed this perversion of the course of Communism building. Therefore economic problems and problems of Socialism in the USSR connected with them appeared unsolved, moreover new problems added and previously unsolved problems «rose from the dead». Yet they have to be brought to light and solved because by the Predestination there is no room for the *civilization of speaking human-like sensible apes and their demonic masters and bosses*. So let us come back to the facts that J.V. Stalin regarded as incontestable progress of Socialism and to the way he understood problems that were to be solved.

J.V. Stalin regarded national economy of the USSR as an integral system, i.e. as an object of management constituted of a number of elements with different functions that interact with each other. He conceived developing this multi-industry production and distribution system as development and update of the element basis and the interconnection system of elements. Anybody can make sure that it is true after a careful consideration of the text of “The Economic Problems of

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Socialism in the USSR”. At the same time the integrity function should be subject to certain laws forming the hierarchy of mutual multiplicity.

The most important law among them must be the main economic law of Socialism formulated by Stalin the following way: *«providing maximum satisfaction of ever-growing material and cultural needs of society by means of continuous growth and improvement of Socialist production on the basis of advanced techniques and equipment»*.

The law of planned (proportional) development of national economy is in its turn subordinate to the main economic law. In “Digression 6” we analyzed carefully the understanding of the words «planned» and «proportional».

Explaining the interrelation of economic laws of socialism and their interconnection with life, J.V. Stalin pointed out that unlike the force of law of value under spontaneous market capitalism, economic laws of Socialism do not have the characteristic of automatism of the kind. They take knowledge. Only after that effective planning and national economy management becomes possible according to the knowledge and public needs. In particular:

«...the law of balanced development of the national economy makes it possible for our planning bodies to plan social production correctly. But possibility must not be confused with actuality. They are two different things. In order to turn the possibility into actuality, it is necessary to study this economic law, to master it, to learn to apply it with full understanding, and to compile such plans as fully reflect the requirements of this law. It cannot be said that the requirements of this economic law are fully reflected by our yearly and five-yearly plans». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 1. “Character of Economic Laws Under Socialism”.)

Many people suppose that J.V. Stalin attached no importance to «the law of value» as a code of objective showings of economy efficiency such as production cost value, market prices and profitability and therefore national economy of the USSR appeared so inefficient. Actually is absolutely untrue.

J.V. Stalin attached special importance to «the law of value» that was impossible to achieve under the conditions of capitalist economy. But *beginning from the first edition of “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” economists and first of all titled fools from the*

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

economic department of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and union republics or the present Russian Academy of Sciences could not or did not want to understand what J.V. Stalin wrote. Neither they understood what there was behind accountants' guides in the course of economical activities. J.V. Stalin wrote the following lines concerning «the law of value».

«...the sphere of operation of the law of value is limited by the social ownership of the means of production, and by the law of balanced development of the national economy, and is consequently also limited by our yearly and five-yearly plans, which are an **approximate reflection of the requirements of this law** (put in bold type by the authors: the important thing here is that saying *approximately* Stalin admitted inevitability of mistakes caused by different reasons. Any plan is subject to them therefore it is not the most precise realization of the plan that is *the best way* of using national economy production facilities among feasible ones).

Some comrades draw the conclusion from this that the law of balanced development of the national economy and economic planning annul the principle of profitableness of production. That is quite untrue. It is just the other way round. If **profitableness** is considered not from the stand-point of individual plants or industries, and not over a period of one year, but from the standpoint **of the entire national economy and over a period of, say, ten or fifteen years, which is the only correct approach to the question** (all put in bold type by the authors), then the temporary and unstable profitableness of some plants or industries is beneath all comparison with that higher form of stable and permanent profitableness which we get from the operation of the law of balanced development of the national economy and from economic planning, which save us from periodical economic crises disruptive to the national economy and causing tremendous material damage to society, and which ensure a continuous and high rate of expansion of our national economy». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 3. “The Law of Value Under Socialism”).

«When speaking, in my "Remarks," of the profitableness of the socialist national economy, I was controverting certain comrades who allege that, by not giving great preference to profitable enterprises, and by tolerating the existence side by side with them of unprofitable enterprises, our planned economy is killing the very

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

principle of profitableness of economic undertakings. The "Remarks" say **that profitableness considered from the standpoint of individual plants or industries is beneath all comparison with that higher form of profitableness which we get from our socialist mode of production, which saves us from crises of overproduction and ensures us a continuous expansion of production** (all put in bold type by the authors).

But it would be mistaken to conclude from this that the profitableness of individual plants and industries is of no particular value and is not deserving of serious attention. That, of course, is not true. The profitableness of individual plants and industries is of immense value for the development of our industry. It must be taken into account both when planning construction and when planning production. It is an elementary requirement of our economic activity at the present stage of development». ("Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", "Reply to Comrade Alexander Ilyich Notkin", "The fifth point").

J.V. Stalin made a reserve bluntly. He wrote:

«...there can be no doubt that under our present socialist conditions of production, the law of value cannot be a "regulator of the proportions" of labour distributed among the various branches of production». ("Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", "Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion", part 3. "The Law of Value Under Socialism").

The function of inter-industry proportions regulation should be performed *the main economic law of Socialism*. It results in defining the objects for the production system and in *the law of planned (proportional) development of national economy*. This law opens up possibilities of bringing production capabilities into accord with needs of society in the best way possible.

But here a question arises: how does the superior profitability of national economy correlate with profitability of every single industry? In other words with profitability of a number of enterprises in certain industries. These enterprises can work by any pattern of ownership, i.e. state, co-operative or kolkhoz and even sole proprietorship.

Normally sales return of a business should exceed expenses. Otherwise donation would be needed. If it is not needed and the business is profitable, then what does profitability of national economy as a unite

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

system in the course of 10 or 15 years mean? Many people do not understand it.

First of all they do not understand it because a Socialist state is not one of the financial system users but the owner of it. Besides the state as the owner of the financial system and a number of enterprises gets no profit and suffers no loss if some values move from the balance of an enterprise to the balance of another one. This process is accompanied by the proper transfer of funds.

Actually it is not so difficult as it may seem. At a certain period gross output can be valued at cost or at a real price. Accordingly at the same period it can comprise capital goods expenditures including the equipment of production distribution system securing production storage and sale to ultimate consumers. After a while these means of production will produce products that a consumer will buy. The way consumers will pay for them and their prices do not matter when considering the question of national economy profitability as a whole. Another thing matters:

Introducing new means of production in all the industries results in a range of products. If national economy on the whole is profitable at a certain period of time then *the cost* of the range of production *at a value cost of the beginning of the period* must exceed the cost of means of production.

Certainly some time is needed for the products to *compensate for the new means of production*. It is natural that the shorter this period, the more effective and the larger the profitability of national economy as a whole. At this it is not production for consumptive use but manufacturing more effective means of production that should be of paramount importance. This is the pledge of stability of the given regime of national economy functioning in the succession of planned production cycles, i.e. intervals of all-system profitability control.

This approach estimates profitability of national economy only by the production activity including production distribution to ultimate consumers. Anything that is not directly relevant to production and distribution is excluded from the estimation of national economy profitability. The reason for it is the fact that other sectors' activity is conditioned by the capability of the production and distribution sector to feed and to settle lives of those involved in other sectors. Scientific, technological and organizational advances are kept in stability store of

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

estimation of national economy profitability. Speculative sector preoccupied with deriving an income from «securities» and on-selling is not taken into consideration for being parasite¹.

