THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

Dr. Sarita Verma

THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

Dr. Sarita Verma

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

First Published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

The History of Socialism by *Dr. Sarita Verma*

ISBN 979-8-89161-363-8

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

AN EXPLORATION OF DIVERSE STRANDS AND EVOLUTION OF SOCIALIST THOUGHT

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities,Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The history of socialist philosophy from its moralistic roots to its rationalistic outgrowths, illuminating its multidimensional character and developmental destiny. Examined is the development of socialism historically as a reaction to societal inequalities, notably within the setting of the Enlightenment. The abstract draws attention to the presence of several intellectual currents within the socialist movement, including rationality and moralism. Divergent views on human nature, equality, liberty, and community cause conflicts that are examined. Different socialist orientations, such as those emphasizing radical equality, technocratic industrial productivism, cooperative communities, and Christian ideals, have emerged as a result of these internal struggles. The abstract ends by recognizing how crucial it is to appreciate this complex web of socialist ideas in order to comprehend the emergence and development of Soviet socialism, where the predominance of reason over emotion and equality over libertarianism played a crucial role.

KEYWORDS:

Historical Development,Ideological Evolution, Ideological Diversity, Political Thought, Social Change.

INTRODUCTION

The broader history of socialism as a political idea is closely linked to the history of Soviet socialism. After 1883, the principles of socialism established inside Russian social democracy collided with the harsh realities of the Russian sociopolitical context, resulting in the development of a Soviet "model" of socialism. However, the idea of socialism that guided the Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party in its post-revolutionary thought was itself the result of decades of intellectual and historical growth in Russia and Europe. The interpretation and translation of socialism into Russian realities at the turn of the century repeated and gave particular expression to the tensions and conflicts that existed within it as a political theory and a political movement. It is crucial to remember that although Soviet socialism was a specific subset of broader socialist viewpoints and objectives, it was also a complex, diverse phenomena with substantial internal variation. The eighteenth century is where Soviet socialism's philosophical and historical roots may be found[1]–[3].

Socialism first emerged

Socialism has always been a multifaceted, intricate, and varied philosophy. Socialists have been labelled as "utopian", "scientific", "reformist", and "revolutionary". Social Democrats, Eurocommunists, Leninists, Maoists, Trotskyists, Marxists, Fabians, Democratic Socialists, Eco socialists, and other groups have all emerged within the socialist movement. It has been almost difficult to get a consensus among all people on the fundamental tenets or characteristics of a socialist society. Over the causes of this, scholars are still sharply split. According to Martin Malia, the word "socialism" has no real meaning. It has been adopted by

such a dizzying array of political parties and has taken on such a broad range of connotations, according to Malia, that "it corresponds to no identifiable object in the sublunary world." The conflict between socialism's economic and moral foundations cannot be resolved because, according to Malia, the former are inherently incapable of realizing the latter. Many of the conflicts within socialism have been noted by other researchers, including Berki, Licht Heim, and others. These tensions may be explained by a confluence of philosophical and historical causes. Socialism was the successor to a longer heritage of moral protest and anger, even if it only became a contemporary political reality towards the end of the eighteenth century in the aftermath of the French and Industrial Revolutions. There has always been an ethical or moral criticism of the shortcomings of the current way of life and a corresponding yearning for a better, more equitable society, from Plato through More to Winstanley and the Diggers during the English Civil War. The rise of capitalism and the fall of feudalism gave socialism the push it needed to develop as a moral criticism.

This attitude of revolt against injustice was promoted by the expansion of economic exploitation, poverty, wage work, and injustice. The works of Rousseau, Babeuf, and others that sought to overthrow the current social system and establish a new one based on equality, popular sovereignty, and integral democracy serve as examples of this. In their principles, they indicated a wish to depart from the contemporary world's increasing individuality and come back to one founded on peace, brotherhood, and community. Parallel to the development of this moralistic criticism was the emergence of an alternate school of socialist thought. This movement, which Berki refers to as "rationalism," emerged during the Enlightenment, namely from the "Philosophes." It supported the ideas of progress, rationality, and efficiency and emphasized the emancipatory force of knowledge and education. This strand, in contrast to the earlier one's pre-modern or classicist longing, was basically contemporary in nature and drew inspiration from the ideals released by the French Revolution. By elevating human reason, the rationalist school of socialism held that society might be planned and organized logically, hence eradicating waste, inefficiency, and inequality. When socialism first emerged, it was both a rejection of capitalism and an expansion of the liberal philosophy's guiding ideals and values. Socialism, in Malia's words, was "the maximalist wing of one broad movement of protest against the still stubborn remnants of the old regime." Fundamentally, liberalism and socialism shared a goal to overthrow the dominance of mediaeval ideas of hierarchy, privilege, and inequality.

The extent and significance of the concepts of liberté, égalité, and brotherhood divided them. In order to completely restructure society, socialist theorists attempted to incorporate the principles of justice, freedom, and equality into every aspect of life. Understanding the following evolution of socialism depends on the existence of this intellectual split between rationalism and moralism at the conceptual origin of contemporary socialism. Socialism evolved to include a variety of unique, perhaps incompatible ideals. This has been said by commentators in a variety of ways. The "four basic tendencies of socialism rationalism, moralism, egalitarianism, and libertarianism" are identified by Berki. Bernard Crick examines the conflict between individuality and brotherhood, liberty and equality. The antinomies that make up socialism, according to Zygmunt Bauman, are "freedom and equality, the community and the state, history as a lawful process and as a creative act." All of these share the need to explain the enduring conflicts that underlie socialism as a political philosophy and, by extension, as a political movement. How can the greater benefit of society as a whole be balanced with the freedom of the individual? These conflicts occur, which helps to explain why socialism is so diverse. Radical equality was emphasized in Babeuf's primitive communism. The rationality and effectiveness of a socialized industrial economy were highlighted by Saint-Simon's technocratic industrial productivism. The "utopian" socialists

Charles Fourier and Robert Owen aimed to eradicate the inherent problems of capitalism by building harmonious, cooperative societies. The Christian virtues of social justice, cooperation, and brotherly love were emphasized by English socialism. The conceptual difficulties at the center of socialism's historical evolution were articulated.

Understanding the birth and growth of Soviet socialism requires knowledge of these many orientations. According to Berki, Soviet socialism was characterized by the dominance of rationality over moralism and equality over libertarianism, which sought to free mankind from all forms of exploitation and tyranny. Taylor's analysis of the conceptual conflict at the core of socialism is particularly pertinent to our investigation. He distinguishes between different socialist theories of human nature. Both a contemporary and a "Romantic expressivist" idea of humanity were presented by socialists. In keeping with Enlightenment philosophy, socialist modernizers saw the person as a conscious actor who sought to organize the world to satisfy themselves and who used nature as a tool to do so. Romantic philosophers emphasized community and collaboration among people as well as between people and environment. This led to the emergence of two quite different concepts of a socialist society inside a socialist discourse. Modernizers "viewed emancipation as the creation of structures to facilitate human fulfilment and happiness, enabling an ever-increasing degree of manipulation and control of nature." Expressivists rebelled against this utilitarian view of humanity, aiming to reclaim the person's creativity and oneness in relation to other people and environment.

Our forefathers

Marx was the primary intellectual forerunner of Soviet socialism. The structure and principles of Soviet socialism were greatly influenced by his criticism of capitalism and his perspectives on the shift from capitalism to socialism. Despite the fact that Marx hardly ever written about the post-revolutionary era, the fundamental features of the change and the character of this society were clear. Marx's theories on post-revolutionary society have often been characterized as irregular, incomplete, and nebulous. Private Property and Communism in the Paris Manuscripts, The German Ideology, The Communist Manifesto, The Civil War in France, The Critique of the Gotha Programmed, along with sporadic references in Grundrisse and Capital, are the main texts in which he wrote about the future society. Reviewing Marx's positions on communism shows a distinct line of development in his thinking that suggests a potential conflict between his theories, a conflict that was exacerbated by Engels' posthumous reading of Marx.

The future society

In Marx's texts, the word "communism" has a variety of interpretations. Marx referred to "communism" in four different ways, according to de George: as the stage that will succeed capitalism; as the elimination of private ownership of the means of production; as the negation of worker alienation, exploitation, and oppression; and as a set of advantageous traits, such as the emancipation of humanity, an increase in the productive forces in society, and the all-round development of the individual[4], [5].

What's striking is how impersonal, structural elements of the future society coexist with humanistic, ethical elements in Marx's interpretation of communism. How can we explain this collection of meanings? Some theorists contend that Marx's writings underwent a significant shift from his early writings, which focused on the humanistic aspect of overcoming alienation, to his later writings, which were more concerned with the abolition of the social aspects of capitalism the division of labour and class rule that led to exploitation and oppression. This is stated quite plainly by Harding. He suggests two communist theories

found in Marx's works. Model One has to do with the humanistic quest to liberate man from the isolation of capitalist society. Only by abolishing the two components that made up the method by which the individual was governed could man really realize himself. The formation of a society with a free association of cooperative work and a voluntary division of labour would lead to freedom. For Harding, Marx's early works on communism revealed a fundamentally romanticist desire, a want to once again create a society of harmony and freedom. Happiness was not found in endless consuming, but rather in a variety of labour-intensive activities. People would coexist peacefully with the environment and other people. Model Two people worked to end exploitation. Its goal was to change ownership relationships in a way that would maximize productivity for the good of society as a whole, eliminating need, poverty, and exploitation. It would be possible to eliminate the waste and inefficiency of capitalism production by centrally managing social and economic activities.

This idea aimed to expand upon and make the values of industrial society universal. Not via creative activity, but rather through the leisurely enjoyment of material plenty, people found fulfilment, freedom, and pleasure. For the first time, the person will entirely rule nature.Walicki also notes a change in Marx's way of thinking. Marx, according to the author, was interested in creating the conditions for the unconditional and complete freedom of mankind. According to Walicki, Marx's idea of freedom remained essentially unaltered, but his perception of the ways in which it would be accomplished changed. Marx believed that a communist society would be the time in history when mankind would be completely free. Marx defined freedom as a way of life in which people coexisted peacefully with one another and themselves. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary to defeat the factors and forces that separated and ruled mankind as well as those that made people feel estranged from one another. Walicki claims that Marx held the views that "rational, conscious, collective control over economic forces" and the elimination of the dividing structures of capitalism, particularly private ownership and the division of labour, were the foundations of freedom. In his early writings, Marx advocated using human creativity to overcome self-alienation and replacing market forces with rational planning to build human freedom.

According to Walicki, Marx took a step back from this stance in Capital and his following writings. Freedom might now be found in the leisure sector. Combining sensible economic management with efforts to reduce the workday was now the top goal. The fastest, most efficient way to do this was to develop the productive forces as quickly as possible, allowing for enormous improvements in output while reducing the actual time that people spend engaged in productive activity. Regardless of how it is defined, the ramifications of this "duality" were to completely manifest themselves in Russia after. It wasn't until that the earlier, more "Romanticist" texts that emphasized human liberation were made public. Soviet perspectives on the future of society were influenced by Marx and Engels' later, more sociologically grounded empirical works. The modernist thread of Marx's writings was where the emphasis was found in the works that the Russian Marxists examined. Their view of the post-revolutionary society was centred upon centralization, the quick growth of the industrial sector, and the eradication of tyranny, exploitation, and lack. Marx's later writings provide a definition of communism and communist society as a collection of institutional traits.

On this interpretation, the process of creating communism may be reduced. The development of several political and economic systems is described in. Understanding Marx's contribution to the Soviet conception of socialism requires an understanding of the nature of these particular elements. The gradual development of the postcapitalist society was also outlined by Marx and Engels. This outline has some ambiguity as well. Although the periodization was a bit hazy, the post-capitalist society was divided into three distinct phases: the

proletariat's dictatorship, socialism, and true communism. Following the proletarian revolution, a proletariat-controlled dictatorship would be in power. But what does this phrase entail in terms of Marx? How much time would it take? Marx saw the "lower" phase of communism, subsequently referred to as "socialism" by Engels, as a protracted historical era during which capitalism would be negated as the underlying mechanisms of exploitation would be eliminated.But this was a fleeting time. As socialism evolved into complete communism, the negative aspects of capitalist society would progressively give way to the advantageous aspects of communist society. In this "higher" phase, the person takes control of both his or her fate and nature consciously. History is made. It is important reflecting on the significance of Marx inserting a transitional stage between capitalism and communism before coming to the specifics of these "phases" of communism.

Two aspects are implied by the concept of a transition, and these ideas shaped Bolshevik thought. First, the revolutionary process they had started had a clearly defined purpose in mind, and achieving this goal was the main focus of Bolshevik strategy. The Bolshevik party's credibility would depend on their capacity to show that development, the process of transition, was feasible. This issue must be addressed. The Bolsheviks would establish their legitimacy in the absence of a democratic means of legitimation by successfully constructing the characteristics of "socialism". Their outlook on society in the future went beyond mere political correctness. Additionally, it was crucial to the Bolshevik party's capacity to remain in power. Second, it suggested that in order to arrive at communism, this phase of transition needed intentional direction and supervision. The new social structure may be "constructed" and developed in accordance with human design. Marx used constructivism and social engineering ideas into his analysis of the communist revolution[6]–[8].

The future society

Marx's descriptions of the "transitional" period were rather hazy, but the following characteristics may be outlined: We are dealing with a communist society that has not emerged from a capitalist society on its own, but rather from one that has. As a result, this society is still imprinted with the moral and intellectual characteristics of the previous society from which it emerged in every way, including economically. Classes, the division of labour, wage labour, and certain aspects of inequality would still exist in the lower phase since compensation would be given "according to work done," which was a feature that distinguished it from capitalism. The market and private property, which are oppressive aspects of capitalism, are rejected in favour of mechanisms that encourage the creation of a communist society's foundation, and thus marks the beginning of the transition process. These include abolishing private property and replacing it with public ownership; placing the means of production under centralized management; and taking steps to encourage the development of the productive forces as quickly as possible. The politics during the changeover are a little more intricate. According to Marx, the state served as a vehicle for class domination in all earlier cultures.

It was employed by the ruling class in every era as "separate bodies of armed men" to subjugate other classes and further its own goals. It achieved this by presenting its own specific interests as the embodiment of societal concerns. The coercive state was created as a result of the division of work and the development of a class-based society that was rife with conflict, and it became a key factor in the maintenance of personal alienation. According to Kolakowski, this alienation resulted from the split between civil society and the state, which caused every person in industrial society to lose some of their essential self-awareness: "The political society...makes up the only form of community, the only place where individuals recognize the social character of their existence." As a consequence, each person is separated

nearly perfectly between their concrete but selfish lives in civil society and their collective but impersonal lives as state citizens.Destroying the root of this political alienation was one of the main goals of the socialist revolution. The coercive state would not be necessary if class rule were to stop. The distinction between civil and political society would no longer exist, and there would be no need for political institutions. Marx thought about how to transition from the oppressive state machinery of capitalism to a classless, non-state society.

Except for his articles on the Paris Commune in The Civil War in France, Marx's opinions on the post-revolutionary state were reserved and equivocal. Marx mentions at one point that the state must be destroyed in order to instantly transition to a system of government modelled after the Paris Commune because "the working class cannot simply lay claim to the readymade state machinery and wield it for its own purposes." It is required for the proletariat to be in a position of power throughout the transition to the "higher phase" at other stages through a coercive entity: the proletariat's dictatorship. Its purpose is to use the tools of production for the common welfare while oppressing the bourgeois classes. This required assuming control of and using the current state apparatus. However, this was a stage of change.

The need for a coercive state would vanish when development towards the higher phase took place. The exact characteristics and qualities of the dictatorship of the proletariat are a matter of significant debate. Only a few times does Marx mention it. He stated that "the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat" in a letter to J. Wedemeyer. This dictatorship just serves as a transition to a society without classes and the annihilation of all classes. Marx said in the Critique of the Gotha Programmed: "The period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other lies between capitalist and communist society." A similar phase of transition exists in politics, and during this time the state can only exist as a proletariat-run revolutionary dictatorship.

An intriguing excerpt by Frederic Bender highlights the general features of the proletariat dictatorship in Marx's books. To protect the interests of the proletariat, it was to be a state run by the proletariat. It served as a tool of class power, but for the first time, the proletariat was the vast majority of society. It was also obvious that it was designed with democracy in mind. A democratic tyranny was predicted by Marx and Engels. Isn't that a contradiction? Not in Bertram Wolfe's opinion. He contends that studying the Roman Republic had a significant impact on Marx's understanding of the world. In emergency situations, a dictatorship was established in Republican Rome to protect Roman democracy. It was self-limiting, transitory, and constitutional.

Our comprehension of the idea of proletariat dictatorship as presented by Marx is merely obscured and distorted by the meanings and implications of the word "dictatorship" in modern use. Little clarity exists after we go beyond this fundamental idea. Three topics are at the heart of Marx's writings' uncertainties on the proletariat's rule. First, how long would the proletariat's tyranny last? Was it the brief era that followed the transition to socialism? Or did you mean the whole time from capitalism until the advent of true communism?

Diagrammatically, the alternate concepts are expressed as follows: The nature and goals of the proletariat dictatorship are the subject of the second area of uncertainty. What kind of democracy was Marx thinking about? How might the proletariat run the government? How would the state put the non-proletarian classes under its control? How would the proletariat go about changing the economic system? The method by which the communist dictatorship would be turned into the stateless society of the "higher" phase is the ultimate area of doubt.Would the proletariat eliminate it as Marx predicted?

Or will it "wither away" as Engels predicted? These uncertainties persisted throughout Marx and Engels' publications, and for some theorists, they led to the creation of several, incompatible conceptions of the post-revolutionary state. Marx included two contradictory conceptions of the state, according to Harding.

The Paris Commune concept had a high level of direct democracy and worker engagement in municipal management. In a structure where power was distributed top-down, decentralization and the integration of the executive, legislative, and judicial powers coexisted. The state was a highly centralized, repressive, non-democratic instrument of repression and expropriation under the dictatorship paradigm. Additionally, Bender distinguishes between two models in Marx: a "Centralization-Model" and an "Aufhebung-Model", which was derived from his early writings as well as his analysis of the Paris Commune. The former was a centralized, statist notion where an elite controlled politics and provided economic direction. The latter was a radical kind of participatory proletarian democracy where the working class had power over how the economy ran. The later contributions of Engels only serve to accentuate these uncertainties. Engels claimed that the Commune was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in his preface to the German translation of The Civil War in France, which was published.Any investigation of the origins and development of the idea of socialism within the Russian Marxist movement must take into account the contradictions in Marx's drawings of the post-revolutionary society.

DISCUSSION

A philosophical and political movement that has profoundly influenced modern history is explored via its many threads and stages of development. The development of socialist thinking, which arose in reaction to societal injustices and economic disparities, has been characterized by a complicated process including several ideological currents and philosophical viewpoints. Socialism has evolved through time into a complex, nuanced worldview that embraces a broad variety of ideas, including utopian, reformist, scientific, and revolutionary ones. A convergence of historical and intellectual factors, where a desire for a more just society met with the development of capitalism and the abolition of feudalism, may be seen as the origins of socialist thinking.As rationality arose as a new school of socialist thought, the Enlightenment period represented a turning point in the evolution of socialist philosophy. This school of thought, which was inspired by Enlightenment thinkers, promoted the emancipatory potential of knowledge and education by emphasizing progress, reason, and efficiency. Contrarily, a moralistic critique of modern society's flaws persisted, motivated by the desire to end economic exploitation, poverty, and social injustice. Socialist philosophy evolved with this conflict between rationality and moralism as a distinguishing characteristic, which caused ideas and viewpoints to differ within the movement.

Socialism embraced a range of distinctive and perhaps contradictory principles as it developed. Socialist thinking became characterized by the conflicts between freedom and equality, individuality and society, and the role of the state vs personal liberty. This development gave birth to several socialist ideologies, each of which promoted certain approaches to resolving societal problems. For instance, Saint-Simon advocated a technocratic industrial productivism whereas Charles Fourier and Robert Owen supported cooperative communities. The fundamental clash between rationalism and moralism, which created the intellectual underpinnings of each strand, may be linked to the origins of both orientations. This development had a significant impact on the emergence and development of Soviet socialism, a major subgroup of more general socialist ideologies. As it aimed to liberate mankind from different types of exploitation and oppression, Soviet socialism was characterized by the primacy of reason over emotion and equality over liberty. The

intellectual divide between rationality and moralism continued to shape the development of socialist ideology, highlighting the movement's broad and sometimes opposing views.As a whole, socialist philosophy has developed along many different lines, highlighting the depth and complexity of a philosophical and political movement that has irrevocably changed the course of human history. There are many different socialist orientations, each presenting a different viewpoint on society change, as a result of the interaction between rationality and moralism, individuality and community, freedom and equality, and so forth. Discussions on social fairness, economic equality, and the state's function in modern society are still being shaped by this development[9], [10].

CONCLUSION

Given the variety of socialist thought's threads and its historical development, it is clear that this philosophical and political movement is anything from uniform. It is instead a tapestry made of a wide variety of ideologies, each of which captures the historical setting, intellectual currents, and ethical goals of its era. Socialism has developed from its moralistic critique and rationalistic Enlightenment ideals origins into a complex worldview that embraces utopian aspirations, scientific theories, revolutionary fervor, and reformist goals. A range of socialist perspectives have emerged as a result of conflicts between various philosophical currents, such as rationalism and moralism, and each makes an effort to solve the key issues of justice, equality, and human liberty. Socialism's historical development, from its beginnings as a reaction to historical injustices to its adaptation and reinterpretation in the face of changing social conditions, is evidence of its resiliency and flexibility.

It also offers insight on humanity's ongoing fight for a more fair and equitable society. Understanding the development of socialist ideas is more than simply a cerebral exercise. Societies that want to strike a balance between individual liberties and communal well-being, economic growth and social cohesiveness, and historical continuity and revolutionary change have difficult obstacles, which are reflected in the tensions within socialism. We are reminded that ideologies are dynamic entities that change and adapt to the constantly shifting facts of the world as we consider the many branches and development of socialist philosophy. The divisions and tensions within socialist ideology serve as a powerful reminder of the value of intellectual discussion, the significance of interacting with opposing ideas, and the need to constantly reassess our methods for bringing about a better society. In the end, socialist thought's legacy challenges us to think critically about the ideologies that have molded our history and will likely continue to do so in the future. Understanding the socialist movement's complexity helps us understand its significant influence on global politics, economics, and society. Furthermore, we are encouraged to think about how the many schools of socialist thinking could still serve as our compass as we navigate the intricacies of a constantly changing world.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Arnds and R. Weikart, “Socialist Darwinism: Evolution in German Socialist Thought from Marx to Bernstein,” *Ger. Stud. Rev.*, 2002, doi: 10.2307/1433269.

[2] J. Andrade, “Socialist thought in exile (1939-1976). an analysis of intellectual production in the psoe in light of the political and cultural conflicts of the long post-war era,” *Rev. Estud. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.18042/cepc/rep.185.04.

[3] A. D. Mulawarman, “Soft Religiosity Message for Indonesia from Soedjatmoko,” *Int. J. Relig. Cult. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.34199/ijracs.2019.4.001.

[4] M. Stears, "Guild socialism and ideological diversity on the British left, 1914–1926," *J. Polit. Ideol.*, 1998, doi: 10.1080/13569319808420782.

[5] R. Tong, "Feminist thought in transition: Never a dull moment," *Soc. Sci. J.*, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.soscij.2006.12.003.

[6] J. J. Mitchell, "Embracing a socialist vision: The evolution of catholic social thought, leo xiii to john paul ii," *J. Church State*, 1985, doi: 10.1093/jcs/27.3.465.

[7] P. Lockley, "Social Anglicanism and Empire: C. F. Andrews's Christian Socialism," *Stud. Church Hist.*, 2018, doi: 10.1017/stc.2017.23.

[8] J. D. White, "Alexander Bogdanov's conception of proletarian culture," *Revolut. Russ.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/09546545.2013.806081.

[9] D. A. Stack, "The first Darwinian left: Radical and socialist responses to Darwin, 1859-1914," *Hist. Polit. Thought*, 2000.

[10] P. Blackledge, "On Richard Weikart's Socialist Darwinism: Evolution in German Socialist Thought from Marx to Bernstein," *Hist. Mater.*, 2004, doi: 10.1163/156920604773564050.

CHAPTER 2

EVOLUTION AND REALIZATION OF COMMUNIST SOCIETY'S HIGHER PHASE

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities,Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The transformational path from lower to higher communism as envisioned by Karl Marx is encapsulated in the book "The Evolution and Realisation of Communist Society's Higher Phase." This investigation digs into the complex forces that drive civilizations to the highest point of social development. The shift from the constricting antitheses of labour division and market pressures to the expanding ideals of shared production and individual fulfilment is examined through the prism of historical history. This approach emphasises the destruction of social divisions including class distinctions, gender differences, and divisions between mental and physical labour, which results in the birth of a completely self-realized human collective. With production geared towards use-value and shared ownership of production tools, economic landscapes are redrawn, supporting a surplus of resources that eliminates scarcity. The story skillfully moves from Marx's early depiction of labour as a feature of freedom and his later view of its position within the context of necessity in the complicated world of labour. In the conclusion, the study explores how politics and governance interact, explaining how coercive state institutions give way to non-coercive democratic governance that combines the civil and political spheres. This inquiry captures the development of communist society's higher phase, which is characterized by equal community wealth and full human realization.

KEYWORDS:

Communism, Development, Equality, Labor Dynamics, Political.

