

Chapter 1 : Chapter 3 * Class Character of the USSR [Sam Marcy]

The first holds that there is indeed a ruling class in the USSR, but there is no general agreement as to its nature and attributes. Some say it is a capitalist class, basically like the ruling classes in the developed capitalist countries though differing from them in relatively minor respects and degrees.

The History Learning Site, 25 May The people of Russia had to read what the state allowed, see what the state allowed and listen to what the state allowed. Those who attempted to listen, read etc. Everybody knew of the labour camps and that was enough of a deterrent. It was not unusual for Stalin to be in a white suit so that he stood out from the crowd. Those who wrote poems and novels had to do the same "write about Stalin in a manner which gloried him. Some artists and authors were so depressed by all this that they committed suicide rather than do what the state ordered them to do. Many others tried to leave the country. Education was strictly controlled by the state. In , a rigid programme of discipline and education was introduced. Exams, banned under Lenin , were reintroduced. Outside of school, children were expected to join youth organisations such as the Octobrists for 8 to 10 year olds and the Pioneers for the 10 to 16 year olds. From 19 to 23 you were expected to join the Komsomol. Among other things, divorce was made a lot more easy under Lenin. Stalin changed all this. He put the emphasis on the family. There was a reason for this. Many children had been born out of marriage and Moscow by was awash with a very high number of homeless children who had no family and, as such, were a stain on the perfect communist society that Stalin was trying to create. The state paid families a child allowance if their were a married couple. It became a lot harder to get a divorce and restrictions were placed on abortions. Ceremonial weddings made a comeback. In the work place, women maintained their status and there was effective equality with men. In theory, all jobs were open to women. The only real change took place in the image the state created for women. Some people did very well out of the system especially party officials and skilled factory workers. Health care was greatly expanded. In the past, the poorer people of Russia could not have expected qualified medical help in times of illness. Now that facility was available though demand for it was extremely high. The number of doctors rose greatly but there is evidence that they were so scared of doing wrong, that they had to go by the rule book and make appointments for operations which people did not require!! Those apartments that were put up quickly, were shoddy by western standards. In was not unusual for flat complexes to be built without electric sockets despite electricity being available "building firms were simply not used to such things. Leisure for the average Russian person was based around fitness and sport. Clubs, sports facilities etc. The state also controlled the cinema, radio etc. Was Stalin a disaster for Russia? The secret police actively encouraged people to inform on neighbours, work mates etc. Anyone with talent was seen as a threat by the increasingly paranoid behaviour associated with Stalin and were killed or imprisoned which usually lead to death anyway. The vast Soviet army was a body without a brain as most of her senior officers had been arrested and murdered during the Purges.

The second major category of answers holds that there is no ruling class in the USSR, arguing instead that state power is in the hands of a "bureaucracy," but once again there is no consensus.

Wright & Erik O. Some materials are available over the internet. Click on the appropriate link within the syllabus to reach them. What do we want to ask about stratification, inequality, classes, and the like? What are the goals of this field? Classes and inequality over time. How are we to conceive the problems of studying classes and inequality as historical entities? Wrong, "Social Inequality without Stratification. The class analysis of Karl Marx. The starting point for everything written about class, even if by omission. See Marx Discussion Questions for orienting questions that will guide us in our class discussion. Marx, The Marx-Engels Reader. Selections [Marxist ideas distilled through a critical and empirical sociological analysis] IV. The class analysis of Max Weber. See Weber Discussion Questions for orienting questions that will guide us in our class discussion. Political domination and alliances based on inequality. Rule through alliances based on status or between classes. Conflict over authority or goods? Bottomore, Elites and Society. Djilas, The New Class. Classical and Contemporary Debates, pp. University of California Press, How do the ways we think, see, and interact become organized by status and social location and, in turn, organize us into distinctive identities? Smith, "Beliefs About Stratification", Ann. Robinson and M Garnier, "Class Reproduction Functionalist analyses of stratification. Wrong, "Functional Theory of Stratification: Social mobility and status attainment research, Part 1. The study of who gets where, what, and why. Zetterberg, "A Theory of Social Mobility. Reflections after Twenty-five Years. Caste, race, and slavery in stratification systems: How do racial and economic inequality depend on each other? Wilson, The Declining Significance of Race. Racial and Ethnic Inequality, , , Racial and Ethnic Inequality, , remaining material. Race, Wealth and Social Policy in America. Jacobsen, Whiteness of a Different Color. Winant, Racial formation in the United States. Social mobility and status attainment research, Part 2. Jencks, "Structural versus Individual Explanations for Inequality. The direct relationship of classes. A recent attempt at integrating ideas.

Chapter 3 : Leon Trotsky: The USSR in War ()

a ruling class in the USSR, but there is no general agreement as to its nature and attributes. Some say it is a capitalist class, basically like the ruling classes in the developed capitalist countries though differing from them in relatively minor respects and degrees.