This is a general point of view. It is to be put into practice on the ground of a certain classified nomenclature of products and services. It forms a basis for planning, production record, production distribution and real consumption. They are to provide correlation between showings at the beginning and at the end of a control period. Otherwise uncertain nomenclature and changes in it during the period of time would prevent from correlating the showings.

The structure of industries and their relationship change in the course of time under the influence of scientific, technological and organizational advance. Therefore division of national economy into industries and classification of industries are secondary to classified nomenclature of production. In other words the system of long-term strategic planning of production, distribution, consumption and recycling can be and must be derived from stable nomenclature of a range of needs based on population study. It should not be the consequence of unstable nomenclature of industries².

J.V. Stalin determined the duration of the estimation period of national economy profitability on the whole as ten or fifteen years. It means that during ten or fifteen years virtually all investments should compensate for themselves in the described way and secure *national economy profitability estimated at constant prices*.

Besides J. Stalin's wording about the rule of superior profitability of national economy actually implicated the requirements for planning. Those are to provide for high-quality renewal of all the equipment and organization of national economy as united system of production and consumption every ten or fifteen years. It does not mean that there cannot be more durable enginery and projects with a longer self-repayment span

¹ It concerns both: Capitalist and Socialist economy with the only difference. The difference is that in Capitalist economy speculative sector is legal, while in Socialist economy it is to be suppressed legally and socially.

² For a detailed study see the USSR IP's «A Brief Course...», «*The Dead Water*» (in editions of 1998 and succeeding years). In these works the theory of multi-industry system of production and consumption unfolds as well as general rules of organization of the long-term planning system conditioned by population study.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

or planned unprofitable but socially necessary projects. It means that in every industry more up-to-date, more efficient equipment and technologies should *be introduced extensively*.

What has been said proves that that J.V. Stalin suggested no protracted building when a project would become obsolete, the execution of it would lose sense and when structures installations would begin ruining in course of construction. *Such protracted building later becomes normal. But it is a perversion of Baibakov's followers¹ in the State Planning Committees of the USSR and republics of Khrushchev and Brezhnev's age.*

J.V. Stalin wrote that the law of value was subject to the rule of «superior profitability of national economy» in the period of ten-fifteen years, while the multi-industry system of production and consumption was subject to «the main economic law of Socialism» and «the law of planned (proportional) development of national economy». Actually all these things implicated two *associated* goals:

¹ Nikolai Baibakov (b. 1911) was the head of the committee for forward planning of the Council of Ministers from 1955 to 1957. From 1957 to 1958 he worked as the head of the State Planning Committee of the RSFSR. From 1965 till his retirement during perestroika he was the vice chairman of the Council of Ministers and the head of the State Planning Committee of the USSR.

We know nothing about N. Baibakov's grievances against economics and against outstanding economists or muddlers personally on the ground of his dissatisfaction with their «scientifically valid» planning methods. We agree that it was impossible to put Stalin's demands into practice on the basis of the existing methods of planning and the way control used to be organized in the USSR. It was impossible not because of real impracticability, but because of the unfounded methods of planning in operation. (You can go back and see the nonsense of the book "The Planned Equilibrium: installation, maintenance, efficiency" by V. Belkin and V. Ivanter, quoted in «Digression 7».) It was also impossible because of the management bureaucratization. It was impossible to put Stalin's demands into practice, as legitimate scientists were incompetent professionally and intellectually.

Initiative in developing methods of planning was not encouraged or supported by bureaucrats of the State Planning Committee and the Central Committee. Even the initiative of such prominent figures as the world chess champion and Doctor of Science Mikhail Botvinnick. Those with no titles were also ignored. If they dared to insist they were suppressed, expelled from the Communist Party, charged with being graphorrhea addict and with anti-Soviet work, etc.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

- Maintaining balance of dues and grants in national economy, i.e. providing for financial stability of planned unprofitable enterprises and business of low profit. That is to be achieved owing to redistribution of excess profits of highly remunerative enterprises in favor of business of low profit;
- Using over and above the plan production facilities so that the produced output would find a consumer and would serve society. These facilities:
 - inevitably exist because of mistakes in books and necessity to secure stability of the plan by resources and facilities involved¹;
 - appear again due to scientific, technical and organizational advance in process of accomplishing state plan targets, – so that the goods which can be produced with these facilities could be in demand and use for the society.

Neither of these goals can be achieved **under bureaucracy rule**. It was one of the reasons for J.V. Stalin to write fairly that «**under the present Socialist conditions of production** (our splash text) the law of value cannot work as a «regulator of proportions» in labor division between different industries».

The matter is that non-profitability and low profitability of an enterprise can have different nature. It can result from poor bureaucratic management and Socialist property looting or from the public price-formation policy pursuing noneconomic objects and being guided by J. Stalin's principle of superior profitability. A bureaucrat who is to manage the balance of dues and grants cannot differentiate between these

¹ Once again we want to remind you that in spite of the bureaucratic and propagandistic custom of the USSR a **NORMAL plan for the state and society had the following characteristics:**

- It is not a high hurdle that the multi-industry system of production and consumption had to clear at the breaking point;
- It is an attainable level with a control index that the system of production and consumption had to maintain and would better exceed. It must be guaranteed by the freedom of scientific and technical, and entrepreneur management creative work.

In other words the plan must be *guaranteed not to be tense*. In process of accomplishing it organization of work must guarantee exceeding production volume if it is needed and forestalling schedule deadline if it is admissible. It must also guarantee development, mastery of technique and production of new products of public utility that initially have not been planned.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

types of non-profitability and low profitability. Therefore basically he can maintain the balance of dues and grants distributing donations in favor of fools and thieves at the expense of hard-working people. Being «quite well-meant» he violates the principle of the superior profitability of national economy trying 'not to make a mistake' and not to harm the public price-formation policy though he does not understand what objects it pursues. But it is within a high-ranking bureaucrat's grasp to maintain the balance of dues and grants according to the principle of the superior profitability of national economy.

A bureaucrat of a lower rank is no better. He is to manage an enterprise. He does not understand the principle of the superior profitability of national economy; moreover it disgusts him thoroughly, because his personal and clannish objects substitute for social ones that determine the principle of the superior profitability. This principle secures his wealth in the future on a par with all people. Nevertheless the fact that business is subject to this principle, so that resources and production facilities are to be used according to it, prevents the bureaucrat from abusing his position and getting rich to the prejudice of others, both: at present and in the future.

In the same way it is impossible to use over and above the plan production facilities under bureaucratic rule. Using over and above the plan production facilities in essence requires expansion of the scope of commodity-money exchange in Socialist economy. The scope should embrace public enterprises of national economy. Then it would become possible to organize self-regulation of the usage of over and above the plan production facilities in national economy. It could be done when they would appear not to be used in a planned work. The immediate person in charge of the facilities would manage it without wasting time on forwarding ideas, arranging meetings, changing the plan in action. It would help to avoid standstill of facilities until they are used for planned production in the next planning period.