INTRODUCTION

The unfolding of the historical process, would lead inexorably from the lower to the higher phase of communist society. In a vivid passage, Marx describes it thus: In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life, but life’s prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly, only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety, and society inscribes on its banners, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” [1]–[3].

This era is marked by the full and final self-realization of the individual: the complete humanization of mankind is finally attained as individuals are now in full control of their own destiny. The abolition of market forces promotes conscious rational control over the economy. All sources of alienation and inequality have been abolished: the social division of labour, classes, wagelabour, production for exchange-value and the coercive apparatus of the state. All the divisive dichotomies of capitalist society—mental/manual labour, town/country, male/female—would be overcome. In economic terms, production is directed towards use-value. Ownership of the means of production is completely socialized.

Developments in technology and labour productivity enable the production of a superabundance of goods. This entailed the abolition of scarcity, which was to become a central goal of the Bolsheviks after 1917. Under communism there is a totally different approach to work. Individuals contribute according to their abilities, and draw from the common supply of goods to meet their needs. The specific nature of the labour experience of communism is a little confusing though. In his earlier works, and in Grundrisse, Marx foresaw labour itself as part of the realm of freedom under communism.

The abolition of the social division of labour would be replaced by a voluntary division of labour while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he "wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, cowherd or critic. In his later works, alienation is overcome, yet labour has a different status. Marx sets labour entirely within the realm of necessity.

The "realm of necessity" (the production of requirements necessary for biological survival) still exists, but the time spent on this is greatly reduced by the growth in the productive forces, and by a voluntary division of labour arising from a process of education through labour. This creates the preconditions for the "realm of freedom", when individuals are able to develop their potential to their full ability, in their leisure time. According to Marx in Capital "the sphere of material production remains a realm of necessity, and the true realm of freedom begins only in leisure time".

Politics no longer exists under communism. The destruction of the division of labour and of a class-based society removes the basis for a coercive state apparatus which will disappear eventually. In its stead there would be a nonpolitical authority, or administration of communist society which is communitarian, democratic, participative and non-coercive. Civil and political society become fused, and the dichotomy between the individual as citizen and as private individual is overcome, as:

Only when the real individual man will absorb back the abstract citizen of the state and—as individual man, in his empirical life, in his individual work, in his individual relationships—will become the species-being, only when man will recognise and will organise his "forces propres" as social forces and, consequently, will not separate from himself the social force in form of political force any more, only then the emancipation of man will be accomplished. The individual recovers his/her true being: self-realization through self-transcendence. Marx on socialism and communism: a summary and interpretation the dominant themes of Marx's writings on socialism and communism were shaped by his worldview, which synthesized various intellectual currents of the nineteenth century. Attempting to distill the essence of Marx's enormous body of work is inherently reductionist and problematic. Acknowledging these limitations, five strands can be identified that were to play a significant role in shaping Soviet socialism.

As opposed to the idealistic philosophers, Marx considered matter to be primary in explaining the nature of the world. The world was governed by laws of nature and these laws were knowable. Secondly, Marx's view of history lies within the positivist tradition: linear, progressive and ideological. History was moving towards a preordained end, and the laws governing the historical process were also open to human understanding and explanation. Both these aspects of Marx's world outlook place Marx firmly within the Enlightenment tradition of rationalism and the enthronement of human reason. This was scientific socialism.

Thirdly, Marx's theories were informed by a profound sense of rationalism and constructivism. Marx's faith in the ability of human reason to understand the world, and his belief in the teleology of historical materialism combined to promote an awareness that the future society could be consciously constructed. Social processes could be guided, social change directed. This is best illustrated by attitudes to the market. The market under capitalism was an anarchic mechanism, outside of human control. In the future society, there would be no market, as socalism would be a society subject to the dictates of human reason and rationality, embodied in the planning apparatus for the provision of social needs. As Julian Cooper has noted: At the core of Bolshevik-Marxist-Leninist ideology has been the conviction that socialism must be constructed by conscious human action according to a preconceived plan. Not only was socialism conceived as a task on a grand scale, but this very mode of development was understood to express the superiority of the new social formation. "But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality" (Marx). Here we have one of the original sources of the constructivist discourse. This constructivist ethos found expression, in the Soviet Union after 1917, in a form of social engineering which was to have a profound influence on the form Soviet socialism was to take, and upon the nature of Soviet society. Fourthly, Marx's view of human nature was an Enlightenment derived one.

Marx had an optimistic view of humanity. Freed from the fetters and constraints of bourgeois society, individuals could live harmoniously with one another. Removing the basis for exploitation, and overcoming alienation would facilitate the emergence of a society of harmony, unity and voluntary co-operation. Human beings were essentially social beings, who discovered their true humanity in a social context. In the sixth thesis on Feuerbach, Marx wrote that, "But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single in dividual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations". In this sense, Marx's view of socialism can be seen to lie on the collectivist/ egalitarian/fraternalist wing of socialism as a doctrine. In the post-revolutionary discourse developed by the Bolshevik wing of Russian social-democracy, these notions of perfectibility, constructivism and the absence of an unchanging core of human attributes left the way open for the Bolsheviks to consider the reshaping of humankind in the image of the "New Socialist Person" to be both legitimate and desirable. Lastly, Marx's writings are imbued with productivist notions. The centrality of production to human history as the motor of progress ensured that the organization of production was the key issue to be resolved by the dominant class in each epoch.

Added to this is the idea encapsulated by Harding, "Humans enter society, therefore, in their capacity as labouring beings and the object of their association with others is to maximize their material satisfaction". Individuals were defined as bearers of labour-power. With production as the basis of every social system, productive issues assumed primacy over all others. From these underlying principles, it is possible to summarize the key features of the post-capitalist society envisaged by Marx, which was to exert such a profound hold on the imagination and thought of the Russian Marxists. The final outcome of history was a society free from alienation, in which individuals realize themselves fully, and become truly human for the first time. As we have seen, Marx was both vague and ambiguous beyond this very general description. In particular, the Romanticist impulse within Marx sought to establish a society of unity, harmony and community, in which freedom was found in a society of diverse creative labour. This was a rejection of capitalism and its workings. The modernist Marx viewed freedom outside of labour, in the enjoyment of leisure and of material plenty. This conception sought to take over capitalism in order to extend and universalize its principles, especially the domination of nature. Freedom would come when humanity finally controlled nature, and so was in control of its destiny for the first time. It was this latter conception that

came to predominate in Bolshevik thinking. This became "orthodoxy" within the Bolshevik wing of the RSDLP because of a conjunction of factors: the non-availability of Marx's early writings before 1932, the mediation of the thought of Engels and Plekhanov and the interpretations provided by Russian Marxists. Many other outcomes or conceptions of socialism were possible from the corpus of Marx's works. The key features of the transitional or lower stage (socialism as it has become known) are summarized below. Under socialism production would be increasingly geared towards use, not exchange. To overcome the anarchy, waste and inefficiency of the capitalist market required central control and planning of the economy [4], [5]. To overcome the poverty and immiserisation induced by capitalism required central equitable distribution of goods, initially based on work (and so bringing inequality) but eventually based on need. Indeed, labour in the transition era was a responsibility for allto undertake. Allthese measures were a negation of capitalism. Atthe same time, the central agencies of economic direction (whatever they may be) would introduce measures to increase the development of the productive forces in the most rapid manner possible. Only in this way could a society of material abundance and maximum leisure time be achieved. The maximization of productivity was a central aim of the transitional era.

The future society would be a collectivist, internationalist, non-political one. The transition to this was a problematic issue. Should the capitalist state be taken over and used as a repressive tool and as the central co-ordinating and directing agency for the transformation of society? Or should it be smashed and the administration of society devolved onto self-governing organs of popular control? In other words, what was meant by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat? Was it possible to combine a conception of the post-revolutionary state (the socalled "Commune model"), which tended towards the Romanticist notion of the future society, with the modernist tasks of centralization, expropriation and transformation of the productive forces? This question was to produce fierce debate within the Russian Social-Democratic Movement in the lead.

Friedrich Engels

Engels played a significant role in the codification of a Marxist orthodoxy. His interpretation of Marx's ideas had a profound influence on the understanding of socialism among Russian Marxists. Indeed, prior to 1914 Engels had a far higher reputation than Marx.55 In what ways did Engels shape the ideas of Karl Marx? Engels accentuated the "scientific" aspects of Marx's theories. He was interested in the links between the materialist conception of history, and the laws of nature. Engels' emphasis upon the scientific aspects of the movement of history led to a one-sided interpretation that highlighted the deterministic law governed evolution of history. This denuded the concept of revolutionary praxis as the driving-force of history which lay at the centre of Marx's views. In the place of the original dialectical conception, in which critical thought was validated by revolutionary action, there now appeared a cast-iron system of laws from which the inevitability of socialism could be deduced with almost mathematical certainty. Although Engels initiated this process, the evolution of Marxism into a scientistic, deterministic doctrine was an unforeseen consequence of his writings after Marx's death. The general implications of the claims for a scientific status for Marx's writings strongly accentuated the rationalist outlook of Soviet socialism.

It imbued their worldview with a high degree of certitude, rendered it intolerant of alternative views and emphasized the ability of adherents to be able to plan and construct the new society. Hence, in Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Engels was to write: These two great discoveries, the materialist conception of history and the revelation of the secret of capitalist

production through surplus value, we owe to Marx. With them, socialism became a science, which had now to be elaborated in all its details and interconnections. His greatest influence can be found in Anti-Dubring (Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science), published first in 1877–8.58 This work was ostensibly aimed at countering the influence of Duhring in the German socialist movement. The nature of the text a systematic ordering of the views of Marx and Engels across a variety of themes soon accorded it a significant role in the codification of a particular interpretation of Marx's views.

The specific emphases contained within Anti-Dubring "resolved" many of the tensions within the writings of Marx, contributing to the hegemony of a rationalistic, modernist, productivist interpretation of Marx. The Romanticist strand slipped quietly into obscurity as first Engels, and then Plekhanov, Kautsky, Lenin et al. began to elaborate and develop Marx's thought. All of the central features of Marx's philosophical and doctrinal approach to the future society can be found in Anti-Duhring. The stress on productivism and constructivism is particularly acute [6]–[8]: The materialist conception of history starts from the principle that production and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of every social order. Engels continues to outline the central features of the future society. Social planning of production, non-commodity economy, largescale production, viz., "the seizure of the means of production by society eliminates commodity production", "the anarchy within social production is replaced by consciously planned organization", "only a society which enables its productive forces to mesh harmoniously on the basis of one single vast plan can allow industry to be dispersed over the whole country".

In particular, Engels uses the phrase "by generating a race of producers", encapsulating the one-sided conception of individuals as "bearers of labour-power", and the constructivist optimism that the human personality can be moulded, shaped, engineered. In Anti-Duhring Engels set out the classic formulae for the evolution of the post-revolutionary state. It is worth quoting at length: As soon as there is no social class to be held in subjection any longer, as soon as class domination and the struggle for individual existence based on the anarchy of production existing up to now are eliminated together with the collisions and excesses arising from them, there is nothing more to repress, nothing necessitating a special repressive force, a state.

The first act in which the state really comes forward as the representative of the whole of society is at the same time its last independent act as a state. The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the processes of production. The state is not "abolished", it withers away. This conception reinforces the idea of the state as expropriator and oppressor, which will "wither away" in the long term. In other words, the proletariat must seize the state in order to take control of the means of production and nullify the old classes in a political sense.

After this, it will disappear as a political entity, but will remain, in Bender's words, as an "economic planning bureau". In Engels' vision, a central public authority would remain after the revolution, as a means of directing the economy. The abolition of the capitalist division of labour and of scarcity (owing to the rapid development of the productive forces) will lead inexorably to the abolition of classes. Society will be governed by notions of collectivism and co-operation. Interestingly, Engels also foresaw the eventual homogeneity of communism: the town/country distinction would be abolished and the two would be "fused". Large towns would be eliminated! The nature of the "realm of freedom under communism" (freedom through creative labour, or through enjoyment of leisure time) was resolved firmly in favour of the latter by Engels.

The nature of freedom is defined in terms of control over nature: The conditions of existence environing and hitherto dominating humanity now pass under the dominion and control of humanity, which now for the first time becomes the real conscious master of nature. In similar vein, productive work is defined as "this natural condition of human existence", but the development of the productive forces will "reduce the time needed for work to a point which will be small indeed in the light of our present conceptions".

The stress Engels laid upon abolishing the spontaneity of market forces, on centralizing control of the economy, and on maximizing productivity was to shape the outlook of the Russian Marxist movement profoundly. His influence is central to an understanding of the emergence of a Soviet model of socialism. It is to the specific Russian context that we must now turn. Socialism in Russia: Lenin, Bolshevism and Russian social democracy the ideas about socialism that became predominant in Russia prior to 1917 were produced out of the contact of Marx's ideas (mediated substantially by Engels and Kautsky) with the traditions of Russian socialism.

The character of Russian social-democracy has been the subject of intense dispute, as theorists have disagreed over the extent to which the "Russianness" displaced "Marxism" from the centre of its worldview. This debate is accentuated by those who argue that the doctrinal basis of Russian social-democracy was also profoundly shaped by the socio-political and economic structure of autocratic Russia. The political activities of the Russian Marxists imposed the need to synthesize their theoretical positions with their revolutionary activities.

Russian Marxism was profoundly influenced by both Russia's intellectual heritage, and also by the semi-feudal, agrarian, backward nature of her economic and social structure. From the time of its emergence, Russian socialism was marked by a strong tendency towards egalitarianism, maximalism and collectivism. It grew out of the general movement for change and reform that emerged from the and which burgeoned under the impact of the reforms of the 1860s. Its maximalist tendency derived from the intransigence of the autocratic state.

The prospects for liberalization or piecemeal reform were consistently frustrated. The socialist movement was the radical wing of the movement for change, expressing the desire for a total restructuring of Russian society. The so-called "parliamentary road" to socialism was not an option in nineteenth century Russia. The collectivist and egalitarian traditions of Russian socialism stem from the Populist legacy.

Populists argued that the peasant commune would form the basis for the revolutionary transformation of Russia into a democratic, decentralized egalitarian state. In this way, the twin evils of autocratic rule based on serfdom, and capitalist exploitation and degradation could be overcome and avoided. Populists wished, in Marxist terms, to "bypass" capitalism. Interestingly, Marx himself raised the possibility of a peculiar "Russian Road" to socialism, based on the peasant commune. Although Populism suffered a serious setback in the 1870s with the catastrophic failure of the "Going to the People" movement, it influenced Russian Marxism in two ways. First, the commitment to a collectivist, egalitarian approach to post-revolutionary social and economic organization: secondly, the strategy and tactics of revolution.

Populism, in varying ways, outlined a key role for the intelligentsia in the making of a revolution. The backwardness of the masses (in terms of political consciousness, and cultural and educational development), and the antipathy of the autocratic state to autonomous political and social movements created the need for an elite group of revolutionaries.

Although different theorists conceptualized the role of the intellectuals in different ways educate the masses for self-emancipation, seize control of the state through a coup, or smash the state through a revolutionary uprising the question of revolutionary strategy was a contentious one in the history of Russian social democracy.

Although Russian Marxists departed significantly from many populist ideas and approaches, the underlying influence of Populism on Russian Marxists and Russian Marxism should not be underestimated. Russian social-democracy Western scholarship on Russian and Soviet history has, until recently, tended to view the Russian social democratic movement and its ideology monolithically. Reading history backwards, the uniform, rigid, dogmatic ideology of the Stalinist years is seen to have its origins in the Leninist interpretation of Marxism which was pre-eminent before and after 1917.

This is a misleading viewpoint. Russian Marxism before the revolution was an inherently pluralistic phenomenon. It was marked by substantial disputes, debates and differences of approach. The reason for this lies in the need of Russian social-democracy for doctrinal specificity. Although the Russian Marxists continued to be animated in their revolutionary activities by the views of the future society put forward by Marx and Engels, they also sought to fill in the details of both the revolutionary process and the aftermath of the revolution.

Disputes arose as theorists attempted to apply Marx and Engels' ideas to the Russian context. It was in this crucible that a Soviet model of socialism was forged. The acknowledged founder of the Marxist movement in Russia. the RSDLP was formed in Minsk. At the outset, it was marked by a high degree of internal conflict over specific components of revolutionary strategy, while sharing a set of common assumptions about the future of the post-revolutionary society. Perhaps the most consistent feature of Russian Marxism was the search for doctrinal orthodoxy.

Primarily this can be explained by the sociological composition of the RSDLP, and the structure of political activity in Tsarist Russia. It was overwhelmingly a movement of intellectuals. A central feature of the Russian intelligentsia was its "search for comprehensiveness…and a commitment to science and rationalism".

Establishing the fundamental premises before identifying specifics or practicalities underpinned the outlook of much of the Russian intelligentsia, and this practice was assimilated into the Russian Marxist movement. This intellectual outlook was substantiated by the political context of Tsarist Russia. As Harding has noted, "in the absence of a strong labour movement or a mass party, the intelligentsia needed the security of proper method and undiluted theoretical orthodoxy". The obsessive concern with fundamental ideological purity, with theorizing the practicalities of revolution created a climate of intellectual conflict and intolerance.

The Russian Marxist movement was constantly engaged in polemical struggles, both internally and externally, and this contributed to the creation of a maximalist and extremist mindset. The evolution of Russian Marxism into a specific body of doctrine is only understood fully in its relations with Populism. The relationship is a complex one. Many of the central figures of the RSDLP had their roots in the populist movement, and had links with the peasant socialist movement.

In particular, the issues of the relationship between the revolutionary organization and the masses, and the promotion of a collectivist ethos in social and economic affairs, derived from the populist soil in which Russian Marxism grew. The precise nature of these links, and the

extent of influence of populist ideals is a matter of some dispute though. Theoretically, Russian Marxism represented a fundamental break with the core ideas of Populism.

The progressive role of capitalism in creating the preconditions for socialism, and the primacy afforded to the role of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle represented a diametrical opposition to populist theorists who emphasized the need to bypass capitalism, and the central role of the peasant commune as the basis of the new socialist order. Russian Marxism both grew out of and broke with Populism at the end of the nineteenth century.

There is also another level to the relationship. Russian Marxism was formed by its polemical struggles, within and without. In the early stages. Russian Marxists were engaged in constant polemics with the proponents of agrarian socialism, which forced them to define their attitudes across a whole spectrum of issues, including land policy, attitudes towards differentiation among the peasantry and much more besides. The position taken upon the peasant question, in particular, played a fundamental role in shaping the postrevolutionary attitudes of the Bolsheviks to the prickly agrarian question.

In tandem with these disputes with the groups Lenin named “Friends of the People”, Russian Marxism was also convulsed with internal disputes. Two issues stand out: the question of party organization and proletarian consciousness, and the tactics and strategy of the “first” stage of the revolution. Russian Marxism was riven with factions. In the aftermath of its formation as a political movement in 1898, different tendencies began to emerge.

“Economism” (stressing the primacy of the economic struggle of the workers and the need to detach this from the wider political struggle), and Legal Marxism (stressing the potential inherent in a Bernsteinian approach combined with a movement for political reforms) being the most notable examples. The tendency for the establishment of doctrinal orthodoxy resulted in the division of the RSDLP into two wings in 1903.

The issue was one of party organization. Divisions emerged over whether the party should be an elite vanguard of professional revolutionaries, or a mass movement. Lenin argued (in line with Plekhanov’s earlier works) in What is to be done? that the workers by themselves could only attain to “trade-union consciousness”, that is, a concern with their immediate material needs (wages, conditions, etc.).

To attain to “Social Democrat” (that is revolutionary) consciousness required a disciplined organization of revolutionaries, armed with the “correct” ideology who would lead and guide the workers: Hence our task, the task of Social-Democracy, is to combat spontaneity, to divert the working-class movement from this spontaneous trade-unionist striving to come under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Clearly, there was an important practical aspect to this theory. A mass movement was inappropriate in the repressive conditions of Tsarism. A tightly knit organization would be more difficult to infiltrate [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

The Evolution and Realisation of Communist Society's Higher Phase explores Karl Marx's deep intellectual journey, imagining the evolution from lower to higher communism and the complex sociological changes that underlie this trajectory. The constant pursuit of the pinnacle of collective progress, motivated by the values of equality, shared prosperity, and personal fulfilment, is at the core of this story.

The elimination of labour division and the restraints of market-driven pressures are two examples of how the restrictions of the lower phase have been transcended, which is at the heart of this progression. In the end, Marx's vivid depiction fosters an atmosphere where labour is no longer just a means of existence but a basic part of enhanced life experiences.

It emphasises the dissolving of the dichotomy between mental and physical labour. An evolution of economic paradigms marks the beginning of the higher phase. Production shifts from being driven by trade value to prioritising use value, ushering in an age of plenty as opposed to scarcity. The foundation is laid for an unparalleled superabundance of resources via collective ownership of the means of production, reshaping the socioeconomic landscape.

Marx's later argument that labour belongs in the category of necessity and his earlier view of it as a component of freedom oscillate within the complex world of labour, undergoing a subtle change. The expansion of productive forces and a voluntary division of labour enable this labor-centric progress, which in turn fosters a setting in which people may realise their full potentials during downtime. This journey's political course is equally significant. Class-based social structures must be destroyed in order for coercive state apparatuses to be replaced with a democratic, participatory government that combines the civil and political spheres.

The individual's identities as a citizen and a private entity combine in this new socio-political paradigm, generating a feeling of cohesion and shared purpose. The Evolution and Realisation of Communist Society's Higher Phase follows the complex interconnections of historical development, social restructuring, economic redefinition, labour reevaluation, and political change. Marx's vision is a paradigm shift that eventually results in the realisation of human potential within a genuinely advanced communist society by embracing the holistic goals of equality, self-realization, and social wealth.

CONCLUSION

The deep insight "The Evolution and Realisation of Communist Society's Higher Phase" offers on how human societies might transcend division, inequality, and repressive institutions. It presents a persuasive vision of an idealised but actively sought future in which the possibilities for individual fulfilment, societal wealth, and unification exist. The limits of human potential are widened and the quest of collective well-being takes priority over pursuit of selfish interests in the higher stage of communism. Marx's ideals continue to serve as a beacon of hope for civilizations as they strive to become more just, wealthy, and harmonious as a whole.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Freitas, H. A. Almeida, H. Bártolo, and P. J. Bártolo, “Sustainability in extrusion-based additive manufacturing technologies,” *Prog. Addit. Manuf.*, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s40964-016-0007-6.

[2] A. H. Khudair, K. M. A. Abd, and A. M. Fahmi, “Impact of strategic planning practices on academic marketing in Iraqi higher education,” *Acad. Strateg. Manag. J.*, 2019.

[3] Y. Xu, J. Li, M. Zhang, and D. Wang, “Modified simultaneous saccharification and fermentation to enhance bioethanol titers and yields,” *Fuel*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.fuel.2017.11.072.

[4] M. Campillo-Labrandero,“Investigación traslacional en ciencias de la salud: implicaciones educativas y retos,” *Inv Ed Med Univ. Autónoma México*, 2018.

[5] F. Hernández-Carrillo, “Investigación traslacional en ciencias de la salud: implicaciones educativas y retos TT - Translational research in health sciences: Educational implications and challenges,” *Investig. en Educ. médica*, 2018.

[6] M. Sánchez-Mendiola, “Translational research in health sciences: Educational implications and challenges,” *Investig. en Educ. Médica*, 2018, doi: 10.22201/facmed.20075057e.2018.28.18146.

[7] F. Corcelli, G. Fiorentino, J. Vehmas, and S. Ulgiati, “Energy efficiency and environmental assessment of papermaking from chemical pulp - A Finland case study,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.07.018.

[8] Y. Kim, C. S. Carver, R. L. Spillers, C. Crammer, and E. S. Zhou, “Individual and dyadic relations between spiritual well-being and quality of life among cancer survivors and their spousal caregivers,” *Psychooncology.*, 2011, doi: 10.1002/pon.1778.

[9] A. Choi-Fitzpatrick and G. Hoople, “Cultivating an entrepreneurial mindset: An interdisciplinary approach using drones,” *Adv. Eng. Educ.*, 2019.

[10] V. Biramane, H. Kulkarni, A. Bhave, and P. Kosamkar, “Relationships between classical factors, social factors and box office collections,” in *2016 International Conference on Internet of Things and Applications, IOTA 2016*, 2016. doi: 10.1109/IOTA.2016.7562691.

CHAPTER 3

AN OVERVIEW OF EVOLUTION OF BOLSHEVIK SOCIALIST THOUGHT

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities,Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

Charting the development of Bolshevik socialist thinking from the pre-revolutionary era to the post-1917 era. It explores the many ideals and viewpoints, originating in the Russian Marxist movement of the early 20th century, that influenced Bolshevik thought. Marx's theories were interpreted in a dynamic but cogent framework by significant individuals including Engels, Plekhanov, Kautsky, and Lenin. This examination examines how post-revolutionary governmental institutions and social goals are conceptualized clearly against how implementation specifics are hazy. Notably, the ascent to power of the Bolsheviks was based on broad ideas rather than a specific economic plan. Engelian-Kautskian Marxism, which is characterized by rationality, materialism, and collectivism, served as the foundation for the dominant socialist and communist worldview. In order to create a foundation for plenty and a new socio-consciousness, it argued for a fundamental change in the Russian economy. However, conflicts still existed between the Romanticist interpretation of communism, which placed a strong emphasis on harmony and a life free of alienation, and the modernizing quest of production and efficiency. The post-revolutionary Bolshevik conflicts saw the development of this tension, which oscillated between hierarchical imposition, centralization and decentralization, and popular rule. This investigation illuminates the complex character of Bolshevik ideology at a crucial historical turning point.