Frontline, Special Pilot Issue, April 11, Transcription, Editing and Markup: You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Has the economy of the Soviet Union deteriorated to the point of near collapse, sparking massive internal unrest and opening the prospects for U. Or is it actually doing quite well, with the future outlook positive regardless of U. A raging debate along these lines has broken out in, of all places, the U. Ideologically, a central justification for the U. A variation on this theme is that because of the inherently counterproductive nature of socialism, the Soviet Union can only make its economy function through military domination of other countries it is then able to exploit. Either way, the bottom line is the same: But more than obligatory anticommunist ideology is involved. According to this view, a concerted U. On the one hand, the Soviet leadership might realize that an attempt to match the U. But should the Soviets attempt to match the U. Either way, the U. In their view, denigrating the Soviet economy is fine for ideological and propaganda purposes. These prestigious ruling class figures argue that the Soviet economy, while experiencing difficulties in recent years, is in fact quite capable of matching any U. The period of the U. Finally, the tremendous cost of financing the military drive worries this sector of the ruling class. Massive amounts of defense spending can only sustain high interest rates, thus hampering even a minimal business recovery. In addition, the cuts shouldered by the lower sectors of the working class will eventually lead to increased social and political unrest. With these as the political stakes, the debate over the health and stability of the Soviet economy has become a major preoccupation of leading bourgeois figures in government and out Of course, those who see the Soviet economy as a basket case have a wealth of literary tradition to draw upon. The ultimate stuff that bourgeois dreams are made of is supplied by Sovietologists like Marshall Goldman, associate director of the Harvard University Russian Research Center, who says U. The workers are unpredictable. They were unpredictable in , they were unpredictable in , and they could be unpredictable now. So there is a chance that the whole thing could explode. Typical of this breed of capitalist is Thomas J. Watson, former head of IBM and U. Ambassador to the Soviet Union in the Carter administration, who declared shortly after leaving his post: During my tenure as Ambassador, we heard frequent reports of alleged food shortages, work stoppages and die like. On occasion, I sensed that various wishful thinkers back home were ready to seize on such reports as evidence that the Soviet system could not long survive in its present form. In my judgment, nothing could be further from the truth, nor more likely to lead the U. In no case have we found evidence of public unrest or any serious challenge to the established authority. The Soviet economy has made good progress since World War II and does provide the Soviet people with much more than they had earlier. More recently, hard-nosed businessmen like Watson have been joined by an unexpected and powerful allyâ€”the CIA. As a result, the inconsistencies between different sections of the report are sometimes striking. After identifying the scale of the Soviet economy and the size of the population base as basic strengths, the study notes: Another of the strengths of the Soviet economy is the tremendous accumulation of capital assets that has occurred since World War II. The value of gross fixed capital assetsâ€”buildings machinery, equipment, and the likeâ€”amounted to over 1. The value of Soviet capital assets expressed in constant prices increased almost fold between and and about 4. This phenomenal expansion reflects the allocation of a large and, until recently, rising share of Soviet resources to capital investment The rapid growth of capital assets has resulted in a more than three-fold increase in the amount of capital per worker. The rise was almost 3. The statistical reflection of this aspect of the Soviet economy is found elsewhere in the report when the CIA notes the marked rise in investment as a percentage of the Soviet GNP, from 14 percent in to 33 percent of a much larger GNP in By contrast, investment as a percentage of GNP in the U. Other widely held prejudices about the Soviet economy are similarly handled by the CIA report which, after taking great pains to underscore its rejection of the basic assumptions of the socialist system, is

nevertheless obliged to undermine many of the stock anti-Soviet arguments current both in bourgeois circles and sections of the left. Not so, says the CIA. GNP increased by 3. Industrial output during this period went up percent while the value of fixed capital—buildings, machinery, equipment, etc. Another misrepresentation about the Soviet economy widely popularized by anticommunist ideologists is that the Soviet standard of living is abysmally low, as a result of which the masses of people are either in a state of near-starvation or on the verge of revolt Again the CIA finds the reality to be just the opposite. But gains have been smaller in recent years, reflecting the drop in the overall growth rate The greatest benefits for consumers have been in durables and soft goods. The major shortcomings have been in the housing sector The growth in food supplies has been low, but the quality of the diet has nonetheless improved greatly, shifting toward a pattern of less reliance on bread and potatoes and more reliance on meat and dairy products This shift has slowed in recent years. Oranges from Egypt and Greece, woolies from Bulgaria, consumer goods from Hungary and Czechoslovakia have all broadened the horizon of the Soviet shopper. The modern Soviet economy is a highly complex organism with tens of thousands of decision-makers who require reliable economic and statistical information. Unless one wants to postulate a hidden second set of books—whose existence could hardly be kept a secret for long—the official statistics available to Western scholars are basically the same ones on which the Soviet planners base their work. A fallback thesis advanced by many detractors of the Soviet Union—ranging from the far right of the U. This view runs something like: Soviet imperialism exports unfinished raw materials to its Comecon trading partners and is able to import manufactured goods from those countries at a very small cost. East Europe, on the other hand, is forced to borrow heavily from the West in order to purchase the machinery, technology and other raw materials necessary to produce those goods. Based on the exploitation of the East European worker, the Soviets have managed to build a burgeoning military machine. Such a scenario, however, is patently false. Perhaps the most surprising aspect of such studies as those provided by the CIA and various bourgeois scholars is that their grudging acknowledgement of the strengths of the Soviet economic system should be seen as major revelations. The spectacular achievements of the Soviet economy from on are a matter of historical record. The dramatic transformation of backward Russia into a modern industrial state in the course of a single decade in the s is undoubtedly one of die most remarkable economic achievements in world history. That this was achieved while the USSR was fostering the growth of socialism in Eastern Europe and developing its own nuclear capacity to match that of the U. The fact of the matter is that the Soviet Union today is an economic powerhouse. Not only does it sustain a vast population at full employment and a rising living standard, it provides that population with the most extensive, all-encompassing system of social services —education, healthcare, vacations, etc. In addition, the Soviet economy anchors a growing socialist system which, by and large, remains invulnerable to the vicissitudes of the capitalist economic cycle. This same Soviet economy is likewise the principal source of extensive material aid to newly liberated countries and to revolutionary movements throughout the world. The decline in the rate of GNP is certainly troubling, although a certain leveling off from the spectacular gains of the earlier period was only to be expected. Clearly the enormous logistical problems of managing the economy of a vast terrain with no convenient sea link from one end of the country to the other and with major portions of the country functioning under unfavorable climatic conditions take their toll. The Soviet economy also suffers from a chronic labor shortage, a problem which reflects the fact that the dramatic potential unleashed by centralized socialist planning frequently outstrips the available labor power. Ironically, the problem most frequently cited by bourgeois critics of the Soviet Union—a decline in labor productivity—is itself a reflection of the protections afforded the working class in a socialist country, since a system of guaranteed employment on-the-job protections and a rising and also guaranteed social wage frequently leads to difficulties in overcoming inefficient practices in the production process or in disciplining low-performance workers. While much is usually made of instances of misappropriation of state funds, bribery and other forms of corruption, the extent of such practices seems to be highly exaggerated in the Western world. It is doubtful that they take place on a scale that could have any significant impact on the functioning of the Soviet economy as a whole. The current Soviet leadership under Yuri Andropov is certainly aware of these difficulties and appears to have launched a major campaign to overcome such problems—particularly cracking down on abuses of the vast

protections enjoyed by the laboring masses and on violations of socialist economic norms by corrupt administrators. Inaccurate assessments of the Soviet economy have led many political forces to disastrous conclusions. Recent policy decisions have only aggravated this concern. As the gas pipeline embargo last year demonstrated, a policy of economic sanctions against the Soviet Union will largely be futile and will unnecessarily antagonize U. The Soviets merely turned to the international market and obtained grain from Argentina at the expense of U. Instead of the Soviets experiencing serious strain, warns a sector of the U.