But bureaucratic rule left out such a possibility, because production facilities belonged completely to bureaucrats, that is business managers and directors. Legalization of the machine of market self-regulation when using over and above the plan production facilities led automatically to sabotage, both deliberate and accidental. Deliberate sabotage was aimed at discrediting Socialism and re-establishing Capitalism. Accidental sabotage was through ignorance. It urged to rush for profits in order to

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

improve the well being of their own group to the detriment of production objects of great importance to society.

The rule of Marxism political economy rooted out the possibility to expose deliberate sabotage and to leave out sabotage through ignorance. Here some explanation is needed.

Henry Ford, being a private proprietor de jure, regarded his enterprises common wealth de facto. Therefore concluding purchase and sale deals and adopting the policy of planned reduction in price for output goods to serve people he objectively worked for the principle of the superior profitability of US national economy. He did not care about correlation of purchase and sale based on property law with the status of public property of his own enterprises. Political economy as a means of organizing sensible public work on the basis of a common world out-look did not matter to him. The reason was that he did not realize it had such a function. He regarded all contemporary political economy experts as windbags and drones whom conscientious working people had to feed. Actually that was essentially true.

In the USSR things were different. Bureaucrats regarded enterprises of public property as their private property within the limits of their authority. Marxism political economy would not answer to the following question:

What if a state owned (Soviet) enterprise transfers some money to the account of another state owned enterprise as a payment (or something else) for certain goods or services produced by the second enterprise?

Unlike H. Ford, J.V. Stalin being the leader of the ruling party and the head of the state thought over this problem and the consequences of it being unsolved. He realized the role of sociological theories and particularly theories of political economy as a means of organizing sensible public work on the basis of a common world out-look. J.V. Stalin wrote the following lines on the problem of an unintelligible interpretation of such questions in Marxism political economy:

«It therefore follows that in the sphere of foreign trade the means of production produced by our enterprises retain the properties of commodities both essentially and formally, but that in the sphere of domestic economic circulation, means of production lose the properties of commodities, cease to be commodities and pass out of the sphere of operation of the law of value, retaining only the outward integument of commodities (calculation, etc.).

How is this peculiarity to be explained?

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

(...)

If the matter is approached from the formal angle, from the angle of the processes taking place on the surface of phenomena, one may arrive at the incorrect conclusion that the categories of capitalism retain their validity under our economy. **If, however, the matter is approached from the standpoint of Marxist analysis, which strictly distinguishes between the substance of an economic process and its form, between the deep processes of development and the surface phenomena, one comes to the only correct conclusion, namely, that it is chiefly the form, the outward appearance, of the old categories of capitalism that have remained in our country, but that their essence has radically changed in adaptation to the requirements of the development of the socialist economy»** (put in bold type by the authors). “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Reply to Comrade Alexander Ilyich Notkin”, part 3 “The third point”).

If we do not examine the problem within the bounds of Marxism we can come to the only right conclusion:

Marxism political economy does not call all things and phenomena by their proper names. Consequently there appears inconsistency of the form and the content of a phenomenon.

In situations of this kind concordance of form and content is a subjective matter:

- As far as H. Ford and J.V. Stalin are concerned it is in favor of public property de facto, planned beginning on a national scale, the principle of superior profitability of national economy based on effective management of business and prices according to real present and future needs of conscientious working people and the state concerning products and services;
- In case with a Soviet bureaucrat, a Marxist and dogmatist it is in favor of himself and to the prejudice of ideals and the cause of Communism. One cannot find fault with it: *everything is justifiable by Communist advisability expressed in Marxism. A person has a right to interpret it in a certain way according to his/her position in the hierarchy of post subordination.*

The inconsistency of form and content is not the result of Marxism only, but of any modification of the I-centered worldview. In order to

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

establish the unity of form and content¹ an alternative comprehensive sociological theory was needed that would call things and phenomena by their proper names, thus secure uniqueness of life conception for different people.

If a theory of this kind were developed, well-meant but ignorant bureaucrats would *begin changing the structure of their mind* while mastering the theory. They would adopt their subjective ideas of life to reality and consequently would quit being bureaucrats. They would become good managers and businessmen, Bolshevik entrepreneurs. The theory would help most people *expose* ill-intentioned «know-alls» pursuing the object of destroying Socialism advances and re-establishing a kind of legalized crowd-“elitism”. As a consequence of this unsolved

¹ If the state is the owner of the financing system then it is mediately the owner of everything that is taken stock of throughout the territory regardless of the patterns of ownership.

Therefore from the State Planning Committee’s viewpoint (as well as that of Ministry of economy) products exchange as a united system of production and distribution accompanied by monetary circulation is built on the basis of interior cost values of the system. They include expenditures conditioned financially, which are characteristic of the system management and stocktaking on different levels. They include: workshop cost value, the cost value of the enterprise workshop cost value + overhead expenses; branch or regional cost value including dues and donations constituents; all national economy cost value = internal prices of production; foreign market prices as one of the features of external economic potential of a super concern-state.

This approach to the description of economic processes secures the unity of form and content on every level: from an individual to super concerns and global economy of the humanity. The approach comes from the principle of integrity of multi-industry system of production and consumption. This way of understanding economic processes corresponds with axioms of economics (*Digression 2*) and with main rules of political economy of an industrial civilization (*Digression 6*). If it dominates in society them micro level management of national economy and macro level management can be brought to a conflict only by evil design and society’s inactivity. Those were things not to be found during the period of Stalin’s Bolshevism.

If the owner of the financing system is not the state (legally it is manifested by the independence of the Central Bank from the state), the financing system is the legal property of international mafia. Mafia is also the owner of everything that is taken stock of throughout the territory regardless of the patterns of ownership.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

problem alongside with some others *J.V. Stalin was right under those social and historic circumstances* to limit the scope of commodity-money exchange (trade in the field of production). The limitation was implemented by means of interaction of the state economic sector and co-operative one on the basis of prices established by the state.

There was nothing to prevent profitability of co-operative business from growing to the level that could be reached on the basis of state planned shopping prices, but bureaucracy in management. The same concerns increasing profitability of state enterprises as compared to a planned level.

Here a question arises, why did J.V. Stalin write that common wealth increase should be ensured by means of:

- Direct wage raise;
- Further systematic cut in prices for articles of mass consumption.

The latter point is especially important.

The answer to the question shows that in Socialist economy the principle of superior profitability of national economy as a whole must go with the principle of achieving utmost self-repayment of enterprises. Note that the principle of superior profitability of national economy is manifested by a planned systematic cut in prices according to the increase of social labor productivity and of serving people's needs in various products including services. As a result the savings of manufacturing a product as well as over and above the plan production should become apparent not only in price cutting and output rate increasing¹, but in the up growth of nominal cash income of enterprises. This enables groups to develop their funds of public consumption and to reward their employees thereby encouraging them to work conscientiously, without waiting for a national cut in prices.

During post-Stalin's period this strategy was distorted. But it does not mean that J.V. Stalin was wrong in his idea of a planned state beginning on a national scale and principles of self-repayment (profitability) of national economy as a whole as well as of single enterprises.