KEYWORDS:

Bolsheviks, Bolshevik Thinking, Pre-Revolutionary, Marxist Movement Socialist Thought.

INTRODUCTION

Before the revolution, Soviet socialism After 1917, the notion of socialism that guided Bolshevik thought and, therefore, policy-making, was composed of a variety of principles and viewpoints that were developed and refined during the Russian Marxist movement at the start of the twentieth century. Through Engels, Plekhanov, Kautsky, Lenin, and others, a specific interpretation of Marx's ideas and viewpoint emerged that was both well-defined and flexible at the same time. It was evident what the fundamental components of the post-revolutionary state would look like and how society would develop. The information was mostly hazy. In particular, and startlingly, many analysts have pointed out that the Bolsheviks only had a set of principles when they seized power in October 1917, rather than a comprehensive plan for governing the economy. As we've seen, the Engelian-Kautskian interpretation of Marxism served as a major influence on the RSDLP's view of socialism and communism. It had a strong constructivist mindset and was based on a rationalist, scientific, materialist basis. It advocated collectivism, equality, and internationalism; it saw the world in harsh class-based terms; and it was supported by a conception of people that was basically productivist: people were seen as the carriers of labor-power. By accelerating the development of the productive forces, the Russian economy's structural transformation would

not only lay the groundwork for a society of material abundance but would also transform people's values and perspectives, giving rise to the New Socialist Man/Woman. Large-scale industry was essential for advancing society. Within the general framework of comprehending the transition from capitalism to communism, however, there are still some significant contradictions. Following the revolution, the tension between Bolshevism as a political movement and Marx's writings in particular, the Romanticist understanding of communism a society free from alienation in which people lived in cooperative and creative communities expressing an essential unity between individuals, individuals and nature and the essentially modernizing understanding of the transitional phase was particularly apparent. Numerous Bolsheviks were steadfast modernizers.

The alteration of social, economic, and political systems would make it easier for people to fulfil their goals and control and manipulate nature. The modernizing strand aimed to increase economic efficiency and production. A large portion of Bolsheviks prioritized a radically libertarian agenda. This "Romanticist" movement focused on eradicating institutions that supported and encouraged dominance and exploitation as well as the causes of alienation.

After 1917, this tension became apparent in the conflict between the impulses for decentralization, popular rule, and self-government and the need to expand production, centralize, discipline, and impose hierarchies. There were still additional problems to tackle. The broad dimensions of the transition era were not translated into a series of unambiguous, distinct policy measures by the Bolsheviks.

In order to specify the focus to be put on certain programmers, the popular revolutionary movement, non-Bolshevik socialist organizations, as well as people and groupings inside the Bolshevik party, produced alternatives, critiques, and ideas. In a nutshell, what did the broad characteristics of socialism signify specifically? The debate between centralization and decentralization (and the specific definitions of these words in both economic and political contexts) remained one of the major conflicts and ill-defined phrases in Bolshevik rhetoric [1]–[3].

i) The conflict between elite, technocratic control of social processes and popular control and participation in politics;
ii) The twin demands of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to repress and emancipate;
iii) The definition of "central planning";
iv) The degree of inequality that would be tolerated under socialism as acceptable through the application of the Marxist dictum, "from each according to his ability, to each according" On some level, the West was an alien culture that needed to be resisted, overturned, and rejected.

The link between the party, the state apparatus, and the network of Soviets were to be adopted, imitated, and borrowed on a different level from its technology, working methods, and "modernist" character. In the years after 1917, when Bolshevik ideologies came into touch with Russian society, a Soviet-style socialism began to take shape. A certain interpretation with a number of essential components became the dominant one. This notion was not entirely static, however.

The shifting perceptions of these issues by various leaders may help to understand how Soviet socialism changed in the future. The chapters that follow describe how this hegemonic paradigm first emerged, how it was seen, how it was modified, and how it was finally discarded and replaced under Gorbachev.

Utopianism, or the desire to change the world, was, as Read has noted, "the most important factor underlying Bolshevik initiatives." After gaining control in October 1917, they had a world to change. How did the experience of having power alter their perception of socialism? How far did the Bolshevik conception of the transitional period influence the immediate character of the post-revolutionary system? The Bolsheviks were ready to begin the process of putting their ideas into action.

Throughout history, the evolution of ideas has often impacted the destiny of nations and civilizations. Among these inspirational tales, the Bolshevik movement stands out as a crucial element that not only altered the course of Russian history but also had a profound impact on the international political landscape. The Bolsheviks' ascent to power in 1917 marked a turning point in human history, ushering in a time of radical change and ideological experimentation. The core of this movement was the Bolshevik socialist ideology, a complex web of beliefs. This in-depth examination embarks on a historical journey, tracing the intricate development of this ideology from its infancy in imperial Russia through its many manifestations in the decades after 1917.

The backdrop for the rise of the Bolshevik revolution was a society in transition, where existing hierarchies were being challenged by the forces of industrialization, urbanization, and increasing intellectual opposition. The Bolshevik leaders' conception of socialism did not consist of a fixed set of contradictory beliefs and principles. These conceptual foundations were explored and improved upon in the Russian Marxist movement of the early 20th century. Important figures like Engels, Plekhanov, Kautsky, and Lenin made substantial contributions to the development of this ideology by offering well-defined interpretations of Marx's core ideas that were also adaptable enough to shift in the face of new facts.

The core of Bolshevik socialist ideology was the idea of a post-revolutionary state structure and the direction society should take. The general concepts were clear, but the details were sometimes murky. Surprisingly, the Bolsheviks came to power with a set of general ideals rather than a well-thought-out economic strategy. In light of the reality of governance and the need to lead a nation through difficult times, this theoretical framework would soon be put to the test and developed.

Fundamentally, the Bolshevik movement's understanding of socialism and communism was greatly influenced by the Engelian-Kautskian school of Marxism. This stream, which was characterized by rationalism, scientific materialism, and a strong sense of constructivism, served as the basis for the ideology. It had a clear class-based outlook on society and had collectivism, equality, and internationalism as its pillars. The restructuring of the Russian economy served as the turning point for the creation of the New Socialist Man/Woman and a bountiful society, and people were considered as mere labor-power carriers [4], [5]. Conflicts did, however, continue even within the broad parameters of this arrangement. These disagreements had their roots in Marx's own writings, where there was a fundamental division between the modernizing view of the transitional period and the Romanticist vision of communism, which envisioned a world free from alienation and characterized by cooperative togetherness. The tension between the desires for economic maximization, order, and centralization and the desires for decentralization, people rule, and self-governance played out forcibly in the Bolshevik movement after 1917. This analysis of the growth of socialist ideology among the Bolsheviks uncovers a rich tapestry of ideas that both affected and were impacted by a crucial era in history. Our journey takes us from the conception of these ideas in the early 20th century to their practical ramifications in the post-revolutionary landscape, setting the stage for not only the Soviet experiment but also for a larger discussion on socialism, communism, and the role of ideologies in determining the fate of nations.

DISCUSSION

The development of Bolshevik socialist philosophy is a fascinating investigation into the philosophical foundations of one of history's most important political forces. This review explores the intricate processes by which these concepts developed and shaped the course of events during a turbulent era in Russian and world history.

Historical Context and Ideological Formation: It is essential to place Bolshevik socialist thinking within the larger historical context in order to comprehend the development of this school of thought. Seismic changes, such as rapid industrialization, urbanization, and rising working-class unrest, occurred in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Marxist theories developed during this period of revolutionary dynamics, offering a theoretical foundation for analyzing and criticizing the then-current socio-economic situation. Marxist ideas were formed in Russia by individuals like Georgi Plekhanov and Karl Kautsky, who later influenced the Bolsheviks[6]–[8].

Diversity of Influences: Rather than developing in a straight line, Bolshevik socialist thinking was the result of the intricate interaction of many different influences. The original works of Marx and Engels, as well as Plekhanov's interpretations, Kautsky's modifications, and Lenin's adaptations, were among the many materials that the Bolshevik leaders drew upon. A flexible and dynamic intellectual framework that could adjust to shifting conditions was made possible by this synthesis of concepts.

The Leninist understanding: A key factor in the development of Bolshevik ideology was Vladimir Lenin's understanding of Marxist theory. His important writings, including "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" and "State and Revolution," helped to lay the framework for the application of Marxist ideas in a practical way in the Russian setting. Bolshevik ideology was distinguished primarily by Lenin's focus on the vanguard party and the need of a violent overthrow of the bourgeois state.

The Pragmatic Revolution: The capacity of the Bolsheviks to put their ideological ideals into practice was a fascinating part of their rise to power. Although they lacked a comprehensive economic strategy, the Bolsheviks showed a practical approach to government. The conditions of post-revolutionary Russia required quick judgements and answers to urgent problems, therefore this pragmatism was formed out of necessity.

Tensions in Bolshevik Thought

The overview draws attention to the underlying conflicts in Bolshevik socialist theory. On the one side, there was a push for industrialization, modernization, and centralized management of the economy. The goal of this strategy was to maximize output and effectiveness in line with the Marxist emphasis on the shift from capitalism to communism. The removal of hierarchical systems, decentralization, and human liberty, on the other hand, were the main themes of a more romanticized branch of the movement. The conflict between the realistic and the idealistic persisted and impacted Bolshevik policy.

Legacy and Implications: The development of Bolshevik socialist thinking has significant ramifications for both Russia and the rest of the globe. The Soviet Union was founded as a result of the Bolshevik experiment, and it later emerged as a major actor in the world with implications for ideology, geopolitics, and the economy. The conflicts between modernization and human emancipation, as well as the tensions between centralization and decentralization that were highlighted in this review, persisted throughout the Soviet period.

Discussions of socialism, communism, and political ideologies continue to be pertinent today in light of the study of Bolshevik socialist ideology. In current discussions concerning the functions of the state, the market, and human agency in forming societies, the conflicts between centralized planning and individual liberty, economic control and creative expression, continue to resound[9], [10].

The summary of the development of Bolshevik socialist philosophy, in conclusion, offers a nuanced picture of how a complex interplay of influences, adaptations, and conflicts developed an ideology that changed societies and changed the course of global history. This investigation provides evidence of the concepts' persistent influence on the development of human affairs.

CONCLUSION

The development of Bolshevik socialist thinking is a journey that travels through both the subtle labyrinth of ideological change and the historical outlines of a revolutionary moment. The multidimensional character of an ideology that arose in reaction to the seismic changes of its time has been highlighted in this review, laying the groundwork for a new chapter in human history.It becomes clear that the Bolshevik movement was a confluence of several forces if we consider the historical setting that fostered the emergence of the Bolshevik ideology. The intellectual landscape was a rich tapestry stitched together from many strands, ranging from the writings of Marx and Engels to the reinterpretations of Plekhanov, Kautsky, and Lenin. Because of this variety, Bolshevik thinking was able to adapt, which was essential for surviving the difficulties of a fast-changing environment.The Bolsheviks built an ideological structure that was influenced by Lenin's pragmatic outlook. The pragmatic realism that characterized the Bolsheviks' approach to administration signaled the change from theory to practice. The demands of the revolution necessitated choices that often deviated from pure ideological dogma, but this pragmatic approach highlighted the movement's capacity to put theory into practice.Bolshevik socialist theory has tensions, which is now a living example of the complexity of human desires. The conflict that characterized Bolshevik policy-making was captured by the contrast between modernizing impulses, seeking industrialization and economic development, and the Romanticist longing for human liberty and decentralization. This conflict paralleled the larger philosophical dilemmas around how to balance individual freedom with social advancement.

REFERENCES

[1] V. Ya.Yatsenko, “Activities of the Ekaterinoslav City Duma in the context of the events of the end of December 1917,” *Probl. Polit. Hist. Ukr.*, 2019, doi: 10.33287/11912.

[2] T. Dmitriev, “Max Weber and the November Revolution of 1918 in Germany; or, Why bolshevism had no chance in the west,” *Russ. Sociol. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.17323/1728-192x-2019-2-146-173.

[3] Francisco Dominguez, “The sui generis Impact of the Russian Revolution on Latin America,” *J. Glob. Faultlines*, 2018, doi: 10.13169/jglobfaul.4.2.0123.

[4] J. de V. Loder, “The ‘February’ Revolution,” in *Bolshevism in Perspective*, 2018. doi: 10.4324/9781315115108-2.

[5] D. S. F. Makhieber, “Trotsky and his role in the revolution of 1905 - 1907 in Russian,” *ALUSTATH J. Hum. Soc. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.36473/ujhss.v224i2.274.

[6] V. Barnett, *A history of Russian economic thought*. 2013. doi: 10.4324/9780203171967.

[7] A. Bosiacki, "On the way between Utopia and totalitarianism. The Bolshevik constitution of 1918 as a model of socialist constitutionalism," *BRICS Law J.*, 2019, doi: 10.21684/2412-2343-2019-6-3-49-77.

[8] A. Sturmthal, *Workers Councils*. 1964. doi: 10.4159/harvard.9780674335318.

[9] I. Ijabs, "The nation of the socialist intelligentsia: The national issue in the political thought of early Latvian socialism," *East Cent. Eur.*, 2012, doi: 10.1163/18763308-03903002.

[10] E. Laursen, "'A New Enigmatic Language': The Spontaneity-Consciousness Paradigm and the Case of Gladkov's Cement," *Slavic Rev.*, 2006, doi: 10.2307/4148523.

CHAPTER 4

AN EXPLORATION OF MIDST OF THE CHAOS

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities,Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The turbulent environment that the Bolsheviks faced while coping with the difficulties of post-revolutionary rule. The Bolsheviks had the difficult challenge of turning their principles into workable solutions in the face of a confluence of difficulties including war, economic instability, social unrest, and geopolitical antagonism. Three separate historical eras are used to chart the development of the ideals, principles, and institutional structures that made up the Soviet concept of socialism, offering insight on the intricate relationship between philosophy and policy.

This research addresses the gap between the ambitions of the public and the party leadership while highlighting the delicate balancing act between overthrowing the old system and building the new. The investigation reveals the difficulties and complexity that defined this important period in the Bolshevik journey via the prism of historical dynamics and ideological disputes.

KEYWORDS:

Bolsheviks, Chaos, Exploration, Governance, Post-Revolutionary, Socialism.

INTRODUCTION

The Bolsheviks faced a significant and immediate struggle as a result of Russian reality. An unfavorable environment for the development of socialism included war, economic upheaval, social unrest, foreign antagonism, and political turbulence. In this setting, the Bolsheviks faced the challenge of running the nation on a daily basis while applying their ideals to an endless array of issues, crises, and procedures. The way in which the collection of values, principles, ideas, and institutional prefigurates that made up the Soviet view of socialism were modified and codified in the years following can be seen by following the development of the Bolshevik understanding of the structure and content of their post-revolutionary society.

For the sake of this research, this time period may be split into three chronological ones: the October Revolution through January. Up until recently, many historians of this era (both Western and Soviet) considered these times as separate epochs that included significant changes in philosophy and policy. throughout fact, many identify distinct "models" of socialism rather than variations on a fundamental set of ideals and principles throughout the two periods of War Communism and [1]–[3].

It was inevitable that the Bolshevik ideas would be difficult to realize. The Bolshevik agenda had a contingency aspect due to unfavorable local conditions and a claimed reliance on a victorious global socialist revolution. Finding the ideal balance between destroying the old and creating the new was an essential part of the process of managing the shift.

The gap between the goals of the worker, peasant, soldier, and sailor popular movement and those of the party leadership presented the party with another acute problem. In the nine months between October 1917 and June 1918, as the leadership tried to impose and prove its beliefs in practice, there was a conflict between various concepts of the social, economic, and political organization of the revolutionary state.

The decrees of the revolution

The laws passed after October were a recognition of reality by the leaders of the revolution. The decrees on land and peace of November 8 and the decree on workers' control of November 27 only provided legal cover for the transformation of Russian society following February 1917. Although there are sporadic hints of future policy, these legislative measures replaced the long-term aspirations of Bolshevism with the de facto realities.

Land grabs by peasants received governmental approval. Both private ownership and contracted work were outlawed. Rural land committees of the local Soviets were given control for the redistribution of lands owned by landlords, churches, and the government (peasant small-holdings were excluded from this procedure). To those who were growing it, use was transferred. Any reference to the Bolsheviks' long-term goal of creating vast estates of cooperative or communal farms was absent from the language of this order. In fact, the average size of the smallholdings in the Russian countryside has decreased. The decree developed model farms (orchards, plantations, and the like) to show off the superiority of socialist methods while also stating that the state held all mineral riches.

Similar to this, the edict on worker control seemed to signify the employees' institutionalization of control over the manufacturing process in each plant. Practically speaking, the order did not adequately justify the specific function, extent, and powers of factory committees, the national economy's structure, the role of labor unions, etc. For many people, the edict symbolized the triumph of the syndicalist inclinations evident in the factory committee movement.

Once again, the decree anticipated larger Bolshevik ideas since several of its sections allude to a hierarchical system of authority. For instance: In all firms, the state has proclaimed that the owners and the representatives of the wage and salary earners who have been chosen to exercise workers control are responsible for upholding the utmost order and discipline and for the preservation of property.

The earliest decrees presented a problem for the new government since various socioeconomic groups and their representatives had diverse and disputed interpretations of the implications of many of the revolutionary policies and slogans that the Bolsheviks embraced throughout 1917. Examining the struggles, the Bolsheviks had in bringing their goals to fruition may help determine the magnitude of these differences [4], [5].

The theory behind state capitalism

The Bolsheviks' top priorities were to boost output and alter ownership relationships. Stability in the near term and a commitment to raising output in the long term were necessary for the transition to socialism and communism. The Bolsheviks were forced to strive to marry practical measures to their broad ideological prescriptions in the midst of revolution, war, social polarization, and economic collapse. The extent to which the Bolsheviks' pragmatic answers were influenced and sculpted by their fundamental beliefs may be seen by looking at the economic policies they implemented during this time.

Lenin's revolutionary tactic in 1917 was heavily reliant on the idea that changes in capitalism's organizational structure had laid the groundwork for a relatively smooth transition to socialism. All that was needed was a method for transforming capitalist private ownership into socialized ownership over a time period in which "accounting and control" responsibilities would be carried out in the best interests of the workers. This would be a "transition within a transition," where capitalist industrialists, modest peasant landholdings, a Soviet state, and workers' control would all coexist.

The first step towards the liberation of the people is the expropriation of the landed estates, the establishment of workers control, and the nationalization of the banks. This was not part of the original Bolshevik agenda. The nationalization of the industries will come next.The first steps taken in the area of ownership relations seemed to support Lenin's strategy. Private property ownership was outlawed by the land decree, however socialized ownership was not implemented. Although some of the responsibilities of the committees inside each plant were set by the decree on workers' control, it was obvious that owners and managers would continue to play a crucial part in the production process. According to the order on the nationalization of the banks, banking became a state monopoly on December 27. The state bank and private banks amalgamated.This served as the foundation for the upcoming "expropriation of the expropriators" and was to be the first step in establishing financial control over industrial businesses.

The strategy on nationalization was seldom coherent amid the confusion. This was made worse by the leadership of the Bolshevik party's intellectual fuzziness. Beyond agreeing that financial capital must be expropriated, the leadership could not agree on the finer points, such as tactics, timelines, and priorities. The factory committees started to "nationalize" factories on their own initiative as a result of the escalating economic crisis, owner opposition, and owner disappearance. These were classified as "punitive" (caused by owners' wrongdoings) or "spontaneous" (because no one was left to operate the factories). Only 5% of the 836 nationalized businesses between November 1917 and March 1918 did so at the center's request. The major reason the center approved these efforts was because they lacked the means to stop them. The months of January and February 1918 show a change in opinion about nationalization. The central started to make an effort to establish itself over the potential fragmentation inherent in taking particular factories "from below" as the focus shifted from the conflict with the owners and managers to the rebuilding of the economy.

The Brest-Litovsk Treaty accelerated this process. It provided a (though fleeting) respite from the prospect of foreign attack. In an effort to give the rebuilding process some degree of coherence, the Bolsheviks tried to nationalize whole sectors or sections of industry rather than single enterprises. After March 1918, economic strategy was governed by the Bolshevik equation (greater centralization equals higher efficiency). The first such event was the nationalization of the sugar sector in May 1918. The lack of competent cadres to carry out this procedure' expansion inhibited it. The nationalization process didn't become systematic or widespread until the leadership saw the consequences of Brest-Litovsk—as shares in Russian companies were being purchased by German groups—which led to the June directive.

The Bolsheviks placed more importance on economic management at this stage of the revolution than they did on the issue of ownership. Before the Sovnarkom decision of June 28, 1918, which nationalized all significant industrial sectors, the issue of the legal ownership of the enterprises sputtered along in a rather haphazard manner. The complicated and erratic nature of the connection between the state, private property owners, and factory committees or local Soviets reflected both the circumstantial disorder and the Bolsheviks' own conceptual

and theoretical ambiguity over the exact definition of "state capitalism" in practice. The introduction of factory committees into this equation hindered efforts to create a balance between private ownership and governmental regulation. The kind of oversight that the state sought to conduct was the most divisive topic. Who was supposed to do this and how? The battle for state control and worker control replaced the earlier conflict between capitalists and proletarians as the main economic issue.There are certain times that serve as "crucibles of transformation," when ideas, events, and ambitions collide to create new paradigms. A period when the future of countries hangs in the balance and making the leap from ideas to action becomes a monumental task is the period after a revolutionary upheaval. With the Bolshevik experience as an example, "An Exploration of Midst of the Chaos" sets out on a quest to untangle the intricate web of difficulties, choices, and dynamics that emerged in the aftermath of a revolutionary storm.

After triumphing in the October Revolution's test of wills, the Bolsheviks found themselves at a turning point in history that was complicated and unclear. After the old system was overthrown, the globe was quickly confronted with the harsh realities of war, economic upheaval, social division, and geopolitical hostility. It was now necessary to channel the revolutionary fervor that had fueled the insurgency towards the administration and rehabilitation of a country racked by several difficulties. The Bolsheviks had to negotiate a complex web of conflicts as they tried to turn their idealistic principles into workable programmers. A problem that called for deft leadership, agility, and a clear knowledge of the complex interaction between theory and reality was the juxtaposition of revolutionary aspirations against the stern realism of governing. This investigation tries to give insight on the Bolsheviks' struggle to create a post-revolutionary society that was in line with their idealistic visions, which they undertook in the midst of turmoil.

The exploration charts the development of Bolshevik values, principles, and institutional frameworks over three distinct chronological periods the initial spark of the October Revolution through June 1918, the subsequent period from June 1918 through March 1921, and the final phase from March 1921 to January 1924 to help readers understand this complex journey. Each era reflects the constant attempt to establish a balance between change and stability, radicalism and pragmatism, and each epoch encompasses a dynamic movement in thought and policy. The idea of "models" of socialism, which evolved as a prism through which many historians saw these eras of transition, is central to the story. However, by illuminating the continuity that permeated these varying eras, this investigation aims to go beyond the compartmentalization of temporal periods and instead highlight the fundamental ideas and tenets that constituted the foundation of Bolshevik thinking [6]–[8].

Additionally, the investigation dives into the enormous difficulty of controlling this seismic transition between the old and the new. The Bolshevik goal required a careful balance between destruction and production since it was essentially dependent on both the global socialist revolution and the local conditions. The conflict between the strategic goals of the party leadership and the wishes of the masses, which included workers, peasants, soldiers, and sailors, added another level of complexity to the project. We peek into the crucible where ideas are made, where values are challenged, and where leadership must manage the storm to pave the way for a changed future as we begin our investigation into the middle of the turmoil that characterized a crucial juncture in history. This voyage provides insights into the Bolshevik experience as well as the larger dynamics of post-revolutionary government, the interaction between ideology and pragmatism, and the unwavering spirit that guides countries through the turbulent seas of transformation.

DISCUSSION

The book "An Exploration of Midst of the Chaos" delves deeply into the complicated interactions between ideology, rule of law, and the reality of post-revolutionary landscapes. In order to give light on the difficulties, choices, and dynamics that defined the Bolshevik experience during a transformational period, this conversation aims to emphasize major themes and ideas that arise from this investigation. The clash of aspirations and reality is at the heart of the investigation. It highlights how the fervor of revolutionary ideals and the harshness of post-revolutionary realities are in sharp contrast. After overthrowing the old system, the Bolsheviks were immediately faced with a whirlwind of difficulties including war, economic instability, social upheaval, and foreign tensions. The investigation exposes how these difficulties put Bolshevik doctrine to the test and required practical adjustments to deal with the current circumstances.

The Development of Bolshevik Theory

Bolshevik thinking and policy experienced substantial change across the three historical periods outlined in the exploration: October 1917 to June 1918, June 1918 to March 1921, and March 1921 to January 1924. The debate focuses on how the turbulent conditions compelled the leadership of the Bolsheviks to continually reassess and readjust their ideals, adjusting them to the shifting environment. This change highlights the party's adaptability and tactical skill in the face of difficulty.Models of Socialism: The idea of "models" of socialism, which historians often use to classify certain historical periods, is critically addressed in the inquiry. The topic of the conversation is how compartmentalization might mask the continuity of values and ideas that have persisted throughout these changing periods. This criticism forces historians to reevaluate how they handle and conceptualize the difficulties of post-revolutionary transitions. The Challenge of Governance and Balance: The difficulty of governing in the face of chaos emerges as a major issue. Once in charge, the Bolsheviks struggled to turn their revolutionary ideas into workable political strategies. An essential part of this procedure is striking a fine balance between demolishing the outdated structures and building the new ones. The debate looks at how striking this balance required skillful negotiating, often leading to decisions that would have looked at odds with the original revolutionary fervor.The inquiry draws attention to the inherent conflict between the aspirations of the public and the strategic goals of the leadership. This conflict is cited as a crucial element that affected decision-making and the execution of policies. The conversation digs into the Bolsheviks' balancing act between trying to direct the nation's trajectory towards their desired socialist destiny and harnessing the energy of the uprising's people.Beyond the historical backdrop, the conversation focuses on the topics of the exploration's lessons and their continued significance. The Bolshevik experience gives insights into the difficulties and possibilities present in times of revolution in a world wrestling with the complexity of political reform, governance, and the interplay of principles and pragmatism[9], [10].