Chapter 4 : Russia - Social Structure

This is a discussion article, not an inclusive survey of all, or even most, of the issues raised when one examines the Soviet social structure.

In which by their decree all nations, races and cultures even the family unit would be abolished and replaced with the New Soviet person. One standard for Jews another for everyone else. As we can witness the Jewish claims of persecution in the USSR are bullshit the Jews lived as a privileged ruling caste. The Evesktsiya job was: Its separatist culture was very aggressively sponsored by the Evsektsiya. They work to hide themselves as this alien ruling class from the dominated goyim. And go to great lengths to make this work. Otherwise as in Poland and Hungary when this was determined by the Gentiles they went on openly anti-Jewish revolts against the Communist regimes. This is why the Jewish leaders, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and such Jewishness where hid from the public. Along with numerous others in the leadership positions. This is why they allowed for a lower class of goyim members who where frequently purged by the upper rung Jews to keep them down. A smoke screen to hide behind. They also pulled off some Jewish, anti-Semitic kayfabe here and there to attempt to trick the goyim subjects as to the totally Jewish nature of the rulers with reverse psychology. With anti Semitism being the death penalty in the USSR they could always and always did fall back on that club. Stalin was Jewish along with the whole upper rulers of the Party: See article Stalin the Jew Poland offers us an open look into this. Yiddish and Hebrew language schools and publications were established, as well s a great variety of cultural and social welfare organizations for Jews. A substantial percentage of the Jewish population was employed in Jewish economic cooperatives. Jews who could physically pass as Poles were allowed to join and were encouraged to state they were ethnic Poles and to change their names to Polish sounding names. The generation of Jewish communists realized that their power derived entirely from the Soviet Union and that they would have to resort to coercion in order to control a fundamentally hostile non-communist society. In fact, every secret police chief in Soviet history has been a Jew, from the first Uritsky to the most recent, the murderous Beria. A Jew is also in charge of the Soviet economy â€” Leonid Kantorovich. Jews who had severed formal ties with the Jewish community, or who had changed their names to Polish-sounding names, or who could pass as Poles because of their physical appearance of lack of a Jewish accent were favored in promotions. Not only were Jewish Communist Party functionaries and economic managers economically dominate they also appear to have had fairly unrestricted access to gentile females working under them partly as a result of the poverty to which the the vast majority of the population had descended and partly because of specific government policies designed to undermine traditional sexual moresâ€!. The domination of the Hungarian communist Jewish bureaucracy thus appears to have had overtones of sexual and reproductive domination of gentiles in which Jewish males were able to have disproportionate sexual access to gentile females. Just like the Jews run the sex slave trade out of Israel to this day. Right from the Torah. Who was the enemy? This was the attitude of the Jewish communists, the Moscow groupâ€!. They had nothing but contempt for the people.

Chapter 5 : Soviet working class - Wikipedia

The author, who left the Soviet Union in , follows his argument to its logical conclusion: the impossibility of basic change, either toward liberalization of the internal order or toward modification of an aggressive foreign policy.

Leon Trotsky Internet Archive This work is completely free to copy and distribute. The future of the Soviet State has again and again aroused discussion in our midst. Never before and nowhere else has this phenomenon been available for analysis. In the question of the social character of the USSR, mistakes commonly flow, as we have previously stated, from replacing the historical fact by the programmatic norm. Concrete fact departs from the norm. This does not signify, however, that it has overthrown the norm; on the contrary, it has reaffirmed it, from the negative side. The contradiction between the concrete fact and the norm constrains us not to reject the norm but, on the contrary, to fight for it by means of the revolutionary road. We do not say: In point of fact, the signing of the treaty with Hitler supplies only an extra gauge with which to measure the degree of degeneration of the Soviet bureaucracy, and its contempt for the international working class, including the Comintern, but it does not provide any basis whatsoever for a reevaluation of the sociological appraisal of the USSR Are the Differences Political or Terminological? Let us begin by posing the question of the nature of the Soviet state not on the abstract sociological plane but on the plane of concrete political tasks. What new political conclusions follow for us from these definitions? The Fourth International long ago recognized the necessity of overthrowing the bureaucracy by means of a revolutionary uprising of the toilers. Nothing different can be proposed or is proposed by the Leftist critics. The overthrow of the bureaucracy therefore presupposes the preservation of state property and of planned economy. Herein is the nub of the whole problem. Needless to say, the distribution of productive forces among the various branches of economy and generally the entire content of the plan will be drastically changed when this plan is determined by the interests not of the bureaucracy but of the producers themselves. But inasmuch as the question of overthrowing the parasitic oligarchy still remains linked with that of preserving the nationalized state property, we called the future revolution political. Certain of our critics Ciliga, Bruno, and others want, come what may, to call the future revolution social. Let us grant this definition. What does it alter in essence? To those tasks of the revolution which we have enumerated it adds nothing whatsoever. Our critics as a rule take the facts as we long ago established them. They add absolutely nothing essential to the appraisal either of the position of the bureaucracy and the toilers, or of the role of the Kremlin on the international arena. In all these spheres, not only do they fail to challenge our analysis, but on the contrary they base themselves completely upon it and even restrict themselves entirely to it. They demand that the totalitarian bureaucracy be called a ruling class. The revolution against this bureaucracy they propose to consider not political but social. Were we to make them these terminological concessions, we would place our critics in a very difficult position, inasmuch as they themselves would not know what to do with their purely verbal victory. Let Us Check Ourselves Once Again It would therefore be a piece of monstrous nonsense to split with comrades who on the question of the sociological nature of the USSR have an opinion different from ours, insofar as they solidarize with us in regard to the political tasks. But on the other hand, it would be blindness on our part to ignore purely theoretical and even terminological differences, because in the course of further development they may acquire flesh and blood and lead to diametrically opposite political conclusions. Just as a tidy housewife never permits an accumulation of cobwebs and garbage, just so a revolutionary party cannot tolerate lack of clarity, confusion and equivocation. Our house must be kept clean! Let me recall for the sake of illustration, the question of Thermidor. For a long time we asserted that Thermidor in the USSR was only being prepared but had not yet been consummated. Later, investing the analogy to Thermidor with a more precise and well deliberated character, we came to the conclusion that Thermidor had already taken place long ago. This open rectification of our own mistake did not introduce the slightest consternation in our ranks. Because the essence of the processes in the Soviet Union was appraised identically by all of us, as we jointly studied day by day the growth of reaction. For us it was only a question of rendering more precise an historical analogy, nothing more. Our critics have more than once argued that the present Soviet bureaucracy bears very