The issue of commodity production under Socialism and accordingly the issue of market functioning is explained by J.V. Stalin in the following way:

¹It underlies the possibility of a planned state cut in prices.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

«Commodity production must not be regarded as something sufficient unto itself, something independent of the surrounding economic conditions. Commodity production is older than capitalist production. It existed in slave-owning society, and served it, but did not lead to capitalism. It existed in feudal society and served it, yet, although it prepared some of the conditions for capitalist production, it did not lead to capitalism. Why then, one asks, cannot commodity production similarly serve our socialist society for a certain period without leading to capitalism, bearing in mind that in our country commodity production is not so boundless and all-embracing as it is under capitalist conditions, being confined within strict bounds thanks to such decisive economic conditions as social ownership of the means of production, the abolition of the system of wage labour, and the elimination of the system of exploitation?

(...)

Of course, when instead of the two basic production sectors, the state sector and the collective-farm sector, there will be only one all-embracing production sector, with the right to dispose of all the consumer goods produced in the country, commodity circulation, with its "money economy," will disappear, as being an unnecessary element in the national economy. But so long as this is not the case, so long as the two basic production sectors remain, commodity production and commodity circulation must remain in force, as a necessary and very useful element in our system of national economy. How the formation of a single and united sector will come about, whether simply by the swallowing up of the collective-farm sector by the state sector – which is hardly likely (because that would be looked upon as the expropriation of the collective farms) – or by the setting up of a **single national** economic body (comprising representatives of state industry and of the collective farms), with the right at first to keep account of all consumer product in the country, and eventually also to distribute it, by way, say, of products-exchange – is a special question which requires separate discussion.

Consequently, **our** commodity production is not of the ordinary type, but is a special kind of commodity production, commodity production without capitalists, which is concerned mainly with the goods of associated socialist producers (the state, the collective farms, the cooperatives), the sphere of action of which is confined to items of personal consumption, which obviously cannot possibly develop into capitalist production, and which, together with its

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

"money economy," is designed to serve the development and consolidation of socialist production». ("Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", "Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion", part 2. "Commodity Production Under Socialism".)

«Wherever commodities and commodity production exist, there the law of value must also exist.

In our country, the sphere of operation of the law of value extends, first of all, to commodity circulation, to the exchange of commodities through purchase and sale, the exchange, chiefly, of articles of personal consumption. Here, in this sphere, the law of value preserves, within certain limits, of course, the function of a regulator.

But the operation of the law of value is not confined to the sphere of commodity circulation. It also extends to production. True, the law of value has no regulating function in our socialist production, but it nevertheless influences production, and this fact cannot be ignored when directing production. As a matter of fact, consumer goods, which are needed to compensate the labour power expended in the process of production, are produced and realized in our country as commodities coming under the operation of the law of value. It is precisely here that the law of value exercises its influence on production. In this connection, such things as cost accounting and profitableness, production costs, prices, etc., are of actual importance in our enterprises. Consequently, our enterprises cannot, and must not, function without taking the law of value into account.

Is this a good thing? It is not a bad thing. Under present conditions, it really is not a bad thing, since it trains our business executives to conduct production on rational lines and disciplines them. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives to count production magnitudes, to count them accurately, and also to calculate the real things in production precisely, and not to talk nonsense about "approximate figures," spun out of thin air. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives to look for, find and utilize hidden reserves latent in production, and not to trample them under foot. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives systematically to improve methods of production, to lower production costs, to practise cost accounting, and to make their enterprises pay. It is a good practical school which accelerates the development of our executive personnel and their growth into

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

genuine leaders of socialist production at the present stage of development.

The trouble is not that production in our country is influenced by the law of value. **The trouble is that our business executives and planners, with few exceptions, are poorly acquainted with the operations of the law of value, do not study them, and are unable to take account of them in their computations. This, in fact, explains the confusion that still reigns in the sphere of price-fixing policy** (put in bold type by the authors: the integral evaluation of economic literacy of managers and economists generation brought up by Marxism political economy). Here is one of many examples. Some time ago it was decided to adjust the prices of cotton and grain in the interest of cotton growing, to establish more accurate prices for grain sold to the cotton growers, and to raise the prices of cotton delivered to the state. Our business executives and planners submitted a proposal on this score which could not but astound the members of the Central Committee, since it suggested fixing the price of a ton of grain at practically the same level as a ton of cotton, and, moreover, the price of a ton of grain was taken as equivalent to that of a ton of baked bread. In reply to the remarks of members of the Central Committee that the price of a ton of bread must be higher than that of a ton of grain, because of the additional expense of milling and baking, and that cotton was generally much dearer than grain, as was also borne out by their prices in the world market, the authors of the proposal could find nothing coherent to say. The Central Committee was therefore obliged to take the matter into its own hands and to lower the prices of grain and raise the prices of cotton. What would have happened if the proposal of these comrades had received legal force? We should have ruined the cotton growers and would have found ourselves without cotton». (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 3. “The Law of Value Under Socialism”).

These fragments show that J.V. Stalin understood that there was no way to escape the objective law of value in economy in the course of building Socialism and Communism. But management and economists' ignorance prevented from achieving the utmost efficiency of planned Socialist economy of the USSR. The efficiency was improved by turning on market machinery of self-regulation of using available over and above the plan facilities. It was impossible to overcome this ignorance under the

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

limitations of I-centered economic theories both: Marxism and private-owner theories. Without overcoming the ignorance they would not solve the problem of combining the plan of public utility conditioned by the population science and market machinery within one system of production and consumption.

This is not the whole story. If de-bureaucratization had been carried out it would have exposed ill-intentioned bureaucrats and would have enlightened ignorant bureaucrats on the basis of a theory alternative to Marxism. Then market machinery could have been subordinated to the planned beginning and the main economic law of socialism by means of the machinery of dues and donations and included into Socialism economy. But J.V. Stalin was not content with *market machinery as a regulator*. It did not guarantee superiority over Capitalism in the quality of economy management for in capitalism economy there had already been an attempt to combine a planned beginning on a national scale with market self-regulation. That was the reason for J.V. Stalin to set another object explaining the issue of the law of value under socialism. This object was more important than combining a plan and market machinery of self-regulation of using available over and above the plan facilities in the USSR national economy:

«In the second phase of communist society, the amount of labour expended on the production of goods will be measured not in a roundabout way, not through value and its forms, as is the case under commodity production, but directly and immediately — by the amount of time, the number of hours, expended on the production of goods <if we specify it as the time conditioned by techniques and organization and remember that scientific, technical, organizational and technological advance are held in store of plan stability then everything is right. There appear no unfounded man×hours needed to make a scientific discovery>. As to the distribution of labour, its distribution among the branches of production will be regulated not by the law of value, which will have ceased to function by that time, but by the growth of society's demand for goods. **It will be a society in which production will be regulated by the requirements of society, and computation of the requirements of society will acquire paramount importance for the planning bodies**» (put in bold type by the authors: comments will be given later). (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Remarks on Economics Questions

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

Connected with the November 1951 Discussion”, part 3. “The Law of Value Under Socialism”).

If we go into particulars of direct responsiveness of people’s needs and production orientation towards them directly, it suggests the following. There should be created such systems of production and of production management and distribution that secure production of almost everything¹ at a pace that does not cause nuisance for a consumer during the time while his order is being executed.

J.V. Stalin realized this system was an alternative for the market, that could excel the market in efficiency. Naturally he did not wait for Communism to be built to move to this system but started it right away.