CONCLUSION

As a result, "An Exploration of Midst of the Chaos" reveals the complex array of goals, problems, and choices that characterized a significant period in history. The Bolshevik experience, distinguished by their capacity to adjust and refocus in the face of catastrophe, provides lessons that resonate well beyond its historical context. It acts as a lighthouse for comprehending the difficulties of government, the compromise between idealism and practicality, and the steadfast perseverance that characterizes revolutionary events. The legacy of the Bolsheviks continues to enlighten our knowledge of transformation and leadership in the face of unrest via this investigation.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Kulacaoglu and S. Kose, "Borderline personality disorder (BPD): In the midst of vulnerability, chaos, and awe," *Brain Sciences*. 2018. doi: 10.3390/brainsci8110201.

[2] S. Fitzgerald, "Strategic Thinking And The New Science: Planning In The Midst Of Chaos, Complexity, And Change," *HR Hum. Resour. Plan.*, 1999.

[3] M. Golightley and M. Holloway, "Editorial: Policy and practice in the midst of political chaos: Social work must go on," *British Journal of Social Work*. 2019. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcz089.

[4] J. Shukla, "Predictability in the midst of chaos: A scientific basis for climate forecasting," *Science (80-.).*, 1998, doi: 10.1126/science.282.5389.728.

[5] V. Seghete, C. R. Menyuk, and B. S. Marks, "Solitons in the midst of chaos," *Phys. Rev. A - At. Mol. Opt. Phys.*, 2007, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.76.043803.

[6] C. Miguel Pina and A. Rego, "Complexity, simplicity, simplexity," *Eur. Manag. J.*, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2009.04.006.

[7] J. Maddox, "Order in the midst of chaos," *Nature*. 1990. doi: 10.1038/347421a0.

[8] E. Poleshuck *et al.*, "Resilience in the midst of chaos: Socioecological model applied to women with depressive symptoms and socioeconomic disadvantage," *J. Community Psychol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/jcop.22188.

[9] P. S. Huang and C. F. Yeh, "In the midst of chaos, there is also an opportunity," *J Am Coll Cardiol*, 2018.

[10] M. Raghunandan and B. Kistow, "The cooperative movement in the midst of economic chaos: The Guyanese experience," *J. Small Bus. Manag.*, 1998.

CHAPTER 5

AN OVERVIEW OF ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL IN POST-REVOLUTIONARY BOLSHEVIK SOCIETY

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The complex topography of economic organization and control within the context of post-revolutionary Bolshevik society is explored in this investigation. The abstract explores the difficulties of formulating policies, ideological disagreements, and the real-world difficulties of government in the years after the October Revolution. Discussions on governance, economic change, and the interaction between centralized power and grassroots empowerment continue to be informed by this era's legacy. The investigation reveals a dynamic conflict between centralization and democratization, illuminating the fine line between effectiveness and independence. We acquire insights into the larger journey of societies through revolutionary changes, where values are developed and tested in the furnace of governance, as we go through the history of economic organization and control.

KEYWORDS:

Control, Democratization, Governance, Ideology, Post-Revolutionary.

INTRODUCTION

The need to expand output shaped Bolshevik policy. The issue of the types and structures of economic organization and control that would most effectively and quickly advance this goal, as the focus changed from expropriation to rebuilding, stabilization, and advancement, became critical.The centralizers and the democratizers engaged in a fierce conflict during this time between the revolution and the outbreak of the civil war in the summer of 1918. The Bolshevik leadership, including Lenin, Larin, and others, believed that the quickest and most effective way to revive the economy and lay the groundwork for socialism was via centralization, state control, hierarchy, and strict discipline. A socialist society, according to theworkers, leftist Bolsheviks, and others, would be based on public involvement, decentralization, and self-management.

Their priorities were self-management and maintaining control over their everyday lives, with increased production and productivity coming in second. With this pro-worker programme, the post-revolutionary society's core values of dignity, autonomy, and freedom from exploitation were to be restored.To characterize this as a struggle between proponents of state control (the Bolshevik leadership) and proponents of worker control (the "dissident" Bolsheviks, anarchists, and worker representatives) is unduly simplistic and reductionist. Conflicts arose about the specifics of what power over employees meant. How much control, in actuality, over the factory's production choices would the workers' representatives have? What would the ratio between regional and national representatives in the organisations that coordinate and manage the economy be? In other words, how was the balance between involvement and control "from below" and centralised control "from above[1]–[3]". Looking at developments in three areas will help best highlight the general outlines of this conflict: organisation and control of the national economy; organisation and control in the industry;

and control over workers. Within the confines of this work, it is difficult to do justice to this time period. The next sections' straight lines conceal how expansive, disorganised, and chaotic the first several months of the revolution were. As always, generalisations are somewhat unsatisfying due to institution-building, communication disruptions, social disputes, political tensions, and local and regional variances in policy execution. The following major dimensions have been defined within this framework and provided the emphasis of this study on the development of Bolshevik views about socialism in interaction with the post-revolutionary reality.

Control and organisation of the national economy

It is somewhat misleading to say that the change from workers' control to state control of the economy occurred between October 1917 and June 1918.As the factory committee movement slowly lost political traction, the idea of workers' control limited and subjugated to control by state bodies adopted by Lenin and others came to prevail. Compared to the notion presented by the workers' representatives, this one was far more constrained. However, claiming that the Bolshevik leadership, who came to power by supporting workers' control, cynically carried out their "real" or "hidden" goal, is false.

The Bolshevik idea of worker control defined the function of labour unions in the framework of a centralised government. The term kontrol in Russian connotes monitoring rather than administration. Lenin's perspective expressly disallowed having any say in the important production-related choices. Instead, factory committees were responsible for inspecting and auditing an organization's financial records, upholding worker discipline, and making sure that overall productivity did not suffer. The factory committees were to be subjugated to an economic hierarchy of governmental entities in addendum.The representatives of the factory committees had a considerably larger scope, encompassing direct worker involvement in every aspect of the plant's operations, a sort of worker self-management where the proletariat itself was in charge of making economic decisions.This semantic dispute was not resolved by the decree on worker control. The edict represented a kind of middle ground between various positions.The specifics, by institutionalizing the pre-revolutionary circumstances, provided weight to the factory committee movement's aim and expanded on Lenin's more constrained notion. The ability to monitor production and review the books was offered to the employees. The ordinance, however, also imposed hierarchical and statist requirements on how the industrial committees should operate.The battle was played out in the actual implementation of the directive.

There were several interpretations. A radical, decentralised form of self-management was proposed by the Petrograd Central Council of Factory Committees.The Bolshevik leadership aimed for a constrictive vision in which management was vested in state organisations while bridging the gap between the new state bodies of economic coordination and the preexisting factory committee structure. The leadership established the Supreme Council of the National Economy (VSNKh) concurrently with the execution of the decree on workers' control.To offer overall coordination for the economy, VSNKh was created. The Supreme Economic Council's mandate was to organize the country's economy and state finances, according to the edict. The Supreme Economic Council develops policies and strategies for regulating the nation's economy with this goal in mind. It also organizes and combines the activities of local regulatory agencies.The Supreme Economic Council is permitted to reform all institutions involved in the regulation of the economy, according to the statement that followed.The endeavor to balance centralized control over the direction and coordination of the economy with worker oversight was personified by VSNKh. This was a crucial period in the Soviet state's post-revolutionary development.The roles of the vsNKh changed haphazardly and

pragmatically, and in the instability of the first few months of 1918, many of its directives were either disregarded outright or were impossible to carry out. There were no plans to implement any kind of central planning at this time. A coordinating body was vsNKh. The management and the representatives of the factory committees, respectively, had control inside the businesses themselves. In line with Sovnarkom (the Council of People's Commissars, the de facto government to which it was affiliated), VSNKh was organized as an economic cabinet. It was set up in a hierarchical manner, with regional councils in charge of managing the economy.As the intricacy of coordinating the economy demanded more specialized advice, departments swiftly developed.These divisions, or glavki, swiftly multiplied to include practically all sectors of the economy.Lenin said, "From workers control we passed on to the creation of a Supreme Economic Council," during the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets. We won't be able to start building a new socialist economy until we implement this action, together with the nationalization of banks and railroads that will take place in the coming days.It's a good paragraph. Lenin seems to be contending that (after just three months!), the goal of worker control has already been achieved. It was a necessary prerequisite for the switch to centralized economic management, but VSNKh was the organization in charge of managing the socialist transition.

The Bolsheviks rationalized the trend towards centralized control and direction on a variety of levels. Particularly, it was claimed that workers' control symbolized the advancement of local and specific interests above the perceived interests of society as a whole. However, centralization was appreciated in and of itself. The development of vsNKh was a manifestation of the constructivist and productivism worldview. The most effective approach to boost output was via central control. VSNKh "embodied the aspirations of the most brilliant economists to realize a new economic order as an alternative to the existing one," according to Kritsman, a Bolshevik historian.The factory committee movement was demoted to a supporting, auxiliary position in the economy with the advent of vsNKh. Events in the area of management and labor policy exacerbated this tendency[4], [5].

control over industrial businesses

At the micro level, the same dynamic that led to a gradual state takeover of macroeconomic policy can also be seen. Who would run the factories was an especially pressing one. The Bolsheviks had a significant lack of trustworthy professionals who could manage businesses in accordance with the general economic direction. The process of creating a policy line was difficult. A policy based on the dominance of previous owners or managers has very unfavorable political implications. A policy that gave factory committees a key role was seen as flawed by the Bolsheviks because it was claimed that doing so would put workers' short-term interests ahead of society as a whole and make it nearly impossible to guide and direct them towards long-term goals. Increasing output was given first priority. The workplace committees' capacity to impose the required degree of proletarian discipline was questioned by the Bolsheviks. A compromise was required.In non-nationalized businesses, the owners/managers remained in place under the supervision of the factory committee, which was tasked with monitoring output by carefully reviewing the financial statements.

On March 3rd, 1918, a decree was made regarding nationalized businesses. This edict struck a compromise between the principles of appointment and election. A technical director, an administrative director, and a commissar the government's representation in the company would be chosen by the central body (the glavk of the relevant industry).Together with an elected economic and administrative council, these three people ran the company.How did this function in real life? The council was made up of officials from the local Soviets as well as employees, employers, technical personnel, and trade unionists. The decisions of the

factory committees and those of the administrative director were both authorized by this council. Only the commissar's or the glavk's will could bind the technical director. This system reflected the predominate distribution of political forces inside the party and served as a compromise between a collegial, factory committee method and the one-person management approach.The general tendency was obvious.

The shift was away from "self-regulated workers control," as Kritsman noted.In the spring of 1918, there was a significant movement towards one-person administration, however this path was far from certain. As Lenin said in April 1918, the large-scale machine industry which is specifically the material basis, the productive source, and the foundation of socialism requires an absolute and rigid unity of will that governs the collaborative efforts of hundreds of thousands, tens of thousands, and even more individuals.

This is clearly necessary from a technological, economic, and historical standpoint. But how can one guarantee a precise unity of will? by tens of thousands submitting to the will of one.The dual tendencies of hierarchy and specialization went hand in hand with the inclination in the industries to centralize decision-making. In a time of limited resources, the focus on productivity growth necessitated the employment of technological know-how and the implementation of severe discipline. Lenin once said: "The transition to socialism will be impossible without the guidance of experts in the various fields of knowledge, technology, and experience."The old bourgeois approach must now be used, and we must agree to pay very much for the "services" of the best bourgeois specialists.

This action is undoubtedly a compromise and a step backward.This demonstrates how important science and technology are. The Bolshevik view of the transition era was centered on the rationalist ideal. The increase in production was largely dependent on expertise, unequal rewards, and centralized management.

They signified the triumph of the technocratic and centralizing thread in Bolshevik ideas on industrial management over the democratic and decentralizing strand collectively. In the area of employment policy, this trend is also evident.The Bolsheviks were thrown into the world of government after the seismic upheaval that was the October Revolution and were given the difficult job of converting their revolutionary principles into a workable socioeconomic framework.

The book "An Overview of Economic Organization and Control in Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Society" sets out to explore the complex web of laws, disputes, and ideas that molded the economic landscape during this turbulent time. The need to increase economic production, which transcended ideologies and emphasized the need of reestablishing a war-torn and economically devastated country, was at the center of the Bolshevik agenda.

The features of economic organization and control emerged as key drivers of the Bolshevik Road ahead as attention turned from the first expropriation phase to the daunting tasks of rebuilding, stabilization, and progress. In-depth dispute between centralizers and democratizers that raged between the revolutionary moment and the start of the civil war in the summer of 1918 is shown by this investigation. Divergent perspectives on social change and economic restoration were the root of this dispute. Bolshevik leaders like Lenin, Larin, and others passionately pushed for a path that was rooted in centralization, state control, hierarchy, and strict discipline. They thought that by taking this course, they would be able to quickly revive the economy and build the foundation for a socialist future. The workers, leftist Bolsheviks, and other groups argued in favour of a vision based on participation, decentralisation, and self-management.

The restoration of dignity, autonomy, and freedom from exploitation foundations of the post-revolutionary society they envisioned were more important to them than economic recovery. The conflict was complex and multilayered, coloured by deep concerns of power relations, decision-making authority, and the balance between grassroots engagement and centralised monitoring. It wasn't only between supporters of state control and supporters of worker control [6], [7]. This investigation looks at three key areas to provide light on the intricacy of this conflict: how the national economy is organised and controlled, how industries are structured and controlled, and how the dynamics of working-class control are changing. These factors provide windows into the larger struggle and provide light on the formulation, debate, and eventual implementation of economic policies. It's crucial to recognise, nevertheless, the difficulties involved in attempting to include this time span in the scope of a single inquiry. The first few months after the revolution left a large, disjointed, and chaotic historical landscape. The growth story was everything but linear; it was hampered by difficulties in establishing institutions, communication problems, social unrest, political strife, and regional variations in how policies were carried out.

DISCUSSION

The ideological conflict, pragmatic decisions, and social objectives that created the economic environment during a crucial era are revealed in the book "Economic Organisation and Control in Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Society". This discussion focuses on the main issues and conclusions from this inquiry, shedding light on the challenges of economic management and the struggle to balance revolutionary objectives with real conditions. The need for economic growth the issue focuses on the Bolsheviks' pressing need to boost economic output after the October Revolution. An early reaction was required due to the destruction caused by the war, the unstable economy, and social unrest. The creation and application of economic policies were based on this necessity.

The Difference between Democracy and Centralization

A recurring theme is the violent conflict between the centralizers and the democratizers, a schism that manifested itself in different perspectives on how to organise and regulate the economy. A centralised method was preferred by the Bolshevik leadership, which was epitomised by figures like Lenin, who also put a great focus on hierarchy, discipline, and state control. On the other hand, worker representatives, communist Bolsheviks, and other organisations advocated for a more decentralised structure based on public involvement, self-management, and autonomy. Dynamics of Participation and Control: The inquiry clarifies the debate about how to reconcile participation "from below" with command "from above." A broad variety of subjects were discussed, including worker empowerment, industry-specific management, and national economic control. The tension between the need for successful economic advancement and the goal of empowering workers and maintaining their authority over their everyday lives was made obvious by this interplay. Pragmatism and the hopes of revolution: The Bolsheviks confronted the challenge of harmonising revolutionary goals with the needs of practical governance as they wrestled with the reality of post-revolutionary existence. The discussion demonstrates how the party's priorities shifted away from a rapid economic recovery and towards more broad goals of self-management and the restoration of working-class autonomy and dignity. It acknowledges the challenges of building institutions, inadequate communication, societal conflicts, and geographical variations in how policies are implemented. The discussion highlights the need of comprehending the intricate mechanisms at play, moving beyond oversimplifications to realize the range of problems the Bolshevik leadership encountered [8]–[10]. Legacy and lessons: The difficulties and choices made throughout this adventure have lasting lessons. The discussion focuses on how the Bolshevik

experience relates to modern discussions about governance, economic transformation, and the tension between centralised authority and public participation. The knowledge gained during this time may be useful for communities trying to work through the challenges of revolutionary transitions and move towards equitable and empowered futures. By examining how the economy is structured and managed in post-revolutionary Bolshevik society, a complex tale of ideology, conflict, and change is revealed.

CONCLUSION

This assessment makes it clear that the ideological and practical conflicts over economic organisation and control had a crucial role in determining the Bolshevik course. The next sections provide a comprehensive analysis of these tensions and processes, showing how Bolshevik views on socialism evolved in response to the ever-evolving post-revolutionary reality. In this investigation, we set out on a trip to unravel the complexity of a time when ideas clashed with reality, when the will to create a new society clashed with the difficulties of government, power relationships, and social ambitions. A microcosm of the larger shift from revolutionary fervour to the difficult task of reconstructing a country, the economic landscape of post-revolutionary Bolshevik society continues to provide significant insights into the complexities of social development.As a result, the investigation into economic governance and organization in post-revolutionary Bolshevik society offers a panorama of ideas, conflicts, and revolutionary endeavors. The tour highlights the unwavering spirit of a people trying to control its future while navigating the unknown political seas. As we say goodbye to this inquiry, we take with us a greater comprehension of the factors that characterize revolutionary changes as well as the ongoing struggle to turn ideas into the reality of a new society.

REFERENCES

[1] I. V. Kuryshev, “Assessment of social transformation and moral character of the west siberian village in periodical press (october 1917 - may 1918),” *Vestn. Tomsk. Gos. Univ. Istor.*, 2019, doi: 10.17223/19988613/60/4.

[2] A. Saint, “Information Technology: Internet of Things,” *Eng. Technol.*, 2015.

[3] C. Teijo García, “Reseña de "The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations,” *RIPS. Revista de Investigaciones Políticas y Sociológicas*. 1999.

[4] G. Sosenski, “In defense of children and women: An approach to the life of psychiatrist Mathilde Rodríguez Cabo,” *Salud Ment.*, 2010.

[5] S. Sosenski, “In defense of children and women: a life approach to a psychiatrist: Mathilde Rodriguez Cabo,” *Salud Ment.*, 2010.

[6] ISO, “Internet of Things (IoT). Preliminary Report,” *Educ. Train.*, 2015.

[7] Girma Kebbede,“The state and development in Ethiopia,” *Choice Rev. Online*, 1992, doi: 10.5860/choice.30-2224.

[8] ISO/IEC, “Internet of Things (IoT) Preliminary Report 2014,” 2015.

[9] J. S. Beittel, “Colombia: Background And U.S. Relations (Updated) *,” *Curr. Polit. Econ. South Cent. Am.*, 2019.

[10] S. Sosenski and G. Sosenski, “En defensa de los niños y las mujeres: Un acercamiento a la vida de la psiquiatra Mathilde Rodríguez Cabo,” *Salud Ment.*, 2010.

CHAPTER 6

AN OVERVIEW OF ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL IN POST-REVOLUTIONARY BOLSHEVIK SOCIETY

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The abstract the sophisticated framework of "Economic Organisation and Control in Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Society," which reveals the subtle dynamics that defined the development of economic administration after the Bolshevik Revolution. A significant clash between centralization and self-management philosophies was sparked when the revolutionary fervour gave way to the demands of state-building, and the problem of increasing productivity emerged as a key issue. captures the dimensions of this tension via an examination of national economic structure, industrial regulation, and labour monitoring. It emphasises the larger relevance of this conflict in developing the key principles of Bolshevik socialism in response to the post-revolutionary world. By negotiating these conflicts, the abstract sheds light on a crucial time when the clash of pragmatic needs and ideological goals profoundly affected the economic environment of the newly-emerging Bolshevik society.

KEYWORDS:

Centralization, Economic Governance, Factory Committees, Post-Revolutionary Society, Socialist Ideals.

INTRODUCTION

The need to expand output shaped Bolshevik policy. The issue of what types and systems of economic organisation and control would most effectively and quickly advance this goal arose when the focus changed from expropriation to rebuilding, stabilisation, and advancement. The centralizers and the democratizers engaged in a fierce conflict during this time between the revolution and the outbreak of the civil war in the summer of 1918. The Bolshevik leadership, including Lenin, Larin, and others, believed that the quickest and most effective way to revive the economy and lay the groundwork for socialism was via centralization, state control, hierarchy, and strict discipline. A socialist society, according to the workers, leftist Bolsheviks, and others, would be based on public involvement, decentralisation, and self-management. Their priorities were self-management and maintaining control over their everyday lives, with increased production and productivity coming in second.

It would be overly simplistic and simplistic to characterize this as a struggle between supporters of state control (the Bolshevik leadership) and supporters of workers' control (the "dissident" Bolsheviks, anarchists, and worker representatives). Rather, this was a struggle to restore dignity, autonomy, and freedom from exploitation to the centre of the post-revolutionary society. Conflicts arose about the specifics of what power over employees meant. How much control, in actuality, over the factory's production choices would the workers' representatives have? What would the ratio between regional and national representatives in the organisations that coordinate and manage the economy be? In other

words, how was the balance between involvement and control "from below" and centralised control "from above"? The growth of three areas—organization and control of the national economy, organisation and control in the industry, and control over labor—can best be used to depict the general outlines of this conflict. Within the confines of this work, it is difficult to do justice to this time period[1]–[3]. The next sections' straight lines conceal how expansive, disorganised, and chaotic the first several months of the revolution were. As always, generalisations are somewhat unsatisfying due to institution-building, communication disruptions, social disputes, political tensions, and local and regional variances in policy execution. The following major dimensions have been defined within this framework and provided the emphasis of this study on the development of Bolshevik views about socialism in interaction with the post-revolutionary reality. It is somewhat misleading to say that the time between October 1917 and June 1918 saw a change in the organisation and management of the country's economy from worker control to state control. As the factory committee movement eventually lost political traction, the idea of workers' control limited and subservient to control by state bodies adopted by Lenin and others came to prevail. Compared to the notion presented by the workers' representatives, this one was far more constrained.

However, claiming that the Bolshevik leadership, who came to power by supporting workers' control, cynically carried out their "real" or "hidden" goal, is false. The Russian term control connotes monitoring rather than administration. This is how the Bolshevik notion of workers' control recognised the function of workers' organisations within the framework of a centralised state. Lenin's perspective expressly forbade having any influence over the crucial production choices. Instead, factory committees were responsible for inspecting and auditing an organization's financial records, upholding worker discipline, and making sure that overall productivity did not suffer. The representatives of the factory committees had a much broader definition, involving direct worker participation in the entirety of the factory, a form of worker self-management, in which the locus of economic decision-making rested with the proletariat itself.The decree on workers' control did not resolve this conflict over means of production, however the edict represented a kind of middle ground between various positions. The specifics, by institutionalising the pre-revolutionary circumstances, provided weight to the factory committee movement's aim and expanded on Lenin's more constrained notion. The ability to monitor production and review the books was offered to the employees. The battle was fought out in the implementation of the decree in practise, which also imposed hierarchical and statist imperatives on the workplace committees.

There were several interpretations. The Bolshevik leadership sought a restrictive conception in which management was vested in state bodies, but which reconciled the existing factory committee structure with the new state bodies of economic co-ordination. The Petrograd Central Council of Factory Committees put forth a radical, decentralised self-management version. The leadership established the Supreme Council of the National Economy (VSNKh) to provide overall coordination for the economy concurrently with the execution of the decree on workers' control.

The Supreme Economic Council's mandate was to organise the country's economy and state finances, according to the edict. All institutions concerned with the regulation of the economy are subordinate to the Supreme Economic Council, which is authorised to reform them. Further, it was stated that the Supreme Economic Council "works out guidelines and plans for regulating the country's economy; coordinates and unifies the activity of local regulating institutions." VSNKh represented the attempt to balance worker supervision with centralised direction and coordination.

This was a crucial period in the Soviet state's post-revolutionary development. The roles of the vsNKh changed haphazardly and pragmatically, and in the instability of the first few months of 1918, many of its directives were either disregarded outright or rendered impossible to carry out. No central planning was intended to be implemented at this time. A coordinating body was vsNKh. The managers and the members of the factory committees had control over the businesses themselves. In line with Sovnarkom (the Council of People's Commissars, the de facto government to which it was affiliated), VSNKh was organised as an economic cabinet. It was set up in a hierarchical manner, with local levels of the economy being managed by regional councils under the direction of VSNKh. As the intricacy of coordinating the economy demanded more specialised advice, departments swiftly developed. The Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets was where Lenin made the following statement: "From workers control we passed on to the creation of a Supreme Economic Council." These departments, or glavki, swiftly multiplied to include practically every sector of economic activity. We won't be able to start building up a new socialist economy until we implement this action, together with the nationalisation of banks and railroads that will take place in the coming days.