little resemblance to either the bourgeois or labor bureaucracy in capitalist society; that to a far greater degree than fascist bureaucracy it represents a new and much more powerful social formation. This is quite correct and we have never closed our eyes to it. We frequently call the Soviet bureaucracy a caste, underscoring thereby its shut in character, its arbitrary rule, and the haughtiness of the ruling stratum who consider that their progenitors issued from the divine lips of Brahma whereas the popular masses originated from the grosser portions of his anatomy. But even this definition does not of course possess a strictly scientific character. The old sociological terminology did not and could not prepare a name for a new social event which is in process of evolution degeneration and which has not assumed stable forms. All of us, however, continue to call the Soviet bureaucracy a bureaucracy, not being unmindful of its historical peculiarities. In our opinion this should suffice for the time being. Scientifically and politically "and not purely terminologically" the question poses itself as follows: A social organ and such is every class, including an exploiting class can take shape only as a result of the deeply rooted inner needs of production itself. If we do not answer this question, then the entire controversy will degenerate into sterile toying with words.

The Early Degeneration of the Bureaucracy The historical justification for every ruling class consisted in this "that the system of exploitation it headed raised the development of the productive forces to a new level. Beyond the shadow of a doubt, the Soviet regime gave a mighty impulse to economy. But the source of this impulse was the nationalization of the means of production and the planned beginnings, and by no means the fact that the bureaucracy usurped command over the economy. On the contrary, bureaucratism, as a system, became the worst brake on the technical and cultural development of the country. This was veiled for a certain time by the fact that Soviet economy was occupied for two decades with transplanting and assimilating the technology and organization of production in advanced capitalist countries. The period of borrowing and imitation still could, for better or for worse, be accommodated to bureaucratic automatism, i. The constantly sharpening contradiction between them leads to uninterrupted political convulsions, to systematic annihilation of the most outstanding creative elements in all spheres of activity.

The Conditions for the Omnipotence and Fall of the Bureaucracy The Soviet oligarchy possesses all the vices of the old ruling classes but lacks their historical mission. In the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet State it is not the general laws of modern society from capitalism to socialism which find expression but a special exceptional and temporary refraction of these laws under the conditions of a backward revolutionary country in a capitalist environment. Both conditions for the omnipotence of the bureaucracy "the backwardness of the country and the imperialist environment" bear, however, a temporary and transitional character and must disappear with the victory of the world revolution. Even bourgeois economists have calculated that with a planned economy it would be possible to raise the national income of the United States rapidly to billion dollars a year and thus assure the entire population not only the satisfaction of its primary needs but real comforts. On the other hand, the world revolution would do away with the danger from without as the supplementary cause of bureaucratization. The elimination of the need to expend an enormous share of the national income on armaments would raise even higher the living and cultural level of the masses. In these conditions the need for a policeman distributor would fall away by itself. Administration as a gigantic cooperative would very quickly supplant state power. There would be no room for a new ruling class or for a new exploiting regime, located between capitalism and socialism. The disintegration of capitalism has reached extreme limits, likewise the disintegration of the old ruling class. The further existence of this system is impossible. The productive forces must be organized in accordance with a plan. Historical experience bears witness, in the opinion of certain rationalizers that one cannot entertain hope in the proletariat. The Spanish revolution was strangled by the Fascist and Stalinist bureaucracies before the very eyes of the world proletariat. Finally, last link in this chain is the new imperialist war, the preparation of which took place quite openly, with complete impotence on the part of the world proletariat. If this conception is adopted, that is, if it is acknowledged that the proletariat does not have the forces to accomplish the socialist revolution, then the urgent task of the stratification of the productive forces will obviously be accomplished by somebody else. By a new bureaucracy, which will replace the decayed bourgeoisie as a new ruling class on a world scale.

The Present War and the Fate of Modern Society By the very march of events this question is now posed very concretely. The second world war has begun. It attests

incontrovertibly to the fact that society can no longer live on the basis of capitalism. Thereby it subjects the proletariat to a new and perhaps decisive test. If this war provokes, as we firmly believe, a proletarian revolution, it must inevitably lead to the overthrow of the bureaucracy in the USSR and regeneration of Soviet democracy on a far higher economic and cultural basis than in To every single person it will become clear that in the process of the development of the world revolution the Soviet bureaucracy was only an episodic relapse. If, however, it is conceded that the present war will provoke not revolution but a decline of the proletariat, then there remains another alternative: The inability of the proletariat to take into its hands the leadership of society could actually lead under these conditions to the growth of a new exploiting class from the Bonapartist fascist bureaucracy. This would be, according to all indications, a regime of decline, signaling the eclipse of civilization. An analogous result might occur in the event that the proletariat of advanced capitalist countries, having conquered power, should prove incapable of holding it and surrender it, as in the USSR, to a privileged bureaucracy. Then we would be compelled to acknowledge that the reason for the bureaucratic relapse is rooted not in the backwardness of the country and not in the imperialist environment but in the congenital incapacity of the proletariat to become a ruling class. We have diverged very far from the terminological controversy over the nomenclature of the Soviet state. But let our critics not protest: The historic alternative, carried to the end, is as follows: If the second prognosis proves to be correct, then, of course, the bureaucracy will become a new exploiting class. However onerous the second perspective may be, if the world proletariat should actually prove incapable of fulfilling the mission placed upon it by the course of development, nothing else would remain except openly to recognize that the socialist program based on the internal contradictions of capitalist society, ended as a Utopia. But are there such incontrovertible or even impressive objective data as would compel us today to renounce the prospect of the socialist revolution? That is the whole question. Urbahns, however, did not draw the political conclusions of his theory. The new bureaucracy is a class, its relations to the toilers is collective exploitation, the proletarians are transformed into the slaves of totalitarian exploiters. Lenin even prior to the October Revolution formulated the main peculiarities of imperialist capitalism as follows: Gigantic concentration of productive forces, the heightening fusion of monopoly capitalism with the state, an organic tendency toward naked dictatorship as a result of this fusion. But where are its limits, and what is its historical weight? What we accept as the deformity of a transitional period, the result of the unequal development of multiple factors in the social process, is taken by Bruno R. This makes it all the easier to disclose his mistake. Like many ultra-lefts, Bruno R. The first assertion is absolutely correct.