«We still have no developed system of products-exchange, but the rudiments of such a system exist in the shape of the "merchandising" of agricultural products. For quite a long time already, as we know, the products of the cotton-growing, flax-growing, beet-growing and other collective farms are "merchandised". They are not "merchandised" in full, it is true, but only partly, still they are "merchandised." Be it mentioned in passing that "merchandising" is not a happy word, and should be replaced by "products-exchange". The task is to extend these rudiments of products-exchange to all branches of agriculture and to develop them into a broad system, under which the collective farms would receive for their products not only money, but also and chiefly the manufactures they need. Such a system would require an immense increase in the goods allocated by the town to the country, and it would therefore have to be introduced without any particular hurry, and only as the products of the town multiply. But it must be introduced unswervingly and unhesitatingly, step by step contracting the sphere of operation of commodity circulation and widening the sphere of operation of products-exchange.

Such a system, by contracting the sphere of operation of commodity circulation, will facilitate the transition from socialism to communism. Moreover, it will make it possible to include the basic property of the collective farms, the product of collective farming, in the general system of national planning». (“Economic

¹ Except for goods and services of daily needs. Their range is constantly changing, that is why the production can be mass, oriented towards not an individual order but the revealed statistics of needs.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”, “Reply to Comrades A.V. Sanina and V.G. Venzher” part 2).

If the state regarded this undertaking seriously more and more enterprises of all economic sectors would be involved in this system of self-regulation of production and consumption in the course of social and historic development. It could be achieved on the basis of virtual management structures of production and consumption products exchange¹. But when J.V. Stalin died this way of development was cut short. Some economic reformers of the age of Khrushchev and Brezhnev and the period after the USSR break-up showed their readiness to capitulate to Capitalism, others showed their feeble mind for they concentrated on the problem of introducing a market machinery into Russian economy. First they tried it as a means to improve the planned beginning function, then as a supposed alternative to it².

¹ For more information about virtual structures and management on their basis see the USSR IP's work “The Sufficiently common theory of control”. Here we shall be brief. Management structures can be permanent and liven up if their activity is necessary. Besides they can appear if their activity is necessary and liquidate themselves by the end of their activity and appear again when new needs come to light. This regime of structure functioning is termed «management on the basis of virtual structures».

Basically if elements composing a super system (i.e. elements are systems) are ripe for management on the basis of virtual structures the super system functions more effectively. This accounts for releasing the elements, which could be employed for inactive full-scale permanent structures. Besides under certain circumstances and due to their own features full-scale permanent structures become parasite if they try to keep their quality under changed conditions.

² As a result of their «reforms» nuclear-powered icebreakers designed to pilot a convoy of watercrafts over the Arctic Ocean route without budgetary financing of «northern delivery» waste their technological lifespan for cruises. They take western tourists fed up with exotics to the North Pole and «earn» about \$30,000 per every tourist to work at piloting watercrafts over the Arctic Ocean route at the end of summer and in autumn.

It is one of the examples of imbecility disguising sabotage impartially being an act of sabotage. It is beyond Y. Gaidar's intellect to understand and to put the principle of the superior profitability of national economy as a united system into practice. The same concerns supporters of pro-bourgeois reforms in Russia.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

While reading the given fragments concerning the substitution for commodity production (and trade correspondingly) by direct products exchange one should not think that J.V. Stalin was an idiot. He was not like those reformers of early 90-s of the 20th century who could not cope with adjustment of the financing system to maintaining product exchange because of their stupidity and grabbling and who drove the country to *barter*. *Barter was a type of exchange trade of primitive society*. Those who take his words about direct products exchange this way are idiots themselves, they insensible to the tenor of life and incapable of thinking. J.V. Stalin had figurative ideas of the way Socialism planned economy was to work in the process of changing to communism. But in the culture of society there was no conceptual system to express his thought clearly. J.V. Stalin did not create this system himself. It appeared too much for him to bear to govern the country day-to-day and at the same time to create philosophy and sociology afresh that agreed with ideals of Communism, building of it in practice and the atmosphere of Marxism cult that was essentially hostile to Communism.

* * *

Keeping the supreme public authority of the USSR under his thumb J.V. Stalin being the leader of the Party and the head of the state for thirty years led society successfully to *another point of re-examining the past and forming intentions for the future*. With the help of the means of expressing thoughts available in the culture of society at that time he revealed and defined the unsolved problems that prevented the USSR society and the global civilization from developing.

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks



That is the reason for us to be thankful to him. Another reason is that he managed to organize the victory in the Great Patriotic War in spite of the tendencies characteristic of the crowd-“elitism”. It will not do to succeed at others' expense: these problems as well as some others were to be solved by science. The fact that mostly on the territory of the USSR they were not solved moreover forgotten demonstrates parasitism, mental and professional weakness. This refers to everybody with an academic degree in philosophy or economics and other branches of sociology beginning from Ph. D. “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” is their verdict of guilty.

*

*

*

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

All the things cited here show that “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” also contains the answer to the following questions:

Why was not the economic reform of the age of N. Khrushchev with its system of «state public farms» designed to manage regional production systems justified?

Why did the reform of Kosygin of early 60-s of the 20th century lose its way? Why did not it produce a beneficial effect on Socialism and Communism as well as the generation of pro-bourgeois dissidents of the sixties who did not manage to «snatch the time of their life» at once.

But the present generation of Russian reformers has no future either if they do not solve the problems posed directly or touched upon indirectly by J. Stalin. Consequently the general global crisis of Capitalism will continue to aggravate assuming new faces such as ecology, terrorism, epidemics of insanity, etc.

Besides the discussed issues there are some less important (in our view) problems in the work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”. We shall not broach them in the present work for they do not correspond to the subject matter. Alongside with examining problems that were to be solved J.V. Stalin expressed his opinion on admissible and inadmissible management decisions in the course of the USSR further approaching Communism. His opinion was mostly conditioned by the social and economic reality of the USSR of those years. His mind was inseparably linked with it. Khrushchev’s rule adopted a new policy to drive the country to elimination of the achievements of Stalin’s Bolshevism. As a result social and economic circumstances changed. Therefore J. Stalin’s opinion lost its topicality. Now it is interesting only from the point of view of history. That is why if anybody is interested in these questions he/she should turn to J. Stalin’s direction to Bolsheviks for the future.

However to all appearance J.V. Stalin went beyond publishing “Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.”. That was a work oriented towards the specific conditions of the USSR mainly. In 1952 in Madrid the «NOS» publishers released a book by a Josef Landovskiy called “The Red Symphony” (“Sinfonia en Rojo Mayor”) translated by Mauricio Carlavia. The after word written by the translator said that the manuscript had been found in the years of World War II in a hut in the suburbs of Leningrad with a dead body together with Josef Landovskiy’s documents. A Spanish man called «A.I.» found it. He was probably one

6.8. Stalin's Directions for the Future to Bolsheviks

from Franco's «Blue Division» fighting on Hitler's side at the front of Leningrad. Later he brought it to Spain.

One of the chapters called «Radiography of Revolution» was published in Russia in the journal «Molodaya Gvardiya» numbers 3 and 4 in 1992. Spanish edition number 9 released in Barcelona¹ was cited there. In the first Madrid edition this chapter is on pages 421 — 461. All in all the book consists of 488 pages. This chapter is about the examination of the Trotskyist G. Rakovskiy. It supposedly took place in a special cottage of People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs² (PCIA) in 1938. The examination was held as a talk over dinner. It is said that during the examination G. Rakovskiy was under a psychotropic that made him unable to restrain himself. Therefore he answered frankly to the questions asked speaking what he really had on his mind.