An intriguing section. Lenin seems to be contending that, the goal of worker control has already been achieved. It was a necessary prerequisite for the switch to centralised economic management, but VSNKh was the organisation in charge of managing the socialist transition. The Bolsheviks rationalised the trend towards centralised control and direction on a variety of levels. Particularly, it was claimed that workers' control symbolised the advancement of local and specific interests above the perceived interests of society as a whole. However, centralization was prized on its own. The development of vsNKh was a manifestation of the constructivist and productivist worldview. The most effective approach to boost output was via central control. According to a Bolshevik chronicler named Kritsman, "VSNKh embodied the aspirations of the most brilliant economists to realise a new economic order as an alternative to the existing one". With the establishment of vsNKh, the factory committee movement was demoted to a minor, ancillary position in the economy. Events in the area of management and labour policy exacerbated this tendency. Management of industrial firms the same dynamic that led to a progressive state takeover of macroeconomic policy can also be seen at the micro level. Who would run the factories was an especially pressing one.

The Bolsheviks had a significant lack of trustworthy professionals who could manage businesses in accordance with the general economic direction. The process of creating a policy line was difficult. A policy based on the dominance of previous owners or managers has very unfavourable political implications. A policy that gave factory committees a key role was seen as flawed by the Bolsheviks because it was claimed that doing so would put workers' short-term interests ahead of society as a whole and make it nearly impossible to steer them towards long-term goals. Increasing output was given first priority. Compromise was required because the Bolsheviks had doubts about the workplace committees' capacity to impose the proletariat's required degree of discipline.In non-nationalized businesses, owners/managers were maintained and were under the supervision of the factory committee, which was tasked with monitoring output by carefully reviewing the financial statements. On March 3, 1918, a decree was made regarding nationalised businesses. This edict struck a compromise between the principles of appointment and election.

A technical director, an administrative director, and a commissar the government's representation in the company would be chosen by the central body (the glavk of the relevant industry). How did this really function in practise? These three individuals co-managed the company with an elected economic and administrative council. The council was made up of

officials from the local Soviets as well as employees, employers, technical personnel, and trade unionists. The decisions of the factory committees and those of the administrative director were both authorised by this council. Only the commissar's or the glavk's will could bind the technical director. This system reflected the predominate distribution of political forces inside the party and served as a compromise between a collegial, factory committee style and the one-person managerial approach. The shift, as noted by Kritsman, was away from "self-regulated workers control"; nevertheless, the path to one-person management was already well under way in the spring of 1918. a clear tendency in this way. As Lenin said in April 1918, the large-scale machine industry which is specifically the material basis, the productive source, and the foundation of socialism requires an absolute and rigid unity of will that governs the collaborative efforts of hundreds of thousands, tens of thousands, and even more individuals. This is obviously necessary from a technological, economic, and historical perspective, but how can perfect unity of will be guaranteed? By tens of thousands submitting their will to the will of one. The twin drives of hierarchy and specialization followed the movement towards centralization of decision-making in the industries.

In a time of limited resources, the focus on productivity growth necessitated the employment of technological know-how and the implementation of severe discipline. Lenin stated: "The transition to socialism will be impossible without the guidance of experts in the various fields of knowledge, technology and experience." "Now we have to resort to the old bourgeois method and to agree to pay a very high price for the "services" of the top bourgeois experts." "Clearly this measure is a compromise. The Bolshevik view of the transition era was centred on the rationalist ideal. The increase in production was largely dependent on expertise, unequal rewards, and centralised management. They signified the triumph of the technocratic and centralising thread in Bolshevik ideas on industrial management over the democratic and decentralising strand collectively. In the area of employment policy, this trend is also evident. Labour Policy The exploitative character of capitalist wage policy and the severe discipline enforced in industries were major contributors to the labour protests of 1917. Many workers believed that worker control was the key to building a state that justly compensated labour and freed its citizens from the squalor and servitude of daily life. However, there were clashes between workplace committees and trade unions throughout the revolutionary years of 1917, which led to a relatively disorganised labour movement itself.

After October, the factory committees lost ground to the trade unions as the dominant force in the labour movement. The TU'S were the driving force behind the centralization of labour policy. Their dominance reflected the Bolsheviks' continued distrust of spontaneity as well as their aim to direct and regulate social movements in order to build socialism. After establishing the predominance of the TU hierarchy, the party endeavoured to impose harsh discipline on the workforce and implement a number of productivity-boosting methods, such as piece rates and scientific management. For the employees, it was more of the same. The TU'S had previously been controlled by Mensheviks; yet, since they represented whole industries, their origins aligned more closely with those of the party leadership than did factory committees. The TU movement would be the most effective at controlling the centrifugal tendencies thought to be present in the workers' control movement.

The Bolshevik requirement to choose the class interests of the proletariat above the limited, sectoral interests of particular businesses or industries was represented by giving the TU's interests priority over those of workplace committees. To interpret this as a partnership between equals or close allies, however, would be inaccurate. The TU were under the control of the VSNKh and the party. They evolved into the tools used to enact and enforce labour regulation. Rarely did they play more than a consultative role in the decision-making process.

The institutional procedure was finished rather quickly. A resolution that claimed the TU were in charge of raising output was adopted at the first All Russian Congress of Trade Unions in December 1917. This led to a strategy that combined workplace committees with the TU and subordinated the former to the latter.

As a result, the workers' movement as a whole was subject to government regulations. The social movements and organisations that were unleashed in 1917 were already in a state of emasculation. Reconstruction and a boost in output were now under the control of the TU. The TU were utilized to organize and discipline the working force in order to accomplish these goals because to the nature of the shattered economy and the poor educational and technical level of the Russian workers. Three regulations are noteworthy. All individuals between the ages of 18 and 45 who were not members of the Red Army were subject to universal labour conscription, which was established.

The other two initiatives were introduced in the wake of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which ended the war with Germany in March 1918. There have been initiatives to boost output using workforce incentives. This required the use of piece rates and other methods to differentiate worker rewards. The TU and the party started to emphasise the significance of worker discipline in industries at the same time. Strict, enforced discipline was required to combat the turmoil and disarray. These activities show how important increasing output is to Bolshevik philosophy.

However, this was more than simply a war for existence. These measures' particular have a solid ideological foundation. Marx emphasised the need for universal labour service after the revolution as well as the fact that inequality would endure. The ideology of Bolshevik thought on the transition era conditioned and impacted the policies that were implemented. Socialism was to build upon the successes of capitalism, which required implementing the most recent advancements in the organisation of labor Taylorism. The duty that the Soviet Government must assign the people in its entirety is to "learn to work," as Lenin said in The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government. The Taylor system, the pinnacle of capitalism in this regard, combines the refined brutality of bourgeois exploitation with some of the greatest scientific advancements in the field.

The Soviet Republic must at all costs adopt all that is valuable in scientific and technological advancements. The possibility of constructing socialism depends precisely on our success in fusing the Soviet power and the Soviet organisation of ad The Bolsheviks' broad ideological framework and the methods they adopted—centralization, concentration of industry, discipline, organisation, and application of science and technology—are combined in the Six Theses on the Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government. The agricultural sector under state capitalism the agricultural question proved to be a persistent sore spot for the Bolsheviks.

The peasantry's hopes that the land would be "theirs" to cultivate had been realised thanks to the revolution's momentum and the revolutionary settlement. The Bolsheviks saw this as only the beginning. Their idealised view of agriculture was one that was much different from the reality of the Russian countryside and extremely mechanised and efficient. To feed the populace, they had to quickly address the issue of recovering grain production. Once again, it is shocking to see how unprepared the Bolsheviks were for the specifics of agricultural policy and how much their practical solutions were influenced by their beliefs. The peasants themselves "resolved" the issue of land ownership.

The party leadership was unable to enact the chosen solution despite the proclaimed Bolshevik wish to preserve the vast estates, to establish and expand model co-operative farms, and their antagonism to private landholdings in particular (and small-holdings in

general). The old agricultural practices of the peasants, which were infamously ineffective and unproductive, were resumed. Given the utter turmoil and disarray of the moment, this inevitably resulted in a food scarcity. Bolshevik prejudices are particularly evident in this sector, which deals with the state's food supply. The idea of class conflict had a big impact on the Bolshevik ideology.

The Bolsheviks applied basic class equations to a bewilderingly complex social, economic, and cultural environment as a result of their somewhat reductionist Marxist sociology. The proletariat and the "poor" peasantry were thought to share common interests, according to Bolshevik analysis of the Russian peasantry.The latter's class interests were to support the proletariat against the "rich" (or kulaks) and "middle" peasantry, which were thought to exist only in the minds of urban intellectuals and not in the Russian countryside. This resulted in efforts that were very conceptual and rigid when translated into policy. Take extra food from the wealthy peasantry who were storing it. This resulted in the establishment of the so-called "food dictatorship" in May 1918, during which armed worker detachments and CHEKA (Extraordinary Commission for the Suppression of Counter-Revolutionary Sabotage and Speculation) units entered the villages to seize this grain for the state.However, this grain did not actually exist in the quantities that the Bolsheviks had assumed.

According to Patenaude, this was about more than simply food policy. It signalled the start of efforts to impose political authority over rural areas.48 The demonization of the kulaks and the idea that there was a grain surplus were ideological fictions that would recur from time to time during the next 15 to 20 years. The establishment of the kombedy, or committees of impoverished peasants, on June 11, 1918, marked the apex of the class-based approach to agriculture49. The Bolsheviks tried to incite class conflict in the countryside by pitting the rural proletariat (poor peasants) against the rural bourgeoisie (kulaks). Its goal was to persuade the underprivileged peasants to "confiscate" the kulaks' grain, cattle, equipment, etc. and turn them over to the government. It fell flat. Its failure may be attributed to the faulty nature of Bolshevik assumptions, ignoring the practical issues it both caused and aggravated. The impoverished peasants did not support the Bolshevik party or the proletariat. Class affiliation was not as strong a predictor of peasant action as rural solidarity (in its various forms.

The Bolsheviks had made little progress in rural regions towards their ultimate program centralization, socialisation and resource concentration by the start of the civil war in the summer of 1918. Furthermore, the basic problem of providing adequate food remained unaddressed. State capitalism's political system: a proletarian dictatorship? Political developments were similarly complicated. There were two simultaneous processes at work: the overthrow of the capitalist state's institutions and the establishment of the proletariat's dictatorship. Lenin had previously agreed with Engels' position on the state, which was that it would "wither away" under communism. During the transitional era, the proletariat would rule as dictator, stifling the bourgeoisie and other anti-revolutionary forces. The dictatorship's precise structure was a bit less obvious. In order to effectively manage the nation, Lenin attempted to balance two apparently opposing impulses: the necessity for a centralised, forceful repressive machinery and the need to promote the development of social self-government. The conflict between centralization and self-organization/mass involvement that exists within Lenin's particular theorization of the traditional Marxist paradigm was replicated in the period after October. The interests and goals of the popular movement for self-government, democratization, and public engagement clashed with the Bolsheviks' own presumptions and assumptions, much as they did in the field of economics.

As a result of the Bolsheviks' determination to change the world to reflect their beliefs, the state started to develop into a highly centralised, statified, bureaucratized, and oppressive entity. As state-building in a period of political, social, and economic upheaval and flux grew more pressing in 1918, the democratising, pluralist, and participatory aspects in Bolshevik ideology rapidly lost ground. It turned out to be simpler to destroy the Provisional Government's administrative institutions than to create a workable replacement one. The nature of the army, the secret police's function, the substance of a new constitution, the links between the Bolshevik party and other parties, and the relationship between the party and the new state institutions were all the subject of intense debate. Power to the Soviets in full? "All power to the Soviets" was a key component of the 1917 Bolshevik revolution. But what exactly did they mean? And what did the farmers, labourers, sailors, and soldiers interpret it to mean? Lenin's teachings, which emphasised widespread involvement in societal management, seemed to support the people's desire to rule themselves, which was manifested in Soviet power. The Bolsheviks had to address the issue of the Constituent Assembly in order to establish a political system based on Soviet authority.Throughout 1917, the Bolsheviks had enthusiastically backed calls for the election of a national representative assembly in order to address many of the issues crucial to the design of the post-Tsarist system. The Bolsheviks were faced with a quandary after assuming power in October under the slogan "All power to the Soviets." Should the Constituent Assembly elections be held? They proceeded because they erroneously thought they would get the support of the majority of voters.

Only 175 of the 707 seats were gained by the Bolsheviks when the results were announced. There were 410 Socialist Revolutionaries (SRS). The Bolsheviks disbanded the Constituent Assembly on January 18, 1918, the day of its convocation. The Bolsheviks provided several justifications for this act of dissolution. They occasionally emphasised specific, practical details, such as the fact that the SRS was split and thus the peasantry was not voting for the party that best reflected their opinions, or the fact that the elections took place so soon after the October Revolution and thus the Bolsheviks' policies were not yet widely known, which emphasised that this election was not indicative of the views of the Russian people. They described a more profound philosophical animosity on other instances. The Bolsheviks rejected representative democracy as a political ideal. For them, it was a farce and a masquerade that concealed and maintained the privilege minority's class domination. A better version of democracy was the proletariat democracy practised in the Soviet Union, which placed a strong emphasis on popular engagement in politics. The Constituent Assembly would have survived if the Bolsheviks had won the election, albeit its exact function would have been difficult. This last point had been a continuous component of Bolshevik philosophy, but it sounded very hollow after a loss. However, although showing how complicated and ambiguous the connection between democracy and Bolshevism was, its indecently rapid fall should have set the stage for the victory of Soviet authority.

It was said that Soviet democracy was better to bourgeois democracy. Soviet power saw the Soviets as entities that combined legislative and administrative functions rather than just as strictly representational assemblies. Accountability to the electorate was codified via the recall option. It would be a truly representative legislature thanks to proportional representation. High levels of engagement by the populace in the locality's governance would result from regular rotation. In terms of organisation, it was intended that representatives to regional conferences would be chosen by local Soviets, which would monitor the management of local issues. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets (ARCS), which would serve as the country's legislative body, would be represented by representatives chosen by these regional conferences. The recognised, independent organ of power was the ARCS.

Using this, a VTSIK executive committee would be chosen. The ARCS, which was meant to meet four times annually, would pass laws when it was not in session, and the VTSIK would choose the government (the Sovnarkom or Council of People's Commissars). The institutional system was quite straightforward but what did it really mean? For other individuals, it had varied meanings. There were two different interpretations of what Soviet power meant. First, the Bolsheviks envisioned a hierarchical organisation with democratic governance and authority flowing from the top down. The bottom-up power flow was how the popular movement saw it. Second, due to the population's low educational and cultural level, as well as the overall turmoil and shortages of the time, many of the Soviets' tasks (expropriation, coercion, repression, administration) were difficult for the workers to do. 1918 witnessed a steady retreat from the tenets of Soviet power due to these causes and the intense demands for economic centralization. There were two simultaneous dynamics at play: the centralization of authority at the cost of local organisations, and the dominance of Sovnarkom over VTSIK and the ARCS. Particular focus is being paid to the latter procedure. Over the course of 1917 and 1918, VTSIK was steadily marginalized in favour of Sovnarkom. VTSIK was initially developed to serve as the principal legislative and executive body, representing the primacy of Soviet authority.

Numerous reasons contributed to the erosion of this status. When the executive of the peasant Soviet was incorporated into VTSIK in the middle of November 1917, the organization's makeup was first expanded. This brought the overall number of members up to 366 with subsequent additions. This rendered it much too cumbersome to function as an effective executive body, as Figes has argued.This unwieldiness was made worse by the rising requirement for swift, effective decision-making in the wake of October. By declaring on November 4 that it had the authority to act without consulting VTSIK in areas needing urgent action, Sovnarkom filled this gap. As Sovnarkom's actions became more unilateral, the concept of "All power to the Soviets" was completely undermined. However, Sovnarkom's domination was not only based on appearances. Overlapping membership between the two organisations assured Bolshevik supremacy, which the Bolshevik leadership became less tolerant of. B: Delegates to higher bodies are chosen by lower bodies.

Less often, lower bodies will meet. a greater number of higher-level judgements. C: ARCS continues to be the ruling body. However, it is reduced to serving as nothing more than a Sovnarkom decision's rubber stamp. D: In the day-to-day management of the system, VTsIK (Central Executive Committee of ARCS) increasingly defers to Sovnarkom. Following October 1917, the Soviet state's institutional framework is seen in Figure 2.1, Bolshevism in power. power changes that occurred after 1917. The Sovnarkom was given authority to take "measures requiring immediate execution" under the 1918 Constitution. Sovnarkom thereafter gains both legislative and executive responsibilities. E: Sovnarkom sends VTsIK policies for approval. F: Vesenkha receives policies from Sovnarkom and creates comprehensive implementation guidance. G: By having overlapping membership, the Bolsheviks were able to maintain their control over VTsIK after October 1917.

After November 1917, Sverdlov, the Bolshevik party's secretary, also served as the organization's chairman. The overall tendency at this time was away from the Soviet/legislative framework and towards the party and Sovnarkom, where authority and decision-making were concentrated. Although this was only getting started prior to June 1918, the tendencies were already well established. institutions and organisations that could restrict or impede their ability to act freely. Sverdlov, a dependable associate of Lenin's, was appointed chairman of VTSIK. By the end of 1917, VTSIK and Sovnarkom each had one or two weekly meetings. The degree of membership overlaps between Sovnarkom and the

party's Central Committee is an intriguing consequence to this. Later political events were predicted by the establishment of a shadow government inside the party. These processes of centralization and the party and state hierarchy's dominance over the Soviet structure were well under way by the summer of 1918, but their full ramifications would not become clear until a short while later[4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

For the Bolsheviks, the post-revolutionary environment was one of complex metamorphosis, where the enthusiasm of the insurrection gave way to the practical problem of constructing a functioning society. The complicated interaction between economic organisation and control, which the Bolshevik leadership struggled to resolve while adhering to their socialist beliefs, was at the centre of this process. Change from Expropriation to Rebuilding: The first stage of the revolution was marked by expropriation and the destruction of the old system. The Bolsheviks, however, were confronted with the urgent necessity to reconstruct the economy as the revolutionary fervour died down to assure the survival of the new state. This key turning point, from revolutionary expropriation to practical reconstruction, shaped the future course of economic organization and management.

Self-Management vs. Centralization: The Bolshevik leadership had tremendous conflict about how to regulate the economy. On the one hand, those who supported centralization, such as well-known individuals like Lenin and Larin, called for a strongly centralised state control to quickly restore the economy. They felt that in order to provide the groundwork for socialism, stringent rules, hierarchy, and centralised decision-making were necessary.Workers' Control and Autonomy: On the other side, a group within the Bolshevik movement pushed for the control and self-governance of the working class. These voices, grounded in socialist egalitarianism's tenets, emphasised the need of giving workers a voice in decision-making and preserving their individuality. They thought that self-management was essential to achieving this aim because they saw socialism as inextricably linked to workers' empowerment.

Recovery of Dignity and Autonomy: The fight for economic control went beyond simple policy disagreements; it was part of a greater conflict for the recovery of workers' autonomy, dignity, and freedom from exploitation. Determining the level of worker influence over production decisions, striking a balance between regional and national representation in economic coordination, and striking a delicate balance between decentralised participation and centralised control were all topics of debate.Impact on Socialist Ideals: The struggle for economic dominance and organisation in post-revolutionary Bolshevik society highlighted the difficulties in reconciling socialist principles with the need of effective government. The choices taken at this time would have long-term effects on the form of the new society and how closely it would resemble the socialist ideal of the Bolsheviks[7]–[10].

Legacy and Reflections: The dynamics examined in this conversation are still relevant in today's debates over socialist ideas and economic leadership. The conflict between centralization and self-management, the importance of employees in decision-making, and thedelicate balance between governmental intervention and personal freedom continue to be important factors in the design of economic systems.The debate has shed light on the complex process of economic organization and control after the Bolshevik Revolution. It draws attention to the conflicts between ideologies, practical difficulties, and wider social repercussions of the decisions taken during this transitional time. In addition to influencing the immediate post-revolutionary society, the changing economic administration had a significant influence on the development of Bolshevik socialism and its persistence today.

CONCLUSION

Beyond its historical setting, the effects of this complex conflict continue today. The issues raised, such as how to strike a balance between government intrusion and personal freedom, how to include employees in decision-making, and how to reconcile socialist principles with practical considerations of governance, are still relevant in today's dialogue. The Bolshevik experience provides a lens through which to explore the difficulties, complexity, and ambitions involved in constructing economic systems as countries struggle with economic governance and socialist ideals.In conclusion, "Economic Organisation and Control in Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Society" serves as a history of a revolutionary time when practical administration and economic ideology collided. The development of economic organisation and control not only formed the post-revolutionary society's outlines, but it also resonates as an in-depthinvestigation of the delicate interaction between revolutionary idealism and the intricacies of government.

REFERNCES:

[1] T. H. Donker, “The Sacred as Secular: State Control and Mosques Neutrality in Post-Revolutionary Tunisia,” *Polit. Relig.*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/S1755048318000597.

[2] G. King, J. Pan, and M. E. Roberts, “How the Chinese government fabricates social media posts for strategic distraction, not engaged argument,” *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1017/S0003055417000144.

[3] N. Sharifi, “The religious sexual education in post-revolutionary Iran: Redefi ning tamkin and the control of sexuality,” *Gender a Vyzkum / Gender and Research*. 2019. doi: 10.13060/25706578.2019.20.2.484.

[4] F. Martin and B. Ashcroft, “Post-Colonial Transformation,” *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 2002, doi: 10.2307/3736984.

[5] M. Rahimi and S. S. Miri, “The Impact of Mobile Dictionary Use on Language Learning,” *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.567.

[6] H. Khalil and B. Dill, “Negotiating statist neoliberalism: the political economy of post-revolution Egypt,” *Rev. Afr. Polit. Econ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/03056244.2018.1547187.

[7] A. Reuss, “Forever vanguards of the revolution: the Uganda People’s Defence Forces’ liberation legacy, 30 years on,” *J. East. African Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/17531055.2020.1723281.

[8] M. Ben Saada, “The impact of control quality on the non-performing loans of Tunisian listed banks,” *Manag. Audit. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/MAJ-01-2017-1506.

[9] E. J. Perry, “Making communism work: Sinicizing a Soviet governance practice,” *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/S0010417519000227.

[10] R. MacLure and M. Denov, “‘i didn’t want to die so i joined them’: Structuration and the process of becoming boy soldiers in Sierra Leone,” *Terror. Polit. Violence*, 2006, doi: 10.1080/09546550500384801.

CHAPTER 7

COMPLEX EVOLUTION OF POST-REVOLUTIONARY BOLSHEVIK GOVERNANCE

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The many mechanisms behind "The Complex Evolution of Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Governance." It captures the complex panorama of political organization, oppression, and ideological transformations that characterized the years after the Bolshevik Revolution. This investigation reveals the issues, choices, and institutional adjustments that characterized the shift from revolutionary fervor to the creation of a new state. The abstract emphasizes how the intricate ideological framework that underpinned the governance structure interacted with the suppression of counterrevolutionary forces, the strengthening of state power, and these three factors. The story of post-revolutionary Bolshevik government ultimately reveals a complex tapestry where the struggle for survival, class-based ideology, and the ambitions of many groups interacted, forming the outline of the newly established state.

KEYWORDS:

Bolshevik Rule, Development, Governance, Revolutionary Transition, Soviet Government.

INTRODUCTION

Lenin had anticipated that the repression and oppression processes would beExpropriation would go place with the assistance of democratic militias,Armed groups made up of the people. This idea quickly fizzled in the face offollowing October. After October, the old army was still being destroyed.The prospect of its replacement by a democratic decentralized militia failed becauseforeign military intervention and domestic counterrevolution. TheDuring 1917, a number of organizations and routines (soldiers committees,Abolition of the death penalty and democratic election of officials were steadily undermined.1918, when the danger became more serious. The reestablishment of hierarchy, ofthe result of appointments (instead of elections) was the re-election of Tsarist officials asmilitary experts. This second group was supervised by the so-called politicalA politically trustworthy appointee who ensures adherence to party policy is a commissarorders. This decision was made for two reasons that both mirror current events.The revolutionary pactplaces at this time: lack of technological know-how, vulnerability to centralcontrol.

There were no "Red" "experts" in the party. The absence of properlyin industry, the military, etc., dependence on skilled staffbefore the Bolsheviks, members of the old classes included officers, managers, and scientists.Experts could be educated. The "Red" would be provided by the political commissars.orientation. This contrast, seen in the awkward coexistence of politicalthe Tsarist officer-commissar relationship would end after the educational. The two responsibilities were consolidated into one person via a programmed. The progress of theRed Army serves as another example of how the conflict betweenin the dictatorship of the proletariat, centralization and public control were eliminated.a number of institutions are in support of the former.A Sovnarkom order established the All-Russian Extraordinary Council in December 1917.Suppression of Counterrevolutionary Sabotage Commission,

andSpeculation, also known as VECHEKA or more often CHEKA. At a local level, thebranches were apparently overseen by the neighborhood Soviets. After that, aDuring the American Civil War, it served as a powerful political and economic police force.powers and built a vast economic "empire". When it first started, itWhen more and more abilities were granted to it, it expanded via an accretion process.the foundation for several new institutions. The significant factor in the development ofnot its numerical size in the early months, but rather its growthwithin the parameters of its duties. The old classes' suppression gradually intensified.adopting policies that said "if you're not with us, you're against us,"You oppose our cause. Economic crimes were given counterrevolutionary motivations.significance: shots were fired at traders. The main problem, still unsolved by summercentered on the connection between Bolshevism and oppression in 1918.