Chapter 6 : Why we continue to defend the Soviet Union | Liberation School

Caste & Class in the USSR 'All Shades of Political Thought' In analyzing the political and social character of the Stalinist ruling caste in the Soviet Union in the s, Leon Trotsky laid great emphasis on the political heterogeneity concealed behind the facade of "monolithic" unity.

By guaranteeing the peoples held captive in the Tsarist empire the right to separate and form their own states if they wished, the Bolsheviks gained important allies in the civil war that erupted after the revolution. The Soviet census listed nationalities, 22 of which numbered over a million. Fifteen of these have their own republics, 20 others have the lesser status of autonomous republics, and 18 more reside in autonomous regions and national areas. The Kremlin oligarchy, saturated with Russian chauvinism, has for decades attempted to extinguish the national cultures and languages of minority nations in the USSR. Sometimes the Stalinists resorted to jailings, deportations and police repression, but a variety of more subtle techniques were also used to promote Russification. Russians make up only 50 percent of the population of the Soviet Union, yet more than 80 percent of books and newspapers are printed in Russian. Access to many branches of higher education is effectively restricted to Russian-speakers. Unlike the chauvinist Soviet bureaucrats, Trotskyists are internationalists. As such we are indifferent to the question of state boundaries. Lenin made this clear in *How to Succeed in Business Without Really Trying*. However many independent republics there may be, we shall not be afraid. What is important for us is not where the state frontier passes, but that the union of workers of all nations shall be preserved for the struggle with the bourgeoisie of whatever nation. For only through an internationally planned economy, based on workers democracy, can the material basis be laid for abolishing scarcity, which lies at the root of every form of oppression. In the USSR the international extension of the revolution is inextricably linked to the overthrow of the Russian-chauvinist Kremlin bureaucrats through proletarian political revolution. A key element in the program of such a revolution must be the intransigent defense of the equality of all nationalities and, in particular, the right of oppressed nations to self-determination. Yet, in upholding the general democratic right of nations to self-determination, Marxists do not automatically support the demands of all nationalist currents. Separatist movements that lure the oppressed nationalities to embrace capitalist restoration can only result in the brutal subordination of those peoples to imperialism. It is the duty of Leninists to say so forthrightly, and to oppose such movements. This vital distinction is ignored by most of the ostensibly Trotskyist left. National self-determination is one of the elements of democracy. The struggle for national self-determination, like the struggle for democracy in general, plays an enormous role in the lives of the peoples, particularly in the life of the proletariat. He is a poor revolutionist who does not know how to utilize democratic institutions and forms, including parliamentarianism, in the interests of the proletariat. But from the proletarian standpoint, neither democracy as a whole nor national self-determination as an integral part of it stands above the classes; nor does either of them supply the highest criterion of revolutionary policy. This slogan was a clear statement of opposition to capitalist counterrevolution, even when it wore a cloak of resistance to national oppression. It also served to link the struggle against national oppression to the struggle against the parasitic Stalinist ruling caste. Nationalism and Social Counterrevolution Today within the Soviet Union the national question is posed most sharply in the Baltics. In March , Lithuania declared its independence from the Soviet Union. The imperialists, in turn, have loudly proclaimed their support for Lithuanian self-determination. Chronic economic mismanagement and corruption, overlaid with bureaucratic and national oppression, have, in the absence of an organized socialist opposition, turned the nationalist movements throughout the USSR into vehicles for the generalized hostility toward Stalinism. This is a significant indication of the level of frustration with Moscow felt by wide layers of the Soviet population as the country slides into economic chaos. Faced with this situation, the centrist League for a Revolutionary Communist International LRCI argues that revolutionaries must go along with the pro-capitalist independence movement because the majority of Lithuanian workers want it. If we stay neutral, let alone support the attempts of the central government to maintain their rule, we will push the masses much more into the hands of radical right-wing elements. Of course there is the immediate danger of capitalist counterrevolution. But we can fight it best by cutting the

ground from under the feet of the bourgeois forces. It would never occur to these centrists to oppose the counterrevolutionary Sajudis. Despite this, they flatly maintain that if it came to blows: When Gorbachev responded to the secessionists by economically blockading Lithuania, Workers Power urged the imperialists to break the Soviet blockade. In May Workers Power advised: The fight to defend proletarian property forms against capitalist counterrevolution is not counterposed to, but intimately connected with, the struggle for the right of each nation in the USSR to establish an independent socialist republic. The struggle against the Great Russian chauvinism of the Stalinist bureaucracy will be a vital factor in mobilizing for workers political revolution. Trotskyists oppose all forms of national oppression: In advocating the voluntary unification of the peoples of the USSR on the basis of socialist republics, revolutionists simultaneously support the right to national self-determination, i. This does not mean the right to establish an independent bourgeois state. For the Lithuanian working class, as for those of the other oppressed nationalities in the USSR, independence won through capitalist restoration would be a profound defeat.

Chapter 7 : Caste & Class in the USSR - 'All Shades of Political Thought'

The Soviet working class was, according to Marxist-Leninist theory, supposed to be the Soviet Union's ruling class during its transition from the socialist stage of development to full communism. However, it's commonly argued that its influence over production and policies diminished as the USSR's existence progressed.