The fragment published in «Molodaya Gvardiya»³ creates an impression that J. Stalin's secret services did it to introduce certain information concerning Marxism and the «world backstage» to the public. So they produced a hoax novel inculcated it in the culture of the West. But for all that the character has a real Trotskyist's name that is G. Rakovskiy, sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment in 1938. Everything that he says about Marxism and the World Revolution during the examination is true.

Here are some details of the story. Doctor Josef Landovskiy was involved in the work of the PCIA owing to his outstanding achievements in narcology and toxicology. He happened to be present at the examination. With his two hands and a typewriter he managed to make an extra copy of the record of the examination. Later he quitted working for the PCIA and the PCIA forgot about their bearer of a secret and lost track of him. Consequently during World War II he turned to be alone at the front of Leningrad with his personal files that he had brought secretly from the special place of the PCIA where he had lived working for them. So he violated sequentially the system of State secrets protection

¹ In the USSR IP's InfoBase distributed on CDs the text is in the section «Other Authors».

² «The Ministry of Internal Affairs» (Police etc).

³ It means «Young guards» — Literary-publicistic magazine in the USSR and nowadays in Russia.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

functioning in the USSR. Due to that his personal files full of secrets was found with the dead body. This story is certainly a hoax made up to explain credibly how this information that could not be a subject of public speculation either in the USSR or in the West gained publicity¹.

We do not insist that Joseph Dzhughashvili besides writing under the pseudonym of Joseph Stalin once published a book in Spain under the pseudonym of Joseph Landovskiy. But the fact that «the Red Symphony» appeared almost at the same time as “The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR” and that they add to each other’s themes is not just a senseless twist of fate, it is not pure chance. «Chance is a powerful momentary weapon of Providence»².

¹ It reminds us of a true story. It presents how Great Britain facilitated Hitler in the course of World War II to give an order to get ready to repulse the landing operation of the allies of the anti-Hitlerism coalition in Greece in 1943. Actually they were preparing for a landing in Italy and carried it out.

Adolph Hitler consulted his personal astrologer. He was acquainted with another astrologer as they had worked together before the war. The latter knew the way Hitler’s astrologer used to work. During the war he was invited to work as an adviser in Great Britain to duplicate the recommendations that Hitler got from his personal astrologer relying on the common methods. The doubling adviser decided that Hitler would be advised to get ready to repulse the landing operation of the allies in Greece. When Winston Churchill was informed of it he commanded to prepare for a landing in Italy though the headquarters had been working out the operation in Greece.

After that in the Atlantic Ocean a body in the uniform of a British officer and a case were taken out. The case was full of documents, which made it evident that a landing and opening of a new front in Greece had been being prepared. The papers were given to the leaders of the Nazi Germany. At the same time an «unsuccessful» «search» of the «bearer of secrets» was conducted by the English. It also became known to the German intelligence service. Finally German leaders made sure they were right to prepare for a landing of allies in Greece. They went on developing their military potential at that cite. But allies landed in Italy in 1943. Hitler’s personal astrologer passed away in a concentration camp...

So the trick with the body of a «secrets bearer» is a standard procedure in the stock of secret services.

² A. Pushkin. «About the second volume of «The History of the Russian People» by Polevoy» (1830). Cited by the Complete Academic Works in 17 volumes reedited in 1996 by the «Voskresenie» publishers. First published in 1949 by the Academy of Science of the USSR. Page 127.

7. *The Prospects of Bolshevism*

One can use the following quotation from H. Ford to describe the fortunes of those who regret the break-up of the USSR:

«More men are beaten than fail. It is not wisdom they need or money, or brilliance, «pull», but just plain gristle and bone. This rude, simple, primitive power which we call «stick-to-it-iveness» is the uncrowned king of the world of endeavor. People are utterly wrong in their slant upon things. They see the successes that men have made and somehow they appear to be easy. But that is a world away from the facts. It is failure that is easy. Success is always hard. A man can fail in ease; he can succeed only by paying out all that he has and is». (“My Life and Work”, Henry Ford, chapter 15. “Why charity?”)

But the words which H. Ford continues the above quotation with can be addressed to «democratizes» and Russian «nouveau riche» *sjids of all nationalities and races* who think that they have defeated bolshevism in Russia and therefore have defeated it in the entire world:

«It is this which makes success so pitiable a thing if it be in lines that are not useful and uplifting».

In the autumn of 1991 in Moscow a Soviet-American symposium was held at the Academy of labor and social relations which was among others attended by the Japanese. This is how the Japanese billionaire Herosi Teravama answered the Soviet economists and sociologists who kept talking profusely about the «Japanese economic wonder»:

«You are not speaking about the main thing. About your leading role in the world. In 1939 you Russians were smart, and we Japanese, were fools. In 1949 you became even smarter, we were still fools. In 1955 we became smarter, you turned into 5-year old children. Our economic system is almost entirely a copy of yours <i.e. of the Stalin era>, the only difference is that we have capitalism, private businesses, and we could never achieve a more than 15 % growth. You had social ownership of production means and achieved 30 % and more. Your slogans from Stalin’s times are in the offices of all our companies» (A. Shabalov. “Eleven Blows of Comrade Stalin”, Rostov-on-Don, 1995).

A Japanese billionaire is in fact reproaching the insane Russian sociologists and economists — the pseudo-scientific consultants of the ruling regime — for abandoning the progressive conceptions of Stalin’s heritage. This is truly a sign that all the people who think on their own can

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

co-operate in building communism on the principles of bolshevism no matter what country and what class they belong to.

In other words, the globalization based on the principles of Stalin's bolshevism, is already taking place. Now that the public bolshevist initiative in Russia has worked out a social scientific theory and has gained conceptual power on its basis, making conceptual power available for anyone, the globalization based on the principles of crowd-“elitism” is doomed to fail.

Our cause is the right one. Victory will be ours, because we abide by God.

January 3 — July 15 2002

SUPPLEMENTS

1. The Biblical Doctrine of Global Slavery

«Do not charge your brother interest (your fellow Jew, as it follows from the context) **whether on money or food or anything else that may earn interest. You may charge a foreigner** (i.e. a non-Jew) **interest, but not a brother Israelite, so that the LORD your god** (i.e. the devil, if one judges the essence of usurious parasitism according to one's conscience) **bless you in everything you put your hand to in the land you are entering to possess»** (the latter refers not only to ancient times and not only to Palestine, the land promised to ancient Hebrews, because it is a quotation not from a transcript of the ancient roll found at the place of excavations but from a widely published book claimed by all Churches and a part of the intelligentsia as the eternal truth supposedly passed on from above) — *Deuteronomy, 23:19, 20*. **«You will lend to many nations but will borrow from none»**, — *Deuteronomy, 28:12*. **«Foreigners** (i.e. subsequent generations of the non-Hebrews who have run into a debt which could be repaid by no means to the tribe of usurious coreligionists) **will rebuild your walls** (today many Arab families from Palestine are dependant on the opportunity of working in Israel) **and their kings will serve you** («I am the Jew of kings» — was the way one of the Rothschilds answered the unfortunate compliment of «You are the king of Jews»); **Though in anger I struck you, in favor I will show you compassion. Your gates will always stand open, they will never by shut, day or night, so that men may bring you the wealth of their nations — their kings led in triumphal procession. For the nation or kingdom that will not serve you will perish; it will be utterly ruined»** — *Isaiah, 60:10 — 12*.