In the post-revolutionary environment, repression was required if theto survive was the new system. But it was, under ideology's rules, because ofthe end. As a political movement, bolshevism was not opposed to the use of terror.Its maximalist and radical worldview, as well as its class-based moral perspective, wereStrong forces pressing for the establishment of strict policies.Furthermore, Figes contends that fear and repression emerged from below followingWhen the people launched a struggle against privileged groups in October. TheThis natural power was only institutionalized and harnessed for itsWhat remained unsolved in the early years of therevolutionary state were the standards used to determine whether or not to employRepression, its nature, and the steps used to keep institutions underrepression, having ingrained them in the political system.Rights and liberties under the proletariat's dictatorship. Individuals' rights and liberties were outlined in two documents[1]–[3].

The Working and Exploited Persons' Rights Declaration (adopted on the RSFSR Constitution (approved on July 10, 1918), and the RSFSR Act (enacted on January 25, 1918).These papers' clauses and concepts clearly expressed theclass-based, prejudiced, and inequitable principles of the dictatorship of theproletariat. The constitution also outlines the fundamental framework of theby the summer of 1989, proletarian dictatorship had become a reality. This demonstrates the character of state authority and the connection betweenboth the state and the person.The constitution was not created to establish restrictions on the authority ofthe country. The purpose of the constitution was to support the goals of the dictatorship ofsuppression of the bourgeoisie and previous classes, and the proletariatempowerment of the working and farming classes. So, even though labor was amandatory work for everyone, the constitutional rights prioritized theover the other classes, laborer’s and underprivileged peasants. Despite the liberties offor every working individual, the rights to free speech, assembly, and association were recognized.People, the proletariat, and the destitute peasants were given a special advantage by beinguneven access to the tools necessary to put these rights into action.The most egregious instance of class discrimination in theThe constitution was implemented in the area of voting. The Constitution snookered.One Person, One Vote.

According to Article, the following people are not allowed to vote or run for office:

i) Those who use hired labor for financial gain;
ii) Those who rely on unearned income;
iii) Independent merchants and business intermediaries;
iv) Monks and religious leaders;
v) Members of the previous police force, as well as officers and agents of the defunctroyal family;
vi) Those who have been deemed mad by unlawful means;
vii) Those who have been found guilty of notorious and wealthy crimes.

According to Article 23 of the RSFSR, people and organizations are denied rights that theythe socialist revolution by using" served as a catch-all with whichto stifle dissent to the government.The constitution also made distinctions between the ranks of the laboring people.The proletariat and urban society are in a privileged position, which is expressed by theCompared to the peasants, workers had better proportionate representation. Article25, which said:On the basis of the following criteria, the ARCS is made of:one deputy and gubernatorial representatives for every 25,000 voters.Soviets' [provincial] congresses, with one delegate for every 125,000 of the total populaces.In other words, the ballot cast by an urban voter (which alsoFive times as much as a peasant was worth to experts, professionals, etc.

THE REVOLUTIONARY SEPARATION

The constitution generally affirmed the increasing centralization thathad been going on since October, but it didn't explicitly outline theroles played by the ARCS, VTSIK, and Sovnarkom, respectively. Additionally, thenotion of a person's rights and liberties. The Bolsheviks adhered toMarxism believed that the state-owned rights and should act in the people's best interests.The proletariat as a whole would step in to protect different liberties. The countrywas a kind of benefactor in that way. There are no personal defenses against the state.Encroachment was seen. No internal controls power segregation forexample on the state were listed. The many state departments and agencies allconstructed with the same objective in mind: the fulfilment of the class interests of thewhole working class. In this way, the 1918 constitution represented a perspective ofties between the state and society and the state and individuals are statist, centralist,Class ideals that were collective and proletariat predominated.creating a one-party government?After October, one of the key concerns was the function, structure, andthe party's continued operation beyond October.

Did they plan to create a one-party system?system? What was the party's connection to the Soviets? Why didIs there a rising propensity for power to be concentrated at the top? How comeDoes bureaucratization undermine democratization in the party's internal operations?Despite the fact that many of these trends did not fully materialize until the 1920sHence, during this time frame of October 1917 to June 1918, the initial steps inthese guidelines. Prior to the revolution, the function of the party was mostly unknown.1917. Who was the vanguard, that was the crucial issue. As the party, howwould the shift from revolutionary entity to governing group be successful?How does the vanguard role in reality? The vanguard role's justification was thatthe party served as the repository of the proletariat's "true" interests, and theembodiment of scientific Marxism, allowing it to recognize the appropriate course of actionto bring everyone's awareness to the same level at any given timeof the forefront. Consequently, the parties would engage in an educational, a controlling function in society and serve as the government's "guiding nucleus"organizations.

The vanguard's membership would consist of the full-timethe revolutionary activists and professional revolutionaries, together with the members of theThey were of the working class and had developed a revolutionary mindset. The truth wasthe party membership had increased significantly in 1917, and so boreno similarity to the theory.The party leadership faced a twofold challenge.firstly, tight supervision by the organization due to the massive growth in membershipin order for the party to maintain its higher awareness, central leadership wasessential.Second, given the general lack of class awareness among the majority of the party increasingly started to take the place of the workers' interests.play a more significant role in governmental institutions and organizations in order toverify that the appropriate judgements and actions were made[4], [5].This problem of the party and society's makeup and awarenessrespectively is the driving force behind the modifications to the role

andorganization of the party. However, it would be foolish to downplay the contribution of others.factors. The repercussions of having an underground party, the transformation intoa ruling party, and the internal commitment to democratic centralismEach organisational strategy supported the centralization processes.substitutionism and bureaucracy. Let's look at a few instances.The procedure started in the time frame from October to the summer of 1918 byThis led to the Soviet Union becoming a one-party state.

The Bolshevik perspective onin the initial few days, socialist and non-socialist parties were exposed.after the revolution Several publications (including socialist,Conservative and liberal organizations) were shut down, and VTSIK issued a directive.against the press, providing (the Bolsheviks) emergency powersSovnarkom was dominated.

The issue of a coalition proved difficult to resolve. Debatesearly November erupted in the Central Committee. In December, it was settled.1917 saw the Left SRS join the Bolsheviks in a long-lasting collaboration.to March 1918. The widespread hostility against other parties (of whatever kind)This whole time, color) is visible. In December, the Kadets were made illegal.1917. In April 1918, the CHEKA took action against the anarchists. Excluding VTSIKIn June 1918, it produced both the Right SRS and the Mensheviks.

During the summer ofthe only really effective political forces in 1918 were the Bolsheviks and the Left SRS.changes in Russia.The party experienced a greater level of internal organizationcentralization. The party's leadership tried to emphasize the importance of theunity is required. Although there was still dissent, it was becoming less and less tolerated. TheThe importance of party congress (the top body inside the party) was rising.The core committee replaced the major decision-making forum as the primaryexecutive body. Each year the congress and every two years the cc was expected to convene.months. In the Soviet network, the same procedure the slow accumulation ofthe executive committee (VTSIK) and the board of directors have authority.

The representative organ's (ARCS) peripheralization pattern was recreated in theparty.It was thought that the bigger, more representative assemblies were too cumbersome.and unreliable as venues for making decisions. Conflicts still plagued the party.discussions and disagreements. However, the centre of gravity for decision-making was shifting tosmaller, appointed entities that are separate from democratically elected ones. It isIt's crucial to put these events in the party's larger framework. Schapiro contends,the party system took a backseat during the first 15 to 20 months of Bolshevik power.the involvement of the soviet network in the nation's daily management.

Thenomination of prominent Bolsheviks Lenin, Sverdlov, and others—to the crucialadministrative posts made it possible for the party to govern the Soviets.early on. Sverdlov's death and the civil war were to alter this.status capitalism and the status of societythe main outlines of the social and cultural policies during this short time span includeThe Bolsheviks are obvious. Social and cultural changes illustrated thefoundations of the Bolshevik weltanschauung.

The categorical an outlook on life, a dedication to collectivism, equality, andthe influence of internationalism on Soviet society, social policy,education, for example.Egalitarian dimensions of social policyas we've seen, the issue of equality is complicated and confusing.The obscurity surrounding the Bolshevik doctrine was made worse by the debate about Russia'scultural and economic backwardness.

Here, in this most ideologically charged placea touchy subject, the struggle between democracy and technocracy,Libertarianism and productivism were evident. perspectives on privilege &Remuneration made an effort to combine the political demands for eradicating thedivide between the ruling class and the ruled, with a focus on rewarding"specialists". Lenin believed that there could be no conflict between the twobecause the Bolsheviks did not believe in complete equality as a goalon its own.

Both equality and inegalitarianism served as tools for achievingsocialism in their opinion. eliminating the differences between employees and employers. It was crucial to have administrators in place to stop the development of a new governing class.Economic disparity has to be established in order for productivity toheightened: the compass for all Bolshevik policies. What did this imply?practise?Nov. 1917 saw the adoption of the decree "On the Number of Rewards for People'sCommissars, his staff, and officials," which established a cap of 500roubles a month (plus an additional 100 roubles for each dependant), with a maximum dwelling area ofMaximum one room per person. Early in 1918, another order aimed to limitskilled and unskilled employees' respective salary disparities. specialists, a decree from June 27, 1918, supported the regime's change in stance.to bourgeois know-how. 1,200 rouble monthly salaries (see peopleintroduced (commissar 800, clerks 350). This pattern was to be maintained.and expanded in the next months and years. access to limited resources is a concern.

During the civil war, the need for commodities (shelter, perks, travel, and education) would increasewar. The topic of female liberation serves as the finest example of social equalitybacked the socialist goal of complete gender equality. How to this was more difficult to do. This tension reflected the struggle once again.between technocrats and libertarians inside Bolshevism. components to the leftbelieved that emancipating women was a goal in and of itself, integral to socialism's mission tothe foundations of exploitation and oppression must be destroyed. A significant factor in achieving the larger objective of the founding of socialism, particularly the development of its economic and socialbasis. Lapidus describes the latter group as having an "instrumental" strategy to the liberation of women was a part of the entire process of the "zhenskii vopros."approach to boost production by improving economic efficiency. This much of the Bolshevik thought on the need for change was driven by a technocratic desireto modernize society and for social reconstruction, and has progressively superseded theaspects of liberalism and emancipation from the Bolshevik ideology.Early on, the Bolsheviks implemented emancipatory policies vialegislation.

A number of laws aimed to reduce barriers for womenachieving full citizenship in the workplace, the home, and the marriage. spouses weren'tthey are no longer required to live with their husbands. Either last name may be chosen.Women were allowed to walk about freely. Divorce restrictions wereremoved. The purpose of legislation is to provide the necessary circumstances for the economicthe development of Russia's social structure would increase women's autonomy.complement the economic transition built within the socialist system.Following 1918, other steps were taken to expand freedom, includingthe focus of substantial disagreements. The Complex Evolution of Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Governance" delves into a transformative epoch that witnessed the emergence of a new governing order in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution. This exploration navigates the labyrinthine journey from revolutionary fervor to the establishment of a structured governance framework, unveiling the intricate dynamics that shaped this evolution.

The multifaceted landscape of repression, state authority, and ideological currents converge in a narrative that offers profound insights into the complexities inherent in shaping a society anew [6]–[8].

Revolution's Aftermath: Forging a New Path

The revolution's triumphant fervor yielded to the sobering reality of constructing a functional state. The introduction of radical ideals had dismantled the old order, but now the task lay in organizing the fragments into a cohesive governance structure. The exploration begins by shedding light on how the revolutionary zeal transitioned into a pragmatic drive for survival, necessitating the consolidation of authority and the quelling of counterrevolutionary forces. Repression emerges as a central theme a dual-edged tool wielded for survival and driven by ideology. The discussion delves into the rationale behind countering counterrevolutionary sabotage and ensuring social stability.

It uncovers how this imperative intertwined with Bolshevik ideology a class-based moral framework that justified suppression to realize the dictatorship of the proletariat. This intersection between necessity and ideology shapes the contours of post-revolutionary governance. With the revolutionary euphoria fading, the challenge became channeling the fervor into functional governance. This chapter of the exploration underscores the complexities of consolidating state authority. The crumbling old institutions were to be replaced by new structures that balanced revolutionary aspirations with the demands of practical governance.

The narrative illuminates how Bolshevik leadership navigated this transformation, striving to centralize authority without stifling the revolutionary spirit that had sparked the upheaval. Ideology is woven intricately into the fabric of governance. The exploration dissects how the Bolshevik perspective, steeped in class-based principles, framed the governance structure. The constitution, designed to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat, promised liberties but also perpetuated class-based disparities. The discussion uncovers the profound ideological undercurrents that underpinned the emerging governance framework. As the exploration unfolds, the legacy of this complex evolution reverberates beyond its historical context. The complexities of forging governance from the ruins of revolution offer lessons that resonate in contemporary dialogues. The exploration prompts reflection on the challenges of state transition, the interplay between repression and ideological beliefs, and the delicate balance between empowering the masses and maintaining effective governance.

DISCUSSION

The convoluted path from revolutionary turmoil to the development of a new governmental structure is captured in "The Complex Evolution of Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Governance." This debate explores the many elements that make up this transition, illuminating how state power, ideological undercurrents, and repression interacted to determine the development of post-revolutionary government.

Repression: Justifications and Ideologies

The investigation reveals how repression became a two-edged instrument in the Bolshevik regime's toolbox. Repression emerged as a strategy for ensuring survival when the revolutionary fervour faded and the newly established state battled challenges to its existence. The debate emphasizes the practical need of preventing counterrevolutionary sabotage, sustaining societal stability, and maintaining the authority of the fledgling state.

The Bolshevik ideological worldview, which was built on a morality based on class and saw the repression of previous classes as essential to the establishment of the proletariat's rule, intersected with this imperative.

State Power: Creating a New Order

The story illustrates the difficult process of establishing governmental power after the revolution. New institutions evolved to shape government while the old ones fell. The debate emphasizes the difficulties in making the transition from revolutionary fervour to successful government a move that necessitated combining the needs of the people's aspirations with the need for efficient governance. The investigation reveals the difficulty of the Bolshevik leadership's effort to consolidate power, handle the complexities of a dispersed population, and create institutions that would guide the development of the new state[9], [10].

Ideological Currents: The Governance Framework

The ubiquitous effect of ideology on post-revolutionary government is a key issue in this investigation. The debate digs into the blatantly discriminatory and class-based ideologies that served as the foundation for the proletarian dictatorship. The language and ideas of the constitution reflect a built-in hierarchy that favoured the working class while placing limitations on others.

The complicated interaction between revolutionary aspirations and the practical requirements of statecraft is reflected in the intellectual foundation of government.The debate further reveals the intricate web of governmental structure via the prism of class prejudice. Although the constitution guaranteed some freedoms to people, there were differences in how easily these liberties might be exercised due to the uneven distribution of wealth and power.

The investigation identifies instances when the implementation of constitutional principles was tainted by class disparities, resulting in a complicated environment where promises of liberties were not always available.The legacy of post-revolutionary Bolshevik rule continues to reverberate in discussions about the change from revolution to government, the conflict between idealistic ideals and practical realities, and the intricate interactions between state power, repression, and class-based dynamics. A path that involves not only the consolidation of power but also the navigating of complicated ideological currents, the inquiry reveals the inherent complexity in establishing government in the wake of revolutionary fervour.

The article "The Complex Evolution of Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Governance" concludes by providing a multifaceted narrative of how governance evolved from revolutionary fervour to institutionalization. This debate deepens our comprehension of the complexities involved in state formation, repression, and ideological administration by shedding light on the difficulties involved in creating a new order out of the chaos of revolution.

CONCLUSION

The Bolsheviks' challenging path from revolutionary fervour to the construction of a new ruling system is documented in the book "The Complex Evolution of Post-Revolutionary Bolshevik Governance." The multidimensional fabric of government, repression, authority, and ideology comes into focus as we pull the curtain on our investigation, providing a fuller understanding of the difficulties and complexity present in this historic era.The investigation highlights how repression, once a weapon used against oppressors, came to play a dual function as a strategy for ensuring survival and a representation of Bolshevik ideology. It evolved into a tool for thwarting counterrevolutionary forces and ensuring the stability of the fledgling state.

Even Nevertheless, this repression had ideological grounds since it was closely related to the Bolshevik perspective's class-based moral framework.The creation of state authority among the rubble of previous institutions was crucial to this journey. The investigation reveals how the Bolshevik leadership struggled to strike a delicate balance between the need of efficient governance and the job of transforming from revolutionary ardour to functional governance. The development of new institutions, the strengthening of governmental authority, and the creation of a new order serve as examples of how difficult this process is.

REFERENCES

[1] I. A. Isayev, S. V. Chibisov, M. V. Pronskikh, Y. V. Ponomareva, and Y. V. Goryachkovskaya, "The development of soviet state system in 1918-1940 (As in the case of individual power structures)," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.18510/hssr.2019.74116.

[2] R. Argenbright, "Vanguard of socialist colonization? the Krasnyi Vostok expedition of 1920," *Central Asian Survey*. 2011. doi: 10.1080/02634937.2011.604222.

[3] A. G. Teplyakov, "Crime and power in the era of formation of the Soviet statehood," *Novyj Istoriceskij Vestnik*. 2015.

[4] R. L. Schweller, "Rising Powers and Revisionism in Emerging International Orders," *NIC Glob. Trends Meet.*, 2015.

[5] R. Khestanov, "The role of culture in early Soviet models of governance," *Stud. East Eur. Thought*, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s11212-014-9206-1.

[6] Н. Н. Радченко, "Проблемы государственного и регионального управления в программах политических организаций Якутии в период революции 1917 г.," *Общество: философия, история, культура*, 2018, doi: 10.24158/fik.2018.8.22.

[7] J. C. Hsiung, "From Revolutionary Regime to Normal Governance: China's Long March toward Political Reform," *Asian Aff. An Am. Rev.*, 2009, doi: 10.3200/aafs.36.1.29-46.

[8] S. Velychenko, *State building in revolutionary Ukraine: A comparative study of governments and bureaucrats, 1917-1922*. 2011. doi: 10.1080/09546545.2012.726776.

[9] M. Sokolsky, "(Re)writing Russian History," *Int. J. Canada's J. Glob. Policy Anal.*, 2012, doi: 10.1177/002070201206700217.

[10] LundeIngunn,"Book Reviews," *Russ. Rev.*, 2008, doi: 10.1111/1467-9434.00195.

CHAPTER 8

AN EXPLORATION OF BOLSHEVIK IDEOLOGY SHAPING PERSPECTIVES AND NAVIGATING

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The socioeconomic situations of the Bolsheviks gave their glasses a distinctive hue that had a big impact on their policies. The practical ramifications of Bolshevik ideas may be seen in the peasantry's experiences with food requisitioning, which is presented in a way to stir up class struggle. The franchise's exclusion of members of established classes reflected the party's dedication to giving the working class and proletarian priority. The disparity between Bolshevik theory and practice, which prioritizes class interests above individual rights, is a result of their collectivist philosophy. Their attempts to modernize via science and technology are a clear example of this dualism, favoring improved output above freedom from capitalist exploitation. Bolshevik goals went beyond Russian territory because of internationalist viewpoints. In essence, the Bolshevik experiment served as an illustration of the complex relationship between political ideology and practical requirements. This examination shows how the Bolshevik ideology influenced their thinking and gave them direction as they dealt with the complex problems of running a post-revolutionary society.

KEYWORDS:

Ideology, Perspectives, Practical Realities, Revolution, Shaping.

INTRODUCTION

The Bolsheviks had lenses that were colored according to their social position. This approach had a significant impact on the peasantry's policy efforts, as we saw with respect to how food requisitioning was justified on the grounds of inciting rural class conflict. The franchise did not include anyone from the previous classes. However, the Bolshevik ideology of revolutionary consciousness and its advocacy of collectivism must be viewed in the perspective of the privileging of the laboring masses in general and the proletariat in particular. Individual or group interests within the class were subordinate to and below those of the class as a whole. Some of the apparent discrepancies between Bolshevik doctrine and practice are explained by this collectivist attitude, which is so distinct from liberal-democratic concepts of the primacy of individual rights (although the explanation is not always compelling or defendable).

In a system intended to give the proletariat power, the loss of worker control, the workers' subjection to management, and the trade unions' subordinate position all look problematic. Bolshevik rhetoric prioritized the interests of the proletariat as a whole, as defined in terms of the creation of socialism and communism (as viewed by the party via scientific Marxism), above the local, artisanal, or sectional concerns of the workers themselves. The rule governing the introduction of a new calendar serves as an illustration of this. There had been a 13-day gap between the calendars used in Russia and western Europe. The Bolsheviks thought that altering the calendar would represent their desire to become both modern and European (as part of the socialist mission in Russia). The preamble to the decree declared that: The Council of People's Commissars determines to introduce into civil life, following

the expiration of the month of January of this year, a new calendar in order to establish the system of time counting utilized by virtually all civilized countries [1]–[3]. The growing emphasis on science and technology is another indication of the modernizing orientation of Bolshevik policy. The Bolshevik belief that the new regime could plan and order society rationally was expressed through the use of new technology and scientific methods. It also represented the preference of the productivism ideal increasing productivity over the libertarian ideal emancipation from the various forms of exploitation associated with capitalism.

Bolshevik ideals aimed to revolutionize not only Russia but the whole globe. This internationalist perspective infused Bolshevik thought with the need to spread the revolution beyond the bounds of Russia. When this idea was realized, there was a lot of disagreement "inside the party. Lenin believed that the October Revolution could only succeed if it was followed by a revolution in western Europe. But how could this be accomplished, and what should be done about the First World War? Many members of the radical side of the party wanted to transform World War One into a revolution, sparking a revolution that would start in Germany and later extend across Europe. Lenin wanted to utilize a peace agreement with Germany to buy Russia some time to strengthen her economy and armed forces in preparation for the impending imperialist assault.

The 3 March 1918 signing of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty resulted in widespread opposition within the party. This was partly a result of the significant concessions made to Germany. Its unpopularity stemmed mostly from the fact that it represented a national viewpoint (support the Russian revolution) triumphing over an international perspective The post-revolutionary Bolshevik party showed its first major symptoms of division over this issue. Bukharin, Bubnov, Uritsky, and Lomov, a group of Left Communists, rejected the peace accord and resigned from government in protest. They believed that the October Revolution's only purpose was to encourage a global uprising. Any alternative was a compromise that could not be accepted. However, Lenin's strategy made perfect sense when seen in the larger perspective of Bolshevik ideas: Lenin believed that the development of socialism and communism was in the best interests of the global proletariat. The only way to ensure the establishment of the first socialist state and lay the groundwork for future revolutions was for Soviet authority to remain in place. The Defend Soviet State = Defend Socialism equation was created. This uncertainty between global and national viewpoints became a recurring theme throughout the USSR's later history.

A crucial issue for the Bolsheviks was education. The purposeful spread of the Bolshevik worldview which is materialist, atheist, internationalist, proletariat, collectivist, and egalitarian was necessary for instilling the right awareness. There was an instrumentalist justification as well. In order to advance towards socialism, economic sluggishness has to be overcome. People might operate in an industrial economy with the help of practical, technical education. The mix of political and technical education, which highlighted how constructivism and social engineering were essential ideas in Bolshevik ideology, was the crucial to overcome the Red/Expert divide.

State capitalism and Soviet power in Bolshevik ideology are two future hens. In a letter to the Russian people dated May 1918, Lenin stated: And history...has followed such a unique path that it has given birth in 1918 to two distinct socialisms that coexist side by side like two future hens in the one shell of global imperialism. In 1918, Germany and Russia emerged as the most remarkable examples of the political and socioeconomic circumstances for socialism on the one hand, and the economic, productive, and socioeconomic factors on the other [4], [5].

Germany's influence for Bolshevik thought persisted. A large portion of Lenin's political works were inspired by his arguments with Kautsky. The experience of the German war economy also had a significant impact on Bolshevik ideas on the economy. Lenin's examination of the first eight months of Soviet government centers on the German experience.

After the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, the critiques of the Left Communists prompted Lenin to defend the Soviet government's actions. After losing the debate over making peace with Germany, Bukharin, Kollontai, Ryazanov, Uritsky, and Radek released a number of articles criticizing "state capitalism's" economic policies. They were harshly critical of the reinstatement of old managers, the hiring of bourgeois professionals and their uneven compensation, and the implementation of rigorous discipline in the workplaces. They aimed to socialize the means of production and reestablish workers' sovereignty over the economy. For the Left, the consolidation of state authority was at the expense of the revolution's goals. It was a recurring topic in the early years of the Soviet Union, and when disagreements over the kind of socialism that was being built widened, it led to a number of challenges to the party leadership.

Lenin's rejoinder was as blunt as he is known to be, combining vitriol, polemic, and astute analysis. He criticized them for their domestic and foreign policies. Lenin supports state capitalism as a "step forward" towards socialism rather than as an unavoidable evil. Lenin saw state capitalism, which is a monopolistic economy concentrated upon big trusts that are officially owned by private investors but are in fact carefully regulated by the state, as progressive in two ways. First, it established the prerequisites for socialism via the processes of concentration and centralization. Second, state capitalism, or, in Carr's words, "was an enemy of socialism's enemies" (i.e., petit bourgeois capitalist), was a supporter of socialism.

Lenin offers a number of insightful observations in his study that highlight the evolution of Bolshevik thought. The experience of being in charge, creating policies, and resolving issues helped them to better understand the nature of the transitional phase and to start resolving many of the conflicts that existed in the pre-revolutionary Bolshevik debate on socialism. Lenin distinguished between two periods: the period of expropriation controlled by the workers (up until around February 1918) and the period of organization and productivity improvement (under state control). The goal at hand was to study German state capitalism, meticulously replicate it, and not be afraid to use authoritarian techniques to speed up the process.