Prior to the February Revolution, the first phase of the Russian Revolutions of 1917, the party worked underground as organized anti-Tsarist groups. Alongside it, grassroots general assemblies spontaneously formed, called soviets, and a dual-power structure between the soviets and the provisional government was in place until such a time that their differences would be reconciled in a post-provisional government. Lenin was at this time in exile in Switzerland where he, with other dissidents in exile, managed to arrange with the Imperial German government safe passage through Germany in a sealed train back to Russia through the continent amidst the ongoing World War. In April, Lenin arrived in Petrograd renamed former St. Petersburg and condemned the provisional government, calling for the advancement of the revolution towards the transformation of the ongoing war into a war of the working class against capitalism. The revolution did in fact prove to not yet be over, as tensions between the social forces aligned with the soviets councils and those with the provisional government now led by Alexander Kerensky, in power, came into explosive tensions during that summer. The Bolsheviks had rapidly increased their political presence from May onward through the popularity of their programme, notably calling for an immediate end to the war, land reform for the peasants, and restoring food allocation to the urban population. This programme was translated to the masses through simple slogans that patiently explained their solution to each crisis the revolution created. Up to July these policies were disseminated through 41 publications, Pravda being the main paper, with a readership of 1.5 million. This was roughly halved after the repression of the Bolsheviks following the July Days demonstrations so that even by the end of August the principal paper of the Bolsheviks had a print run of only 50,000 copies. Despite this, their ideas gained them increasing popularity in elections to the soviets. Lavr Kornilov to eliminate the socialists from the provisional government. As the general consensus within the soviets moved leftward, less militant forces began to abandon them, leaving the Bolsheviks in a stronger position. The provisional government, insistent on maintaining the universally despised war effort on the Eastern Front because of treaty ties with its Allies and fears of Imperial German victory, had become socially isolated and had no enthusiastic support on the streets. On 7 November 25 October, old style, the Bolsheviks led an armed insurrection which overthrew the Kerensky provisional government and left the soviets as the sole governing force in Russia. Outside of Russia, social-democrats who supported the soviet government began to identify as communists while those who opposed it retained the social-democratic label. In 1918, as the Civil War was drawing to a close, Lenin proposed the New Economic Policy NEP, a system of state capitalism that started the process of industrialization and post-war recovery. The Bolsheviks believed at this time that Russia, being among the most economically undeveloped and socially backward countries in Europe, had not yet reached the necessary conditions of development for socialism to become a practical pursuit and that this would have to wait for such conditions to arrive under capitalist development as had been achieved in more advanced countries such as England and Germany. He died on 21 January 1924, only thirteen months after the founding of the Soviet Union, of which he would become regarded as the founding father. Trotsky sought to implement a policy of permanent revolution, which was predicated on the notion that the Soviet Union would not be able to survive in a socialist character when surrounded by hostile governments and therefore concluded that it was necessary to actively support similar revolutions in the more advanced capitalist countries. Joseph Stalin, leader of the party from 1924 to his death in 1953, ultimately, Stalin gained the greatest support within the party, and Trotsky, who was increasingly viewed as a collaborator with outside forces in an effort to depose Stalin, was isolated and subsequently expelled from the party and exiled from the country in 1929. In 1925, the name of the party was changed to the All-Union Communist Party bolsheviks, reflecting that the republics outside of Russia proper were no longer part of an all-encompassing Russian state. By the end of the 1920s, diplomatic relations with western countries were deteriorating to the point that there was growing fear of another allied attack on the Soviet

Union. Within the country, the conditions of the NEP had enabled growing inequalities between increasingly wealthy strata and the remaining poor. To do this, the first five-year plan was implemented in 1928. The plan doubled the industrial workforce, proletarianizing many of the peasants by removing them from their land and assembling them into urban centers. Peasants who remained in agricultural work were also made to have a similarly proletarian relationship to their labor through the policies of collectivization, which turned feudal-style farms into collective farms which would be in a cooperative nature under the direction of the state. These two shifts changed the base of Soviet society towards a more working class alignment. The plan was fulfilled ahead of schedule in 1932. The success of industrialization in the Soviet Union led western countries, such as the United States, to open diplomatic relations with the Soviet government. The threat of fascist sabotage and immanent attack greatly exacerbating the already existing tensions within the Soviet Union and the Communist Party. A wave of paranoia overtook Stalin and the party leadership and spread through Soviet society. Seeing potential enemies everywhere, leaders of the government security apparatuses began severe crackdowns known as the Great Purge. In total, hundreds of thousands of people, many of whom were posthumously recognized as innocent, were arrested and either sent to prison camps or executed. Also during this time, a campaign against religion was waged in which the Russian Orthodox Church, which had long been a political arm of tsarism before the revolution, was targeted for repression and organized religion was generally removed from public life and made into a completely private matter, with many churches, mosques and other shrines being repurposed or demolished. The Soviet Union was the first to warn of impending danger of invasion from Nazi Germany to the international community. While the western governments were mostly committed to neutrality, many western capitalists, notably including the Rockefellers, secured lucrative business deals with the fascist regimes and had direct interests in maintaining them. After many unsuccessful attempts to create an anti-fascist alliance among the western countries, including trying to rally international support for the Spanish Republic in its struggle against a fascist military dictatorship supported by Germany and Italy, in 1939 the Soviet Union signed a non-aggression pact with Germany which would be broken in June when the German military invaded the Soviet Union in the largest land invasion in history, beginning the Great Patriotic War. The Communist International was dissolved in 1943 after it was concluded that such an organization had failed to prevent the rise of fascism and the global war necessary to defeat it. The party also sought to expand its sphere of influence beyond the occupied territories, using proxy wars and espionage and providing training and funding to promote Communist elements abroad, leading to the establishment of the Cominform in 1947. In 1949, the Communists emerged victorious in the Chinese Civil War, causing an extreme shift in the global balance of forces and greatly escalating tensions between the Communists and the western powers, fueling the Cold War. In Europe, Yugoslavia, under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito, acquired the territory of Trieste, causing conflict both with the western powers and with the Stalin administration who opposed such a provocative move. Furthermore, the Yugoslav Communists actively supported the Greek Communists during their civil war, further frustrating the Soviet government. These tensions led to a Tito-Stalin Split which marked the beginning of international sectarian division within the world communist movement. The standard of living for ordinary citizens did increase; million people moved into new housing between 1945 and 1955. General Secretary and Politburo, respectively. He became addicted to painkillers and needed to take increasingly more potent medications to attend official meetings. He also supported a crackdown on absenteeism and corruption. Organized parties were not allowed. Several of them used the name CPSU. Collective leadership in the Soviet Union The style of governance in the party alternated between collective leadership and a cult of personality. Collective leadership split power between the Politburo, the Central Committee, and the Council of Ministers to hinder any attempts to create a one-man dominance over the Soviet political system. Regardless of leadership style, all political power in the Soviet Union was concentrated in the organization of the CPSU. Democratic centralism Democratic centralism is an organizational principle conceived by Lenin.

Chapter 8 : Life in USSR under Stalin - History Learning Site

The USSR in War (September) There would be no room for a new ruling class or for a new exploiting regime, located between capitalism and socialism.