The hierarchies of all the so-called Christian Churches, including Russian Orthodox, claim this abominable conception to be holy, while the canon of the New Testament which had been censored and edited as far back as prior to the Nikean council (325 AD) proclaims it in the name of Christ as the righteous Will of God for all the times to come having no grounds whatsoever to do so.

«Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth,

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished» — Matthew 5:17, 18.

This is the Bible's concrete meaning (according to texts of Russian Orthodox Church's Bible, including Septuagint) which governs the entire Biblical civilization. The rest of the Bible is unimportant or attendant to that conception.

* * *

It is clear from the above that this conception lies within the bounds of the general control weapon means' fourth priority. Yet in the 20th century the bosses of the Biblical project have used up all options of aggression by the means not higher than the fourth priority and decided to proceed up to the third priority.

There are two mutually dependent issues arising in social life which, depending on the way they are resolved, either provide the opportunity for personal, and hence social, development or deny that opportunity:

- providing public access to cultural achievements (works of art, science, technology, etc.) required for the people's personal development which takes place while they become familiar with the cultural achievements of the past and take over this cultural progress;
- providing for the life of those who work in the field of art, science, technology and other fields of creative search.

Because creative search activities very often cannot be combined with profitably taking part in the socially common labor, the entire history of modern global civilization is full of people considered odd and idle by their contemporaries, who at least died in poverty even if they were not persecuted. Yet their descendants justly held them for outstanding creators, who were by decades or even centuries ahead of their contemporaries'.

Along with creators rejected by the crowd-“elitist” society *there always are justly spurned graphorrea addicts who have nothing to say either to their contemporaries or descendants yet project an image of themselves as true creators*. But this does not justify the society in escaping from practically addressing the two mutually dependent issues.

Let us make it clear once again: these are two different, though mutually dependent issues. They are by no means to be mixed up, and even more so it is unacceptable to pretend addressing the issue of

1. The Biblical Doctrine of Global Slavery

providing for the people engaged in creative search activities while usurping the achievements in arts, science and technology and denying people access to them.

But it is exactly what is happening under conceptual power of the Biblical project's bosses while the I-centric world understanding is dominant in the society.

A global control system of information distribution is being created. This is yet another system of the mafia regime oppressing the society based on the «laws on copyright and allied rights». When some have an exclusively high paying capacity and others are paupers owing to the organized corporate usury and stock exchange speculations, the following can happen:

- first the institution of «copyright and allied rights» is established legally under the pretext of protecting the interests of authors and enabling them to be remunerated when their work is used;
- then these laws and the practice of their application allows to buy up the works of art, inventions, technology and other information;
- at the last stage a system is formed which allows to control access to cultural achievements appropriated by means of corporate mafias, and consequently *to control the direction of cultural development by means of disseminating some information and prosecuting those who disseminate other information under the pretext of breach of «copyright» or allied rights.*

This is not our imagination. H. Ford confronted this system when he was defending in court his right to manufacture cars in spite of the patent issued to some man called G. Selden. H. Ford describes that as follows:

«The way was not easy. We were harried by a big suit brought against the company¹ to try to force us into line with an association of automobile manufactures, who were operating under the false principle that there was only a limited market for automobiles and that a monopoly of that market was essential. This was the famous Selden Patent suit. At times the support of our defense severely strained our resources. Mr. Selden, who has but recently died, had little to do with the suit. It was the association which sought a monopoly under the patent. The situation was this:

¹ «Ford Motors»

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

George B. Selden, a patent attorney, filed an application as far back as 1879 for a patent the object of which was stated to be «The production of a safe, simple. And cheap road locomotive, light in weight, easy to control, possessed of sufficient power to overcome an ordinary inclination». This application was kept alive in the Patent Office, by methods which are perfectly legal, until 1895, when the patent was granted. In 1879, when the application was filed, the automobile was practically unknown to the general public, but by the time the patent was issued everybody was familiar with self-propelled vehicles, and most of the men, including myself, who had been for years working on motor propulsion, were surprised to learn that what we had made practicable was covered by an application of years before, although the applicant had kept his idea merely as an idea. He had done nothing to put it into practice». (“My Life and Work”, Henry Ford, chapter 3 “Starting the real business”).

H. Ford won the case, that is why now we know about a car-manufacturing company called «Ford Motors». The business of «protecting» «copyright and allied rights» has moved very much forward. Let us turn to an interview given to the Pravda.ru web-site by the «World of Internet» magazine content editor and one of the founders of the iFREE¹ public initiative Alexander Sergeev.

«A. Sergeev: Under the pretext of protecting the interests of the author information distribution of all kinds is artificially limited by insurmountable financial and legal barriers, — says the iFREE manifesto. As a result, creation outside the corporate framework that provides legal and financial support is doomed to be either illegal or marginal.

(...)

Now on the threat to culture. Copyright strengthens the principal division of all people into authors and consumers of cultures. But such a division is contrary to the modern tendencies of cultural and scientific development.² Of course, traditional forms of authored creative activity will remain, yet a different, non-authored culture is becoming more and more significant in comparison to it. It includes fan clubs, happenings, joint musical

¹ An abbreviation of Information Free.

² It is contrary to the very human nature itself and is therefore one of the faces of Satanism.

1. The Biblical Doctrine of Global Slavery

performance, public discussions, teleconference, network projects with undefined or changing number of participants.¹

Non-authored culture has always existed, for example, as folklore. Its main difference from authored culture is in having no strict division into consumers and authors. Rather, it has participants and leaders. With the introduction of book-printing, sound records, radio, television non-authored culture receded into the background, as only professional authors and editors were able to manage expensive printing space and no less expensive broadcast time properly.

The Internet creates entirely new opportunities for developing non-authored culture. But in the 500 years since the times of Guttenberg and especially in the 20th century we have almost entirely forgotten that it exists. Modern copyright legislation provides authored culture many advantages over non-authored one. It creates an effective way of appropriating cultural values² and limits broad public access to them.

But the future belongs to non-authored culture. And one should not think that non-authored culture will be necessarily marginal. Professional authorship formed as a response to the challenge of publishers. The dominating form of cultural interaction is changing. After the era of broadcast we are entering the era of communication. And this must be certainly reflected in the legal procedures which regulate cultural activities. Above all the law on copyright — the main obstacle in the way of non-authored culture.

Question: Copyright has yet had little chance to go on the spree in post-Soviet countries. But it seems that Russia has prepared an analogue of Digital Millennium Copyright Act 1998 (DMCA) — the amendments to the RF Law «On copyright and allied rights». The bill on the amendments contains amenability for by-passing copyright protection hardware, as well as the ban on manufacturing and distributing devices used for by-passing or facilitating the by-

¹ But Internet network projects are only a beginning: scientific, design, political and other projects can be based on same principles. They reflect virtual structures-based activity, which has been mentioned in the main part of this book.

² By those who are themselves creatively barren and have nothing to do with creating and work of art, science, technology or other.