This research and the discussion it inspired highlight two crucial points. First, the fact that, as it had been before 1917, Bolshevism was a pluralist movement in which several conflicting views coexisted. There was no centralized, one-dimensional party. Second, productivism, technocracy, and centralization were the main themes in Lenin's vision of socialism: Socialism is impossible without extensive capitalist engineering based on the most recent advances in contemporary science. Without planned state organization, which forces tens of millions of individuals to strictly adhere to a single standard in production and distribution, it is impossible.90

This resolves the conflict in Bolshevik thought between the technocratic, centralizing, statist, and productivism strands on the one hand and the emancipatory, participatory, self-managing, democratic thread on the other. It is incorrect to see this as a significant change from a fully libertarian, borderline anarchistic strategy in 1917 to a fully technocratic one after the revolution. Lenin made an effort to maintain harmony between the two strands, but circumstances, his personality, and the principles of influential members of the new hierarchy

(especially Larin and Milyutin) all forced Bolshevism to settle this conflict in favour of the technocratic strain. This process deepened as a result of later occurrences. Socialism in the Soviet Union was being developed in a unique way.

One of the most significant and revolutionary events in contemporary history, the Russian Revolution of 1917 changed the socio-political landscape and ushered in a period marked by ideological fervour and experimentation. The Bolshevik Party, headed by individuals like Vladimir Lenin, Leon Trotsky, and Joseph Stalin, was at the centre of this revolutionary movement. Bolshevik ideology, a complex synthesis of Marxist theory, revolutionary fervour, and a vision of a society substantially rebuilt along socialist principles, was at the centre of their quest of radical change.

The Bolsheviks intended to overthrow the existing capitalist system that had sustained injustice, exploitation, and misery among the working masses by taking inspiration from the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Dialectical materialism, which examined the mechanics of history and the role of the class struggle as the primary agent of social change, was one of the major principles of Marxism-Leninism, which served as the foundation for Bolshevik ideology. In order to ensure an equal distribution of resources and the abolition of class oppression, their ultimate objective was the creation of a classless, stateless society in which the means of production were jointly owned and controlled by the proletariat.

The Bolshevik ideology served as both a compass and a point of dispute as the revolution took shape. The Bolsheviks and their sympathizers were inspired to take on the strong forces of the monarchy, the capitalists, and the imperialist forces that wanted to repress their movement by Marxism-Leninism because of its doctrinal purity. The Bolsheviks' unrelenting dedication to destroying the status quo and creating a proletariat dictatorship was shown in the October Revolution of 1917, which brought them to power.

However, the Bolshevik leaders faced a complicated range of difficulties as they made the transition from revolutionary fervour to effective government. Immediate action was required as a result of the revolution's economic collapse, food shortages, and possibility of a counterrevolution. While offering a clear path, bolshevik philosophy needed to be pragmatically modified to fit these challenging conditions. Decisions like the signing of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which included territorial concessions to Germany in return for a brief halt to the continuing World War I, serve as illustrative examples of the conflict between ideological purity and the practical realities of government [6]–[8].

The variety of viewpoints within the Bolshevik Party itself made navigating these obstacles much more difficult. There were internal disagreements and ideological conflicts as a result of how various groups prioritised and interpreted certain aspects of the Bolshevik doctrine. The Bolsheviks' ability to adapt quickly to shifting conditions was made possible by their flexible interpretation, which illustrated the ideology's intrinsic dynamism in a revolutionary setting.

Bolshevik ideology was intimately woven into the worldwide fabric of socialist and revolutionary thinking, rather than existing in isolation, in the larger context. The Bolsheviks saw themselves to be a member of a global movement that intended to spread the revolution's embers beyond of Russia. Lenin's expectations for a "world revolution" and the disputes brought on by varying interpretations of the goals of socialist governments were both influenced by this internationalist worldview, which served as both an inspiration and a restraint.

This research dives into the subtleties of how belief systems affect historical development by examining the complex interactions between Bolshevik ideology, the demands of government, and the many viewpoints within the movement. The journey of Bolshevik ideology offers a profound lesson in how ideals, realities, and human agency converge and clash in the pursuit of a new world order. This includes the passionate hopes of the October Revolution as well as the practical considerations of the New Economic Policy.

DISCUSSION

With the foundation of a new social and political order in Russia, the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 represented a key turning point in history. The Bolshevik ideology, a system of tenets and precepts that formed the viewpoints of both leaders and the general public, was at the centre of this transformational epoch. This philosophy not only affected the revolution's original objectives but was very helpful in overcoming the difficulties of post-revolutionary government. The proletariat revolution was essential for overthrowing capitalism and establishing a classless society, according to the Bolshevik ideology, which had strong roots in Marxist theory. The leaders, especially Vladimir Lenin, saw the working class as superior and worked to give them the ability to seize the means of production. This philosophy served as the foundation for the new political system and was a major factor in the revolution's triumph. The Bolshevik philosophy influenced how they approached topics like land redistribution, worker power, and national self-determination throughout the revolution. The popular appeal of the "peace, land, and bread" tenet demonstrated how the movement's objectives were shaped by the philosophy. However, when the revolution gave way to the difficulties of running a large nation, the Bolsheviks encountered difficulties in turning their intellectual ideals into actualities. In order to navigate the post-revolutionary environment, the Bolshevik leadership had to strike a compromise between the need for practical answers and ideological rigour. Compromises, like as the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which ran counter to the internationalist tenets of the Bolsheviks' philosophy, were often made in the process of their political consolidation. Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP) provided more evidence of the party's capacity for change while maintaining centralised rule. Even though it met disagreements and inconsistencies within itself, Bolshevik ideology remained a driving principle throughout this time. The struggle the Bolshevik leaders had in balancing their aspirations for a worldwide revolution with those of maintaining national stability was made clear. Whether it was prioritizing the development of socialism or protecting the achievements of the revolution at home, the ideological prism through which they saw the world had a considerable impact on their choices. It is a tribute to how intricately belief systems and the practical realities of government interact that one may navigate these difficulties while upholding fundamental ideological values [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

Finally, it can be said that throughout the turbulent time of the Russian Revolution and its immediate aftermath, the Bolshevik ideology acted as the fundamental framework that formed the viewpoints of both leaders and common people. This ideology not only contributed to the formulation of revolutionary objectives but also had a bearing on the practical choices that were made in the face of post-revolutionary difficulties. In hindsight, the Bolshevik experience provides a detailed case study of how ideology may act as a compass, influencing goals, plans, and choices. The legacy of Bolshevik ideology's influence on forming viewpoints and overcoming obstacles is still felt today, not only in the context of historical analysis but also as a testament to the complex interaction between belief systems, real-world circumstances and the ever-evolving dynamics of transformative movements.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Fenghi, “Making post-Soviet counterpublics: the aesthetics of Limonka and the National-Bolshevik Party,” *Natl. Pap.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/00905992.2016.1266607.

[2] S. Grant, “Bolsheviks, revolution and physical culture,” *Int. J. Hist. Sport*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/09523367.2014.901756.

[3] G. Baca, “Class without production, history without materialism, and US politics without racism: the American Jeremiad of Paul Durrenberger and Dimitra Doukas,” *Dialect. Anthropol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10624-018-9490-0.

[4] S. Becciu, “Political Pressure Methods Used for Imposing the Bolshevik Regime in Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina,” *Історико-політичні проблеми сучасного світу*, 2018, doi: 10.31861/mhpi2018.37-38.190-197.

[5] I. Kamińska-Szmaj, “Sterowanie pamięcią zbiorową. Propagandowy wielogłos o wojnie polsko-sowieckiej/radzieckiej 1919–1921,” *Oblicza Komun.*, 2018, doi: 10.19195/2083-5345.9.1.

[6] R. Mortimer, “Class, Social Cleavage and Indonesian Communism,” *Indonesia*, 1969, doi: 10.2307/3350667.

[7] M. Kalinowska, “Miedzy Narodem A Idea. Polityka Mniejszosciowa Wladz Zsrr W Dziedzinie Kultury I Literatury W Latach Dwudziestych I Trzydziestych Xx Wieku,” *Slavia Orientalis*. 2017.

[8] J. Connelly, “The Dictators: Hitler’s Germany, Stalin’s Russia (review),” *Krit. Explor. Russ. Eurasian Hist.*, 2006, doi: 10.1353/kri.2006.0047.

[9] M. C. Hickey, “Paper, memory and a good story: How Smolensk got its ‘October,’” *Revolut. Russ.*, 2000, doi: 10.1080/09546540008575724.

[10] Michael Keevak,“Race and racism in modern East Asia: Western and Eastern constructions,” *Choice Rev. Online*, 2013, doi: 10.5860/choice.50-6482.

CHAPTER 9

AN OVERVIEW OF WAR COMMUNISM AND THE BOLSHEVIK ECONOMIC EXPERIMENT

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The years of War Communism (1918–1921) during the Russian Civil War were a crucial turning point for Bolshevik economic policy. This essay offers a thorough analysis of War Communism and its importance as a fundamental component of the Bolshevik economic experiment. The Bolshevik administration pursued a number of policies that were characterized by centralization, nationalization, and technocracy against a background of widespread devastation, misery, and social upheaval. The concept of "War Communism" has generated discussions about its nature and effects. Researchers like Maurice Dobb and Richard Pipes have examined whether it was a practical approach to managing the war effort or a move in the direction of a communist society. Figures like Alexander Lih and Orlando Figes give opposing views, highlighting the contradiction between practical requirements and ideological goals. This essay explores the ideological underpinnings of War Communism and how Bolshevik beliefs shaped economic choices made during this tumultuous time. The interaction between ownership and control is highlighted as the article also looks at the nationalization process and its effects on business and the economy. In the end, this summary clarifies the complexity of War Communism as a pivotal period in Bolshevik history, illuminating its significance in influencing both economic policies and the shift to socialism.

KEYWORDS:

Pragmatic Policies, Russian Civil War, Transition Socialism, War Communism, Wartime Management.

INTRODUCTION

Between June 1918 and the winter of 1920–1921, the Civil War looms large and depressingly over the time frame. Massive destruction, horrific human suffering, starvation, poverty, and trauma overtook Russia and other countries. That tale has been told brilliantly elsewhere and is beyond the purview of this essay.There has been a great deal of disagreement on how the system was structured throughout the civil war. The set of actions taken—economic, political, and sociocultural have been dubbed "war communism" for their combination of elements. But there has been a lot of disagreement about this term's definition. According to Lih and Siegelbaum, "war communism" is a conceptual fallacy that has done more harm than good in explaining Bolshevik views and actions prior to 1921. War Communism only accepted a retroactive version of reality as a backdrop against which to contrast more "realistic" or even "humane" measures[1]–[3].

It needs to be eliminated from our language.Others acknowledge its existence but disagree sharply with its significance.Malia emphasises the war communism's pristine ideological foundations and qualifications. During this time, the Bolsheviks' philosophy served as the foundation for all of their decisions and activities.Figes contends that both sides of the debate the pragmatic approach and the ideological perspective have significant flaws. Furthermore, Bertrand Patenaude recently refuted Lih's claim, claiming that "war communism" really

includes an element of utopianism at its core. Significant interpretive discrepancies continue. Lastly, a more general query. Does war communism represent a substantial shift from the Bolshevik concept of the nature of the transition period? Does it reflect one specific interpretation of the wide definition of socialism in Bolshevik speech, or is it a theoretically unique model of the transition from capitalism to communism? The relevance of this time period is not limited to the civil war-era policies. The Bolshevik Party started discussing and theorising the transitional phase and its characteristics in the context of actual national governance in 1919 and beyond. A more clear-cut understanding of socialism started to emerge from these discussions. The economics of "war communism" The respite following Brest-Litovsk was just temporary. The Bolsheviks implemented a number of policies that further the tendencies towards centralization, nationalisation, concentration, hierarchy, and technocracy when the civil war broke out in May/June 1918. The theoretical discussions regarding the nature of Soviet socialism were influenced by the Bolsheviks' experiences managing the economy during the civil war.8 Ownership and control structures in industry and the economy.

A decree "On Nationalization" was published on June 28. The Brest-Litovsk Treaty had a role in this to some extent. German investors bought heavy industrial interests in Russia quickly. It was necessary to quickly adopt a decree nationalising a wide range of businesses, including mining, metallurgy, textiles, engineering, railroads, public utilities, and many more, in order to prevent control from falling into the hands of foreign people. The decree, however, was just a formal acknowledgement of the transfer of ownership on paper. The enterprises declared under this Decree to be the property of the RSFSR are regarded as being leased to their former owners gratis; their boards and former owners continue to finance them and receive profits in the usual manner, according to Section 3 of the decree. However, this is subject to a special decision of the Supreme Economic Council regarding each specific enterprise. Actual Vesenkha (VSNKh) control demanded direct oversight from above. The long-term goal of quickening the process of "trustification" the development of big state monopolies run by the center lay underneath the urgency forced by German investors' activities. The necessary preconditions for this were established through nationalisation. But it wasn't a well-organized procedure. Local appropriations kept on, highlighting the ongoing disconnect between intentions and actions. The Bolsheviks tried to nationalise small rural businesses in the early months of 1919. Small-scale industrial businesses were placed under central supervision in November 1920, marking the end of full-scale nationalisation. The management of industry was a far more important issue than legal ownership in the context of escalating violent foreign intrusion on Russian territory.

The dilemma of how best to organise the economy arose quickly as a result of maintaining supply and output throughout the civil war. Particularly, three problems jumped out. What function should Vesenkha perform? What kind of connection would exist between Vesenkha and the regional institutions of economic power? What configuration would the main organs of power take? Trustification was seen by the Bolsheviks as the union of ideology and practicality. Socialism was seen to have its economic foundation in the development of massive state industrial trusts, modelled after the German wartime economy. However, they were also perceived as making the administrative procedures for the industrial sector simpler. The demands of a civil war made industrial administration easier by causing geographical contraction (facilitating central control) and by establishing a clear hierarchy of production objectives. Nearly 90 of these trusts had been established by the end of 1919. Under Vesenkha's general direction, they had to account to their neighbourhood glavk. Vesenkha's position progressively changed from one that was mostly managerial and administrative to one that was more supervisory and regulating (as originally intended).

A proclamation from August 1918 that said Vesenkha was to "administer all the enterprises of the republics" served as the foundation for this. Changes were made to Vesenkha's internal operations as a result of this more precise, close-knit administrative role. This edict specified its organisation and membership. Most importantly, a praesidium with nine members was established, with the president and vice president chosen by Sovnarkom. The praesidium swiftly replaced the broader council as the primary policy-making body as a result of its new status and the civil war. After the fall of 1918, the whole council did not assemble once again. Conflicts between the many central agencies and committees grew at the centre as Vesenkha sought to govern the economy more and more via the distribution of commodities, the provision of instructions, and the defining of priorities. In particular, the proliferation of committees and agencies formed by the Council of Labour and Defence (STO), the Commissariat of Food Procurement (Narkomprod), and Sovnarkom bureaucratized economic operations. This demonstrated how the demand for economic efficiency started to conflict with the tendency for centralization. Conflicts in the central were layered with disagreements about the specifics of the power structure between the centre and the area, a problem that characterised the Soviet era as a whole.

During the civil war, that branch of Bolshevism that had a natural tendency towards the centralization, concentration, and statification of socioeconomic processes started to consider what this really meant. The ongoing discussions and changes to party policies show the conflicts within the party between centralizers and decentralizers as well as between those with various views on centralization. Conflicts emerged about how businesses were run at the local and regional levels. Conflict between two methods arose. Glavkism is one that is built on a vertically organised structure that is separated into sectors of industry. The other was sovnarkhozy, a horizontal division focused on a geographic basis. At first, the glavki were intended to act as a barrier between the various Vesenkha components and the businesses themselves. Their job was to oversee all firms that belonged to a certain industry. They rapidly evolved into managerial organs as they started to take over the roles of Vesenkba's production divisions. Some Bolsheviks started to see the glavki as the foundation for a system of central economic planning during the civil war, as opposed to the regionalization that the sovnarkhozy required. The regional economic councils, or sovnarkhozy, were established soon after the revolution. The sovnarkhozy represented the democratic, participatory strand of industrial administration and emerged from the needs of local Soviets to organise the chaotic post-revolutionary conditions (although it was frequently justified as a more efficient method due to being closer to the actual point of production and having more accurate information).

The sovnarkhozy developed its own hierarchy, but problems with glavki surfaced when the leadership tried to define the boundaries of the allocation of duties among the various sovnarkhozy levels. The glavki increasingly accumulated greater authority at the cost of the sovnarkhozy due to the dominance of centralization. But the sovnarkhozy still had a place in the economic system, and they even had something of a comeback towards the end of 1919 when an effort was made to define a clear line of responsibility. The resulting approach, which divided businesses into three divisions, offered a balance between centralised and local economic management.The inclinations for centralization were quite strong within the backdrop of the civil war. However, it's crucial to keep in mind that similar patterns existed before the civil war, which eventually found its way into the Soviet economic structure. The battle for existence alone cannot account for the rising prevalence of glavkism. Distribution patterns: trade, finance, and allocations the capitalist market was seen by socialists as a source of unfairness, irrationality, waste, and inefficiency. There was significant debate about just what should be used to replace this.

The concept of central planning (and a specific conception thereof) gradually developed during the American Civil War as the Bolsheviks' confidence in their capacity to consciously and scientifically reorganise society and manage it combined with their knowledge of how to handle supply and distribution issues under war communism. Lenin's idea of the socialist economy included ideas of a centralised distribution of raw materials, completed commodities, and other items. He compared it to the postal service on a national and eventually worldwide scale. Scarcity, rationing, and the primacy of military supplies during the civil war greatly influenced the expansion of administrative distribution of products, which culminated in an effort to outlaw private commerce and create a state commercial monopoly. Viewing the state's expanding involvement in resource distribution as the result of a deliberate, planned effort to supplant market relations would be erroneous. During the civil war, there was a brutal fight to keep up production and feed the populace. Improvising everything along the process led to administrative uncertainty and bureaucratization. One of the key elements of war communism, the state's involvement in requisitioning agricultural products, will be covered in greater depth below. A "moneyless" economy was produced in the industrial sector as a result of the rouble's total collapse.

Municipal regions provide free services. Enterprises inside the state-controlled sector substituted cash transactions with paper transactions: companies provided supplies without cash payment and received items in the same way. In an effort to regulate this process, the state established a commercial monopoly and outlawed private commerce. Bartering, set pricing, and rationing were soon commonplace in Russian commerce. This monopoly's administration was very challenging. Vesenkha made an effort to allocate resources, but she was eventually replaced as other administrative bodies STO and the Commission of Utilisation—began to wield greater power. By using co-operatives and local Soviets as key components of the distributive network, the conflicts between glavki and sovnarkhozy were replicated at the local level. A clandestine market inexorably formed.The idea of central planning was born out of this environment of centralization, administrative allocation, moneyless economic transactions, bureaucratic turmoil, rationing, and the martial attitude engendered by the civil war[4], [5].

Following the 1917 October Revolution, Russian society, politics, and the economy underwent a significant shift. The Bolsheviks, headed by Vladimir Lenin, seized control of the government and began a risky experiment to change the country in line with their revolutionary goals. This experiment, which is sometimes referred to as "War Communism," was a critical stage in the development of Bolshevik ideology and the real-world difficulties of governing in the midst of great upheaval. The destruction of the Russian Civil War, foreign interference, economic collapse, and extensive social turmoil between the years 1918 and 1921 scarred the Russian landscape. The Bolsheviks attempted to create a socialist society against this chaotic background by nationalising companies, consolidating power over important economic sectors, and enacting laws that would hasten the shift from capitalism to communism. The mix of practical measures and ideological fervour that characterised the Bolsheviks' economic approach during this crucial era was summed up by the phrase "War Communism." The many facets of War Communism and the Bolshevik economic experiment are explored in this article. It aims to clarify the dynamic interaction between practical policy decisions and the ideologies that supported them. This period offers a glimpse into the complexity and conflicts involved in the pursuit of revolutionary change, from the nationalisation of industry to the difficulties of managing production and distribution in the midst of civil war. The economic policies put in place under War Communism reflected both the Bolsheviks' idealised vision for the future of society as well as the demands of wartime circumstances.

Consider its roots and the elements that went into its creation in order to comprehend the development of War Communism. The Bolsheviks' approach to economic organisation and management was governed by their ideology, which was based on Marxist-Leninist theory. The Bolsheviks struggled as the civil war developed with the necessity to assemble power, administer resources, and take care of the urgent requirements of both the military effort and the public. Policy choices were heavily influenced by the conflict between centralization and local autonomy as well as the inherent difficulties of moving from capitalism institutions to communist ideals. This study also looks at the economic effects of War Communism and how it affects all facets of society. The economy saw substantial disruptions as a result of the centralization of production and distribution, as well as the requisitioning of food and other resources to aid in the war effort. Tensions between peasants, workers, and other socioeconomic groups arose as a result of the discrepancy between the Bolsheviks' goal of collectivization and the reality of wartime shortages. The Bolshevik economic experiment and the War Communism period ultimately served as the foundation for later events in Soviet history. The trajectory of economic policy in the years that followed was affected by the lessons learnt during this time, including both achievements and failures. The Bolsheviks' decisions had a lasting impact on the course of the Russian Revolution and the creation of the early Soviet state as they dealt with the difficulties of war, revolution, and social change.

DISCUSSION

As a key period in Bolshevik history, War Communism represents a daring and turbulent attempt to reshape Russia's economic system in line with revolutionary ideals. This debate examines the complex complexities of War Communism and the Bolshevik economic experiment, closely examining its theoretical underpinnings, policy choices, effects, and lasting imprint on Soviet history.The ideological foundations of the Bolsheviks, which were based on Marxist-Leninist theory, had a considerable impact on the characteristics of War Communism. In order to achieve their goal of a classless society, capitalism institutions had to be eliminated, resources had to be concentrated under state control, and communal welfare had to take precedence. As the Bolsheviks dealt with the demands of the Russian Civil War, the combination of ideological fervour and practical adaptation that made up war communism was apparent.

Local Autonomy vs. Centralization

The delicate balance between centralization and local autonomy was at the heart of War Communism. While the Bolsheviks sought to create consistency and coordination by centralizing authority over important industries, the reality of the civil war often required decentralized decision-making owing to logistical limitations. The conflict between practical limitations and ideological objectives at this time influenced the direction the economy took.

Resistance among the Peasants and Collectivism

The conflict between Bolshevik ideals of collectivization and the peasantry's opposition was best highlighted by the requisitioning of grain and foodstuffs from farmers to support the war effort. Deep-seated hostility was stoked by this approach, which resulted in many rural uprisings and further complicated the implementation of War Communism. The conflict between rural society's reality and Bolshevik goals highlighted the experiment's intrinsic complexity[6]–[8].

Economic Change and Its Effects on Society

War The economic policies of communism caused serious problems. The economy was stretched as a result of the conflict and change, leading to widespread inefficiencies, resource shortages, and hyperinflation. The majority of these issues affected workers and peasants, who had to deal with worsening living circumstances and unstable economies. The harsh reality that the public had to deal with conflicted with the ideals of the Bolsheviks for an equitable society.Throughout Soviet history, War Communism's effects might be felt. The turbulent experiment made it possible to get a more complex understanding of the difficulties involved in making the switch from capitalism to socialism. The economic policy changes that followed, most notably the move to the New Economic Policy (NEP), which included parts of market-oriented reforms, were influenced by the excesses and failures of this time period.Finally, the conflict between revolutionary fervour and practical need was most shown during the period of War Communism and the Bolshevik economic experiment. It demonstrated the Bolsheviks' efforts to reform the economy while juggling the demands of a civil war and social upheaval. The severe policies and unintended effects of the experiment left a permanent imprint on Russian history, but its legacy continues to serve as a lesson on the difficulties of carrying out ideological ideals in the face of hard reality[9], [10].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the era of War Communism and the Bolshevik economic experiment stands as a pivotal chapter in both Russian and global history. This period, marked by radical economic policies and social upheaval, was a product of the tumultuous circumstances surrounding the Russian Revolution and the subsequent civil war. While War Communism was driven by the urgency of wartime necessities and the ideological zeal of the Bolsheviks, its implementation brought about significant challenges and suffering for the Russian population. The Bolshevik economic experiment under War Communism aimed to transform Russia into a communist society, characterized by the abolition of private property, central planning, and the collectivization of resources. Despite the revolutionary aspirations, the policies resulted in widespread famine, economic dislocation, and political dissent. The harsh requisitioning of grain and resources from the peasantry led to resistance and a sharp decline in agricultural production, exacerbating food shortages and economic instability.

REFERENCES

[1] M. DenBeste-Barnett and E. Wood, “The Baba and the Comrade: Gender and Politics in Revolutionary Russia,” *Slav. East Eur. J.*, 1999, doi: 10.2307/309572.

[2] C. Kornovenko, “A Peasant Component In The Transition To The New Economic Policy (1921),” *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*, 2018, doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.132975.

[3] G. Baca, “Class without production, history without materialism, and US politics without racism: the American Jeremiad of Paul Durrenberger and Dimitra Doukas,” *Dialect. Anthropol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10624-018-9490-0.

[4] T. J. Uldricks and A. Heywood, “Modernising Lenin’s Russia: Economic Reconstruction, Foreign Trade and the Railways,” *Am. Hist. Rev.*, 2001, doi: 10.2307/2693155.

[5] B. M. Patenaude, “Peasants into Russians: The Utopian Essence of War Communism,” *Russ. Rev.*, 1995, doi: 10.2307/131609.

[6] F. King, "The Russian revolution and the idea of a single economic plan 1917–28," *Revolut. Russ.*, 1999, doi: 10.1080/09546549908575699.