Bill Hackwell The Soviet Union went out of existence 19 years ago next month. Some progressive people argue that given the fact that nearly two decades have passed, the issue of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is now an irrelevancy. For one thing, the capitalist class and its well-paid intellectuals and pundits continue to argue that the fall of the Soviet Union means that socialism and communism are impossible, that they might have been nice dreams at one time, but, they say, socialism turned out to be nightmare when it actually came into existence. A stereotyped and negative image of the Soviet Union has been relentlessly fed to the people ever since the Russian Revolution, which took place 93 years ago this month. In fact, to this day public opinion polls show majorities of working people in the former Soviet Union, East Germany, Romania, and other countries longing for the system that they lost. The triumph of the Russian Revolution nearly a century ago was truly a world-historic event. It was the first time in history that the working class was able to seize and hold power, and to reorganize the economy and society on a socialist basis. It proved that the oppressed, with their own leadership, their own party, could create a new reality. Challenges faced by revolution The new Soviet government, led by the Bolshevik Party, was immediately confronted with several immense tasks—any one of which would have been daunting. First of all, they had to defend their new state against not only the internal counter-revolutionary armies—the White armies of the old landlords and capitalists—but also against the entire imperialist world. They had to do this under conditions of a total economic blockade imposed by the capitalist world. This was not an optional task: None of the Bolshevik leaders—Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and so on believed that they would be able to succeed unless there were other revolutions in more industrially developed countries, particularly Germany. And the biggest obstacle to revolutionary success there was the lack of a Bolshevik-type party. The fact that the Russian revolutionaries were able to hold onto to power in the face of these momentous obstacles seems almost unbelievable. It is a testimony above all to the immense human potential of the working class, which is suppressed under capitalism and only allowed to fully flourish by a socialist revolution. The years of war and deprivation took an enormous toll on the party and the working class as a whole, a toll that weakened the party and led to later problems. But contrary to the bourgeois presentation of a failed economic system, the Soviet planned economic system—the first time in history there ever was a planned economy—showed the remarkable potential of socialism. Gains showed potential of socialism From being the least developed of the big European countries at the time of the revolution, 40 years later the Soviet Union was the second largest economy in the world, trailing only the U. It was the most rapid economic development ever, by any country. This despite the fact that after barely a decade of initial rapid development in the s, two-thirds of the industry and much of the agriculture was destroyed by the Nazi invasion beginning in And contrary to what we see on the History Channel, it was the Soviet Union that bore the brunt of the Nazi war machine and destroyed it—but at a cost of 27 million killed. Before the revolution, much of the population went through life without ever seeing a doctor. In , a leading U. Of all the physicians in the world today, more than one in five is Soviet —while only 1 person in 14 in the world today is a Soviet citizen. Fields, American Journal of Public Health, November Not only that, but none of those doctors—three-quarters of whom were women—paid a kopek for their education, nor did anyone else in any field of work. Of course, they could not hope to become millionaires. It was a fundamentally different system than the one we live in, more like the one in Cuba today. Every person was guaranteed the right to a job, housing, health care and education, and also the right to vacations, pensions and culture. There were many, many nationalities, each entitled to literature, newspapers and education in their language. Scores of languages that were not previously written were alphabetized. In the wake of the destruction of WWII, vast industrial, infrastructure and housing projects were undertaken. The absence of capitalist competition between enterprises enabled very rapid scientific and engineering development. In addition to its remarkable internal development, Soviet aid was vital to national liberation

movements and newly independent states around the world. The victories of the Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese and other revolutions would have been much delayed or prevented without the Soviet Union. Without Soviet support, Cuba would have undoubtedly been invaded by the U. Problems faced by Soviet state I am recounting just some of the achievements of the Soviet Union because they are almost never mentioned these days. The achievements are all the more remarkable given the serious problems the Soviet state faced. The forestalling of revolution in the advanced capitalist countries, which could have provided immense assistance to the USSR. The imperialist military encirclement of the USSR. This was especially problematic in the late and 80s with the revolutionizing of communications and other technologies, which caused the Soviet Union to begin falling back in relation to the U. By the early s the rate of growth had slowed to 2 percent. Internal problems, particularly bureaucratism, a long-term de-politicization of much of the working class and separation between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the masses of workers and collective farmers. The pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist faction led by Boris Yeltsin and Mikhail Gorbachev won out. By the late s, the Soviet Union was cutting back or eliminating support for national liberation movements and allied socialist states. In , the Gorbachev leadership broke the alliance with the communist governments and militaries in Eastern Europe leading to capitalist counter-revolutions in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania and East Germany, and the disintegration of Yugoslavia. And, in this traitorous group dismantled the Soviet Union itself, leading to the restoration of capitalism in the 15 now-independent republics. We agree with the assessment of Cuban leader Fidel Castro: The ever-more urgent need for socialism is not based on the existence of any particular state, but instead grows out of the contradictions of the capitalist system itself, problems that that system cannot overcome, problems that only socialism can solve. What is most remarkable from an objective standpoint, is not that the Soviet Union fell in , but that it survived through the unimaginable challenges it faced. We should also remember that it took the bourgeoisie, the capitalist class, five centuries from their rise as a class until capitalism became the dominant world system. The Soviet Union should be studied for its incredible achievements as well as its problems and contradictions. It was a first attempt. By its existence for more than seven decades it proved once and for all that the working class can take power and reorganize society on a socialist basis.

Chapter 9 : The Jews Where the Ruling Caste of the USSR – Death of communism

In the Soviet Union there was a bureaucratic ruling class and the working class was subordinate in social production and in society in general. The ruling class consisted of political party apparatchiks, industry managers, elite Gosplan planners, military brass.