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

pass of protection hardware... Among many other things. What will happen if the bill is passed?¹

A. Sergeev: **If the bill is passed, our legislature will become even worse than that of America, which has almost reached the level of totalitarian regimes in the aspect of freedom of information distribution** (put in bold type by the authors of the book). By the way, the next bill is being discussed in the US, concerning the ban on manufacture and sale of hardware and software not equipped with the means of copyright information control.²

The number of information activities and information relations is limitless. Any of them may appear unprofitable to someone. And if the corresponding lobby is powerful enough, this activity is banned. While the lobby of freedom is often the weaker side. Freedom is lost gradually, almost imperceptibly. Every such step in itself seems insignificant. But constant dropping wears away the stone.

Recently I received news — some companies are trying to prohibit through court placing links leading to pages other than the homepages of their sites as it may create a different impression with the user than the author originally intended. Even in the Soviet times³ nobody thought of banning reference to particular pages of books. Yet now to someone this practice became unprofitable.

Actually, the more bans are introduced, the easier it is to make money on them. The scheme is a very simple one and has been known since the times of Inquisition: you introduce a public ban — a moral, legal, political one — and then you start selling pardons...»

Though the problem has been discovered by the society, it is clear that A. Sergeev is speaking only about selling «pardons» to the end of

¹ The activities of the RF Duma aimed at subjecting Russia to the Western conception of copyright and allied rights is yet one more anti-national act among others, reflecting the ill-natured recklessness of some MPs and the idiocy of other.

² This is a step further towards creating a system of buying up information on the basis of usury and corporate mafia control of its distribution.

³ Actually in the Soviet times the laws on copyright and allied right were aimed at making cultural achievements as easily available to people as possible. If bureaucrats suppressed creative work and creators, especially in the post-Stalin times, it is a different matter relating not to the laws proper but to their practical application.

1. The Biblical Doctrine of Global Slavery

making profit. The crucial issue has not been understood and clearly expressed. It has been left in silence, as it is necessary for the bosses of the Biblical project on enslaving the mankind:

A kind of mafia regime controlling the society is being formed and is becoming more powerful. Its power is exercised not by actual dictatorship, but indirectly — through controlling the distribution of information favorable to the Biblical project bosses and persecuting those who distribute unfavorable information, under the pretext of copyright breach. As an interim result, the direction of cultural development on the whole and of scientific and technological development in particular to a very large extent comes under legalized control of the international mafia of usurers who have started to buy up © copyrights.

Thus, *substituting the issue of providing public access to all cultural accomplishments with the issue of presumably protecting the interests of creators from the attempts to parasitize on their work*, the Biblical «world backstage» is trying to pursue its slave-owning ambition by new means.

The Russian idea of copyright is that it is **the right of a person gifted by God to gift other people with the fruits of his or her work according with his genuine understanding of God's Will**. It is incompatible with the abominable Western conception of copyright and allied rights and the laws it is reflected in.

Ignore the laws on copyright and allied right for the benefit of all, and God speed you.

Only in a nightmare hallucination can one imagine Jesus as a pettifogger who defends in court his © copyright on the Gospel. But the very fact of the © copyright institution's existence in the West explains that the West lives under the power of the New Testament which has been privatized and perverted by the mafia like the Testament given from the above through Moses had been privatized and perverted by mafia before.

2. The interview with Joseph E. Stiglitz

The interview with Joseph E. Stiglitz, former vice-president of the World Bank, economic advisor to US President Clinton, winner of the Nobel prize in economy for 2001. Published in the Sunday supplement to the «El País» newspaper of June 23, 2002. Recently he wrote a book about the IMF under the title of «El malestar en la Globalización» («The Disease of Globalization» — approximate translation). Here are some parts of that interview (based on Russian translation).

— *You write that while working in the Clinton administration you were surprised by the circumstance that many decisions in the White House, as well as the IMF, were often taken out of ideological and political considerations, rather than according to the requirements of economy?*

— In a certain sense, I was not greatly surprised by what was happening in the White House. I was disturbed that ideology and politics played such a significant role in international economic organizations where professional economists are supposed to set the fashion. For example, research indicated that liberalizing financial market would result not in economic growth but in destabilization of economy. We knew that, it should not have been done according to the science of economics, yet the IMF kept trying to implement exactly this kind of liberalization. Its motives in doing so were purely ideological and political...

— *When the reader comes to the end of your book, he might be puzzled with the following question: who is taking decisions which determine world events affecting the well-being of millions of people?*

— According to my experience of working in the American government and the World Bank there is no single person who makes such decisions. This is a complex process involving many forces. Even the President of the USA is not able to influence many issues. He doesn't even have the information necessary to do it. There are too many decisions to be made, one must also take into account the nature of information that he gets... Different groups try to control his incoming information, informing him only of what can persuade him to take a certain position favorable to them. Many people cannot understand that there is no such single man who controls the situation personally.

2. The interview with Joseph E. Shtiglits

— *OK, it is not a single person, not the President of the United States, but someone, some people do make decisions. Who are they?*

— In my book I tried to clarify the fundamental role played in this process by major financial interests and transnational corporations. But at the same time, I would like to stress that there are other forces involved in this game. For example, the «Anniversary-2000» movement played a significant role in reducing the debt. The IMF resisted, but the civil movement turned out to be so strong that got the upper hand on that point. There are many economists inside the World Bank itself who are genuinely concerned with the problems of poverty and environment protection...

— *You leave no doubts in your book about the US Treasury and the IMF having the real power. Is it they who determine policy?*

— Yes, the IMF sets the macroeconomic and financial policy. Unfortunately, a country needs to get the IMF's approval before it can receive help from the European Community or the World Bank. In this sense, the Fund's power is enormous...

— *In crisis situations in developing countries the US Treasury and the IMF deliberately gave recommendations which aggravated problems, as you firmly claim in your book, but which corresponded to the economic and ideological interests of developed countries. What does it mean from the moral point of view?*

— This means that they used the crises in those countries to pursue their own interests...

— *You tell that some heads of states sadly admitted to you that they had to follow the IMF's tastes though its recommendations were clearly bad for their countries; that the IMF played the role of an international policeman who forced them to make destructive decisions.*

— Quite so. They were afraid to get on the IMF's black-lists. In that case they would not get any credits either in the Fund, or the WB, or the EC. And owing to low IMF assessment they wouldn't be able to count on attracting private investments. Worse than that, they were afraid even to speak of their problems openly, fearing that such an openness in itself will be considered as impudence and confrontation by the IMF which will then punish them and revenge. It means that they considered any form open dialogue impossible.

— *You think that the IMF is mistaken in refusing to take into account the opinion of the governments of the countries where it*

Ford and Stalin. How to Live In Humaneness

executes its policy. Is it just like you describe in your book: the Fund's representatives arrive, in three or four days they suggest the country's leadership to sign certain conditions¹ similar for all, and then accuse the this same leadership of corruption?

— They lay down a number of conditions...

— *Could you tell us how the IMF functions? How is its economic policy defined?*

— There is only one country in the IMF which has the veto right. It is the Treasury of the United States.

*

*

*

And so on about the same thing...

July 18, 2002.

¹ It does not say so in the interview given to «El Pais», but in other interviews which can be found on the Internet Shtiglits asserts that IMF representatives have standard conditions for all countries consisting of 111 clauses. Shtiglits also says that everyone is offered large bribes, and those who nevertheless refuse to sign, are simply destroyed physically.