In the Transitional Program, the founding document of the Fourth International, Trotsky observed: On 2 June the army opened fire on a rally in the central square, killing dozens. The KGB Soviet political police attempted to suppress all information about the events by threatening eyewitnesses with prolonged jail sentences. The limits of glasnost were tested in late with the appearance of the first openly anti-Marxist article in the official Soviet press. Its author, Alexander Tsipko, who had earlier worked as a speechwriter for Gorbachev, proudly recalled: They represented the first attempt to openly challenge Marxism and were written from a White perspective I managed to get my views published in the official press in a country that just a year earlier had celebrated the seventieth anniversary of the October Revolution and remained the stronghold of world Communism. I did this while not only being a Party member, but also working as a consultant for the International Affairs Department of the CC [Central Committee]. Unlike many pro-capitalist elements among the nomenklatura who underwent an incremental political evolution to the right, Tsipko claims to have been a subjective counterrevolutionary his whole life: These things represented a myth, a paradise lost which captured my imagination I did not like these films, because the side I supported always lost. A few years later, Georgi Smirnov, a top Gorbachev aide, approached Tsipko to do some speechwriting for his boss. Smirnov did not need to spell it out that the time for coming out with these ideas in public had not yet come and that we needed to exercise caution and support Gorbachev. Our entire social structure is predicated upon false premises. Collectivization and the Bolshevik-inspired self-genocide of the Russian people have their roots in Marxism. Only the unhappy late Jan Smeral, the son of a Comintern leader and a founder of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, could not break with Marxism. All the other people who surrounded me in the CC were quite indifferent to the fate of the doctrines of Karl Marx. They were, however, afraid of what subsequently happened, that perestroika might lead to total chaos with unpredictable consequences. This possibility was discussed among my colleague-consultants as early as the beginning of Its author, Andrew P. It is true that on 8 November , Valery Sablin, the political officer on board the Storozhevoy, locked up the captain and seized control of his ship. But Sablin did not head to Sweden to defect, but rather to Leningrad now St. Petersburg , where he hoped to set off a popular revolt that would topple the corrupt and dictatorial Stalinist bureaucracy and replace it with a genuinely socialist regime. His father and grandfather had been in the Soviet navy, and in , at the age of 16, young Valery enrolled in the Frunze Naval Academy in Leningrad. He was soon elected head of the Komsomol branch at the academy. One of his classmates, Alexei Lialin, recalled: We all believed in them, but Valery had such integrity he wanted to put these ideals into action. The love of life, and I mean not in the sense of the life of a comfortable bourgeois, but a bright, truthful life which inspires a genuine joy in all honest people. I am convinced that in our nation, just as 58 years ago in , a revolutionary consciousness will alight and we will achieve communism in our society. He was sternly reprimanded for this indiscretion, but because he was such an outstanding officer candidate he was eventually allowed to graduate. He was offered command of a destroyer in , when he was only His friends and family were shocked when he chose instead to enrol in the Lenin Political Academy for a program of advanced ideological studies. In hindsight his brother Boris speculated that Valery had wanted to understand how the system worked in order to better struggle against it. Another brother, Nikolai, commented that Valery was very disappointed that even in the elite party school access to information and books was restricted. On 8 November , the Storozhevoy was docked in the Baltic port of Riga, where it had participated in a commemoration of the October Revolution. This was the moment that Sablin chose to make his move. A few days earlier, Sablin had taken one of the seamen, Alexander Shein, into his confidence. Amazingly, eight agreed to throw in their lot with him. The sailors, following Shein, unanimously opted to go along with the mutineers. One of the junior officers who opposed the revolt managed to escape from the Storozhevoy while it

was still in Riga and went straight to the authorities. Sablin considered abandoning the project at this point, but the crew urged him to carry it through. Sablin decided to broadcast his radio appeal to the Soviet working class before reaching Leningrad. Leonid Brezhnev was woken in the middle of the night and advised of the revolt. He ordered that the Storozhevoy be apprehended, or, if necessary, sunk. Sixty planes and 13 ships were sent out to hunt for the rebels. The KGB initially suspected that the appeal to the workers might have been a blind, and that the real destination of the mutineers was Sweden. By dawn the Soviet coast guard had located the Storozhevoy. The KGB offered to pardon the men if they stopped immediately, but Sablin refused, stating that they were not traitors and had no intention of defecting to the West. The first wave of planes from the Baltic fleet air wing that reached the Storozhevoy refused a direct order to fire on it. This infuriated Defense Minister Andrei Grechko who demanded that his instructions be carried out immediately. The second wave of planes did drop their bombs and managed to crack the hull of the Storozhevoy, disabling it. Putorny then alerted the authorities that he had regained control, and a party of KGB officers and paratroopers clambered aboard. Six hours after it had begun, the mutiny was over. On the trip back to Riga a paratroop officer guarding the mutineers asked Sasha Shein: You broke your oath. What sort of a life is that? Do you really think people should have to live like this? When the Storozhevoy arrived back in Riga, the KGB arrested the whole crew, even the officers who had opposed the mutiny. Sablin, Shein and 14 others were subjected to an intensive grilling by KGB interrogators who were chiefly interested in uncovering the nature of the organization which they presumed stood behind the attempt. Sablin was questioned every day for nine months. Shein was sentenced to eight years in prison. As Russian historian Nikolai Cherkashin explained: It was a convenient theory because it reduced the significance of this event. It was just a regular criminal act. The capitalist movie moguls were no more interested in telling the real story of the mutiny than Brezhnev had been. He was undoubtedly aware that the Stalinist police apparatus devoted enormous resources to locating underground revolutionary organizations in the USSR and he therefore concluded that the only chance lay in surprise. But the failure of the Storozhevoy mutiny also points to the limitations of individual actions, however heroic. In drawing the lessons of that experience we observed: The weakness and disorganization evident on both sides presented an opportunity for a Trotskyist group committed to preserving nationalized property under the direction of democratic organs of workers power. The immediate tactical objective in those first days would have been to organize an assault to disperse the few hundred lightly armed Yeltsinites in and around the Russian White House. It would also have been viewed sympathetically by a considerable section of the armed forces, and could have galvanized active support from pro-socialist elements. The scattering of the Yeltsinites could have been followed up by a call for representatives from every factory, barracks and working-class housing estate to gather at the White House to create a real, democratic Moscow soviet. After being harangued for three hours, Yevdokimov met General Konstantin Kobets, whom Yeltsin was soon to appoint as defense minister, and Russian Vice President Alexander Rutskoi, a Soviet Afghan War hero, and promised them his support. But Yevdokimov, a career army officer, was not so lucky: Most of the Stalinist apparatchiks who slandered him as a pro-capitalist renegade have themselves long since made their peace with the counterrevolution. At a reunion on the 25th anniversary of the Storozhevoy mutiny, Sasha Shein commented: Sablin was that sort of noble spirit. On no account ever be one of those people who criticizes but does not follow through his actions. I wish you courage, my dear. Be strong in the belief that life is wonderful. Be positive and believe that the Revolution will always win.