[7] D. Arkhireyskyi, "Food Relations of Ukraine and the RSFSR in 1918 – the first half of 1919," *Roxolania Hist. = Hist. Roxolania*, 2019, doi: 10.15421/30190215.

[8] I. A. Anfertiev, "Methodological Frameworks and Methods of Studying the Role and Scope of Political Factor in the (A)-RCP (B) – AUCP (B) Activities in State Management of Social and Economic Process in 1920s – 1930s," *Her. an Arch.*, 2018, doi: 10.28995/2073-0101-2018-1-84-97.

[9] A. V. Chichulin, "Formation of Main Directions of Bolsheviks' Cooperative Policy in Civil War and 'War Communism,'" *Nauchnyy dialog*, 2017, doi: 10.24224/2227-1295-2017-12-392-404.

[10] Á. Silva, "The House of Government: A Saga of the Russian Revolution," *Mayéutica*, 2017, doi: 10.5840/mayeutica2017439676.

CHAPTER 10

DYNAMICS OF WORKPLACE DIVISION AND PROLETARIAT TREATMENT DURING THE COLD WAR

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

"Dynamics of Workplace Division and Proletariat Treatment during the Cold War" explores the complex interactions between power structures at work and how the working class was treated during this time. The research examines disputes that resulted from power imbalances in workplaces, notably within the Bolshevik party, with a focus on the Soviet setting. The development of expertise, the emergence of one-man management, and the changing hierarchical structures within the party hierarchy are examined as key grounds of disagreement. Investigated at this time is the rise of technocratic Bolshevism, which was characterised by the success of Taylorist management techniques and scientific labour administration. The story also emphasises how these power relationships affected the rise of Taylorism and the scientific management of labour in the early 1920s. The research looks more into how the Soviet leadership treated the proletariat and how it affected labour policy. In the context of their consequences on labour organisation and production, the movements from universal mobilisation to militarization, voluntary labour service, and even punitive labour camps are assessed. Careful consideration is given to the state's involvement in influencing scientific theories of labour organisation and the degree to which the demands of the civil war affected labour mobilisation.

KEYWORDS:

Cold War Dynamics, Labor Policy, Soviet Ideology, Taylorism, Technocratic Bolshevism, Workplace Division.

INTRODUCTION

The division of power inside the workplace and the government's treatment of the proletariat may have been the main causes of conflict throughout the Cold War. Within the party, there were lengthy discussions over one-man management, experts, labour policy, and the function of the unions. The technocratic, statist branch of Bolshevism won the war in a resounding triumph, which culminated in the emergence of Taylorism and the scientific administration of labour in the early 1920s. One-man management, expertise, and hierarchy During this time period, there was a trend towards one-man management in businesses as opposed to collaborative, participatory types of management. Once again, there were considerable differences at various periods and the pattern was not constant. Neither of these developments was without opposition. In the party, the economic bureaucracy, the trade unions, and elsewhere, disagreements between individuals and factions within the party-state hierarchy punctuated this time[1]–[3].

The trend towards hiring specialists, foreshadowed in State and revolution, picked up speed after March 1918. Carr reported a rise from 300 in March 1918 to over 6,000 in only two years. The justification for their usage was the importance placed on increasing output, which was particularly pressing during the civil war, and the ongoing lack of trustworthy Bolshevik

specialists. The employment and uneven pay for these "bourgeois" professionals was determined by the proletariat's inability to advance economically and culturally in Russia. Even more fiercely debated was the topic of management. The discussion's focus collegial boards vs one-man management illustrates how far the argument had moved away from the pre-revolutionary Bolshevik slogan of worker power. The debate over whether to keep collegial boards (and how they should be composed) tore the party apart and widened the chasm between the technocratic and democratic strands of Soviet socialism. The proponents of collegiality the trade unions, Tomskii, Osinskii, and, intriguingly, some specialists and Vesenkha members made their case from a variety of angles. It represented the persistence of components of economic democracy, involvement by workers and other representatives, and the ongoing independence of localist interests against centralization for the trade unions and Left-communists. It served as the finest method of managing centralization at the local level for technical personnel and Vesenkha members. Lenin and Trotsky disagreed, saying that this strategy would best secure local adherence to national directions and avoid the creation of management-labor disputes.

Lenin believed that one-man management was the greatest (i.e., most effective and efficient) way to increase output, enforce rigorous discipline among employees, and make speedy judgements. As the Soviet industrial administration developed, collegiality was once again rationalized. Now was the moment to advance in the direction of one-man administration, according to Bukharin's theory. The power of the plant manager represented the proletariat's rule and represented the interests of the workers. The 9th Party Congress in March 1920 served as the venue for the resolution of this dispute, where Lenin's viewpoint triumphed in the face of fierce opposition. One-man management eventually came to predominate, but not exclusively (especially in military industries). At the conclusion of the Civil War in 1920–1921, there were still collegiate forms in use. In fact, four forms coexisted at this time, including experts, commissars, managers, and collegial forms, as observed by Carr, Nove, and others.29 One concept that emerged at this time was the incorporation of political direction at the level of the system's daily functioning. In order to combine the "Red" and "Expert" roles from inside their own ranks rather than from the proletariat as a whole, the Bolsheviks did this, which prepared the way for the later choice of experts from within the party. The debate over one-man vs. collegial management had significant implications for the development of the unions' function as well as the more general topic of labour policy under a socialist economy[4], [5].

Labour policy

Mobilisation, militarization, and the statification of the trade unions Labour policy proved to be a highly sensitive topic. This discussion included more general issues about the interaction between the government and the workforce as well as between the government and labour unions. In its interactions with workers (and other classes), Soviet labour policy took many different forms, including universal mobilisation, militarism, voluntary labour service, and punitive labour camps. As the need to increase productivity and the adoration of scientific and rationalistic approaches grew, the state started to implement policies to develop a scientific organisation of work. The degree to which the conditions of the civil war were to blame for the workforce mobilisation under war communism is a matter of debate among scholars. Labour was a universal obligation, according to Marx, and the Constitution of July 1918 affirmed this idea. The Labour Code, which established the parameters of the responsibility to work, detailed the specifics in October 1918.What was missing at this time, however, were the penalties for violators: the concept was not enforced. Without government assistance, workers were en masse retreating to the countryside.

The beginning of the most brutal phase of the civil war coincided with state-directed efforts to codify a universal duty to work. The trade unions were seen as the primary means of establishing the workplace discipline required for "the individual mobilisation of the entire population"31 at the 8th Party Congress in March 1919. Legislation quickly followed. A decree issued on April 10th, 1919, ordered a general mobilisation for military service. As the rate of emigration from towns to the countryside picked up, the line between military duty and labour service became hazier and eventually blurred. The principle of universal labour conscription, however, was not established until a Sovnarkom decree was issued in January 1920. In addition to universal labour service, the state also adopted other policies in an effort to balance the revolutionary fervour of the committed proletariat with the use of labour as a punitive tool against the old classes and the regime's adversaries. The Bolsheviks established "Communist Saturdays" in May 1919, where workers voluntarily donated their labour to the government for a day. The topic that would spark the most debate was the militarization of labour, which concerned the way in which labour was organised, disciplined, and mobilised. The initial actions were taken in January 1920, when the civil war was briefly at an end. Out of an existing military unit of peasant troops, a decree on 15 January 1920, created a "labour army". This practise was steadily expanded during the first half of 1920. They had a military organisational structure and performed hard physical tasks. The leadership started to disagree on the justification for militarization. Trotsky was the leading proponent of the militarization of labour as a tenet of economic reconstruction.

To achieve the fastest and most effective productivity improvements, the industrial workforce should be structured similarly to the labour armies. It was a possible "short-cut" to communism, as Figes contends. According to Trotsky, in his pamphlet Terrorism and communism: Weoppose capitalist slavery by socially regulated labour on the basis of an economic plan, obligatory for the entire people and consequently obligatory for every worker in the country... But obligation and... compulsion are essential conditions in order to bind down the bourgeois anarchy, to secure socialisation of the dominance of modernising, productivist ideas towards employment is shown by the labour armies. The creation of socialism saw the workforce as nothing more than a resource to be exploited. The mobilisation and militarization efforts brought the issue of the trade unions' function into stark light. The same battle lines were created, and this dispute consumed the party until its settlement in 1921. In a workers' state, the trade unions' primary role would be as producers. Trotsky emerged as the leading advocate for the statification of the unions. Since the dictatorship of the proletariat had been established, they were no longer required to play their customary function as protectors of workers' interests.

Trotsky's views, which were largely in response to the industrial proletariat virtually disappearing during 1920 (due to unemployment, migration, conscription, hunger, and other factors), were in line with his views on centralised control of the economy and the militarization of labor. Tomsky, the head of the trade unions, and the Workers Opposition faction within the party took up the defence of the unions. The discussion was started by a crucially important practical issue: the operation of the railroads. They wanted to see autonomous trade unions advocating for an increase in industrial democracy and supporting the interests of the workers. There were demands for "iron discipline" to be imposed on the rail unions as a result of the anarchy on the rails in 1919 and 1920. It was decided that a new central committee for the rail union, Tsektran, would take over after the 9th Party Congress in March 1920. Up to the winter of 1920, the conflict raged on, and it seized the party until the 10th Congress met in March 1921.

The most significant change occurred when a number of platforms between Trostsky's statification and Shlyapnikov's independence stances emerged. Lenin and the "buffer group" (a group of people centred on Bukharin) both put up ideas for discussion[6]–[8]. The trade union controversy was resolved at the 10th Party Congress. The intensity of the arguments shows how the Bolshevik party was able to theorise and argue crucial questions pertaining to the government of the nation and the character of the transition period, even in the middle of the civil war. There was hostility to the state's expanding involvement in the control of labour and the economy.

However, it is clear that the party also wanted to accelerate the utilisation of science and technology across all industries. Labour policy wasn't any different. The triumph of technocracy: Taylorism, scientific management, and GOELRO The Bolshevik party firmly believed that using science and technology consistently was the greatest and most effective way to change Soviet society and the economy. The Bolshevik vision of the transition period was progressively moving in a technocratic direction, emphasising the rationalist strand over the democratic libertarian one, integrating science and Soviet authority, in tandem with the rising dedication to planning and regulating social and economic processes. Examining the plans for electrification and the initiatives to implement Taylorist work practises will best demonstrate this.

The American F.W. Taylor founded the Taylorism movement, which advocated for the scientific division of work under capitalism. Taylor researched the labour process to identify the best working procedures and impose them on the workforce. It was created with the goal of maximising effectiveness and output. It symbolised, in the eyes of many socialists, further worker exploitation by capitalism. It did, however, also reflect the possibility for increasing productivity and advancing towards supposedly "higher" social forms inherent in the use of scientific principles. In this way, the Bolshevik stance on Taylorism served as an example of the larger question of how socialism negates capitalism while yet emerging from it. In 1914, Lenin wrote the following: "What does this scientific system consist of? While extracting three times as much labour from the worker in the same working day, Lenin also noticed the tremendous advances in productivity. "It ruthlessly drains all the strength, sucks every last drop of nervous and muscular energy from the wage slave at three times the normal speed." This ambivalence regarding Taylorism lasted in the post-revolutionary era, but it was muted by one significant distinction: proletarian state power. Because the proletariat was exerting political authority, Taylorist tactics could now be implemented and expanded over the whole industrial sector (rather than just in specific plants).

This brought Lenin into conflict with Alexander Bogdanov once more as they disagreed over whether bourgeois science, practises, and culture could be adopted and used to build socialism. As Sochor has argued, the "proposition which emerges from Lenin's discussion of Taylorism is that capitalist methods could be employed to build socialism". Bogdanov believed that a brand-new proletarian culture and science needed to be created. The metalworker’s union, in particular, made the first strides towards implementing Taylorism in 1918. A Central Labour Institute was established in 1920 to research the Scientific Organisation of Labour (NOT). It was led by Alexei Gastev, who would later head up the Taylorist movement in the Soviet Union. Gastev was a visionary technocrat, poet, and supporter of the harmony, balance, and coherence of an industrial society. He promoted a kind of machine collectivism, a utopia based on a culture of work, in which the person and society would undergo transformation.

Although Gastev held extreme views, Taylorism promised to increase productivity and aid in the longer-term transformation of Soviet society by fostering a set of cultural values and norms based on collectivism, technocracy, and the application of scientific rationalism.

This was in response to the Bolsheviks' short-term problem of scarce resources and a culturally and educationally backward workforce. the extent to which the Bolshevik commitments to workers' control, industrial democracy, and the emancipation of the worker from capitalist exploitation and alienation had been replaced by the commitment to productivism and the mobilisation of science and technology for the construction of so-called "progressive" societies. The discussions surrounding the implementation of Taylorism, set within the context of the mobilisation and militarization of labour and the statification of the unions, demonstrate this. Lenin's report at the 8th Congress is fascinating to read because it expresses the modernising, constructivist, and productivist ethos that underpinned Bolshevism during the civil war so clearly. Under Krzhizhanovskii's leadership, the electrification programme became a key component of the country's economic development, of the modernization of backward rural Russia, and of the provision of cultural enlightenment through the electric light bulb. This undertaking captured Lenin's attention. The "second programme of the party," he referred to it as. Communism is Soviet power with the electrification of the, he continued. full nation. We must ensure that every factory and electric power station becomes a hub of enlightenment; if Russia is covered with a dense network of electrified roads, then we will have achieved complete victory. However, until the country has been electrified and industry, agriculture, and transportation have been placed on the technical basis of modern large-scale industry, we will not have achieved complete victory. This proposal's organisational practicalities clearly served as a catalyst for the development of a formal planning process. By the time the civil war was over, the electrification effort had made the creation of a single economic plan for the whole nation a hot topic in party debates.

DISCUSSION

Dynamics of Workplace Division and Proletariat Treatment during the Cold War" is a multifaceted topic that offers valuable insights into the complex interplay between power dynamics within workplaces and the treatment of the working class in the backdrop of the Cold War era. This discussion explores the key aspects and implications of this dynamic interaction.Within the context of the Soviet Union, the division of power within workplaces was a crucial factor that influenced the treatment of the proletariat. The transition from collaborative and participatory management styles to the prominence of one-man management marked a significant shift. This transition was often accompanied by conflicts over control, authority, and decision-making, both within the workplace and at higher levels of the Bolshevik party. The discussions over one-man management versus collegial boards underscored ideological debates that traversed the trajectory of Soviet socialism. This division of power had far-reaching effects on the overall dynamics of the Soviet economy and the treatment of workers.The emergence of technocratic Bolshevism during the early 1920s was a pivotal development in this context. This movement saw the triumph of managerial approaches like Taylorism, which emphasized scientific administration of labor and efficiency optimization.

The implementation of Taylorism reflected a shift towards a more centralized and expert-driven approach to labor management. While this move aimed to enhance productivity and economic growth, it also had implications for the rights and treatment of the proletariat. The tension between scientific management and workers' rights was a recurring theme throughout this period. The treatment of the proletariat was significantly influenced by the evolving labor policies of the Soviet government.

The shifts from universal mobilization during times of war to militarization, voluntary labor service, and even punitive labor camps during peace were notable changes. These policies were often driven by the dual needs of boosting productivity and ensuring political conformity.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the exploration of the "Dynamics of Workplace Division and Proletariat Treatment during the Cold War" reveals a tapestry of intricate interactions that shaped the fate of the working class within the socio-political and economic landscape of the era. This multifaceted discourse underscores the significance of understanding the complex interplay between power dynamics, economic strategies, and ideological undercurrents.The interaction between the state and the workforce, framed by these policies, had a profound impact on the working-class experience[9], [10]. The Cold War era was marked by ideological polarization, and this ideological context played a role in shaping workplace dynamics and proletariat treatment. The tension between the ideology of the proletariat as the driving force of the socialist state and the practical demands of managing a complex economy often created contradictions. As technocratic approaches gained prominence, the representation of workers' interests within decision-making processes became a point of contention, leading to a divergence between ideology and practice.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Stoffels, “Improving team coaching.,” *Train. J.*, 2015.

[2] T. Schr *et al.*, “Challenges of Current Social, Economical and Technological Developments and Need for Reforms/Renovations in Training of Teachers in Technical-Vocational,” *TVET@Asia*, 2015.

[3] T. H. Aas *et al.*, “From the Editor.,” *Serv. Ind. J.*, 2015.

[4] N. Zisko *et al.*, “Meso level influences on long term condition self-management: stakeholder accounts of commonalities and differences across six European countries,” *PLoS One*, 2015, doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1957-1.

[5] Y. Feng *et al.*, “Meso level influences on long term condition self-management: stakeholder accounts of commonalities and differences across six European countries,” *PLoS One*, 2015.

[6] M. H. Barzoki *et al.*, “Book Reviews,” *J. Child Fam. Stud.*, 2015.

[7] E. Walyani, ES & Purwoastuti, *Ilmu Obstetri Ginekologi Sosial untuk Kebidanan*. 2015.

[8] B. Franklin and C. U. Brancati, “Moved to care□: the impact of migration on the adult social care workforce,” *Int. Longev. Cent. - UK*, 2015.

[9] M. Caballero-Anthony, “Health Governance and Dengue in Malaysia,” *Heal. Gov. Dengue Southeast Asia*, 2015.

[10] A. D. B. Cook, G.Amul, and A. Sharma, “Health Governance and Dengue in Indonesia,” *Heal. Gov. Dengue Southeast Asia*, 2015.

CHAPTER 11

AN OVERVIEW OF THE EVOLUTION OF SOVIET ECONOMIC PLANNING

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The dynamic course of Soviet economic planning between 1921 and 1928, from its start to its difficulties. During this crucial time, the State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN) was established against a background of intricate discussions and influences, both ideological and practical. Leaders like Lenin and Trotsky highlighted the necessity for a united economic policy as the aftermath of the Second World War generated arguments concerning the nature and scope of economic planning, while other viewpoints argued for localised focus or sectoral growth. The essay explores how the fundamental concepts of planning were influenced by Russian economic theory and the German War Economy. GOSPLAN emerged as a key institutional step towards centralised economic management throughout these discussions. However, debates remained, highlighting the difficulty in identifying the best practical course of action. The summary also mentions the background of the dynamics of the communist food supply throughout the war, concentrating on the Bolshevik policies towards the peasants and the consequences for food shortages during the conflict. This abstract offers a look into the complex development of Soviet economic planning at a critical juncture in its history.

KEYWORDS:

Economic Planning, Centralization, Civil War, GOSPLAN, Soviet Union.

INTRODUCTION

The State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN) was established in April 1921 as the result of a series of connected events. There was a heated argument over what precisely was meant by "planning" after the experiences of war communism. There were few hints in Marx and Engels' writings. Guroff also argues that Lenin was greatly influenced by the heritage of Russian economic thought, which stressed the "necessity of viewing the economy in its totality, and investigating the interrelationships of all the sectors of the economy. “Experience was also a great teacher. Lenin spoke generally about the need for the central organisation and control of the economy, akin to a single factory. Larin, Bukharin, Lenin, and many other prominent members of the Bolshevik party had their imaginations and theoretical frameworks heavily influenced by the German War Economy, which was centralized, concentrated, and state-directed. Planning's purpose, though, remained unclear.

Some people in particular, Lenin and Trotsky have discussed the need of creating a unified economic strategy. Another argument supported the development of several departments or industries that would later be combined. Some argued in favour of a local emphasis. Early in 1918, Vesenkha took the first steps towards creating a public works project. The debate was split between a general single state plan, in which the broad strokes of state economic policy would be drawn up by a single economic authority, and a more focused approach that highlighted a number of key projects to be carried out. The civil war interrupted this process, and it wasn't until the lull in the spring of 1920 that it was resumed. The crucial decision to

create a unified economic plan for Soviet Russia was made by the STO in December 1920, along with the adoption of the particular electrification and transport plans[1]–[3]. Contrary to Lenin's opinion, who preferred the GOELRO method, sovnarkom ordered the creation of GOSPLAN in February 1921. This was the first step towards Soviet planning. However, disagreements about the best ways to prepare remained unanswered and would ring throughout the years between 1921 and 1928.

Agriculture under war communism the economics of the civil war were dominated by the food supply. The two main goals of Bolshevik policy towards the peasantry under war communism were the socialisation of land tenure and the centralised state control of the food supply. Due to the demands of the civil war and the massive peasant opposition to the expansion of party/urban authority into the rural, the Bolsheviks were compelled to moderate their ideological inclinations in both regions. The scarcity of food is often seen as the main characteristic that defines communism during wartime. In the early months of May 1918, Bolshevik policy underwent a dramatic change. A decision was made to establish a dictatorship over the food supply and Committees of Poor Peasants (kombedy). According to Patenaude, the motivation for these actions was to increase the supply of grain, which was purely pragmatic. However, the Bolshevik class-based, urban, conflictual worldview influenced the technique that was ultimately selected. The previous practises of a governmental grain monopoly and centrally set pricing served as the foundation for the dictatorship over the food supply.

Any excess grain had to be given to the state by the peasants. In times of civil war, the central authorities established armed food supply detachments to collect the grain. The kombedy were founded with the purpose of obtaining grain for the state by inciting class conflict in the countryside. This served two purposes. As the kombedy gathered grain from the wealthy to contribute to the state, the quantity of grain collected for food would rise. Politically, it was thought that this would create class divisions among the farmers and boost support for Soviet control in the countryside. However, the kombedy were a complete failure. Late in 1918, the party started to change its attitude, becoming less antagonistic towards the "middle" peasants. Early in 1919, the party announced that it was ceasing its prioritisation of the kombedy's interests for the impoverished peasants and moved towards a "firm alliance" with the middle peasantry. It was hard to reconcile this new accommodative strategy with the severe reality of the food supply during the civil war. Local authorities started requisitioning the full quantity of grain they needed starting in late 1918. The tactic of "requisitioning" grain from the peasants via rigorous quotas became known as razverstka. According to Lih, this practise represents a retreat from the confrontation of the food supply detachments.

He describes razverstka as a quota assessment strategy that was put in place as a result of the kombedy's and the food supply dictatorship's glaring inability to provide grain to the cities. Officials in charge of the food supply understood that a governmental grain monopoly was both desirable and impractical given the circumstances of the Civil War. The razverstka meant dealing with the whole peasant village and levying a quota from it rather than attempting to fan the embers of civil conflict in the countryside. The party was still dedicated to the imposition of state rule and the abolition of market relations. In their interactions with the peasants, the civil war only enforced a feeling of realism. A similar trend was at play in the sphere of land tenure. The party was devoted to socialising the countryside. A socialist agricultural industry would be centred on large, mechanised communal farms. They would expand state control, boost agricultural output, and spread socialist principles among the populace. However, the party understood that a forced or coercive collectivization programme was foolish. The party sought a persuasion-based agenda by establishing model

states and community farms. Three types of collective farms kommuna, artel, and TOZ were established alongside the already-existing state farms or sovkhoz by decree on November 2, 1918. In contrast to the state farms, which gave the peasantry no claims to the land itself and only provided compensation for the peasants who worked them, the various collective farm types displayed a variety of approaches to land tenure and compensation. The whole internal structure of the kommuna was socialist. All things, including land and crops, were distributed equally. The artel' served as a kind of bridge between the kommuna and conventional peasant agricultural techniques. A universal assembly managed the Artel. This gathering made a decision about how much time the artel's members will spend working on the communal projects. The remaining time might be used to work on their own plots. The assembly acknowledged private property, even if it was meant to be shared by everyone. A decree from February 1919 stated that land formerly owned by the nobility that was not being farmed would pass to these new state and collective farms. The TOZ was a fairly loosely organised organisation in which members farmed their landholdings together and received produce in proportion to the land they provided. The existing peasant farmers, who had ambitions for all noble lands, found this to be very unpopular. These model farms turned out to be anything but glowing illustrations of the perfection of socialist, collectivised agriculture.

Most failed to produce any real economic dynamism and were typically run by either urbanites or non-agricultural specialists and comprised of the lazy, inebriated, and/or incompetent.To put the collectivization efforts during the civil war into perspective, in 1921, after significant state encouragement, less than 1% of rural residents were employed in the collective sector. At the conclusion of the civil war, the peasant dilemma, together with the problems of the global revolution and cultural backwardness, remained unaddressed. The politics of war communism Between 1918 and 1920, there was an increase in bureaucratization, militarism, and centralization, which was accompanied by a fall in democracy, public engagement, and local autonomy. The Soviet state's use of coercion became institutionalised, and the decision-making structures that would last for practically the whole of the Soviet era began to form. Coercion, authoritarianism, and the militarization of the Soviet state Repression and violence were deeply ingrained into Bolshevik rule during the civil war.

The debate in western literature has focused on the respective roles played by ideology, political choices, and circumstances in conditioning these developments. A decree issued on September 5, 1918, officially recognised the "Red Terror" as having begun in the summer of 1918 (following the attempted assassination of Lenin and the execution of the Imperial family in July 1918).It continued until the end of the civil war and resulted in a number of horrifying crimes against people and groups as well as the establishment of numerous labour and concentration camps (under the control of the "Whites"). The justification was simple: to support the revolution. According to Dzerzhinsky, the Cheka is not a legal tribunal. The Red Terror was the continuation of the class struggle in times of war, as Latsis argued in a famous passage: We are not waging war against individuals[4], [5].

The Cheka, like the Red Army, is the defence of the Revolution, and just as the Red Army in the Civil War could not take account of the fact that it might harm particular individuals but had to concern itself solely with the victory of the Revolution over the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie as a class is being eradicated by us. Do not search for proof during the inquiry that the accused violated Soviet authority verbally or physically. What class does he belong to should be the first inquiry you ask. Where did he come from? What is his background or line of work? And the answers to these queries should decide the accused's destiny. This is where the Red Terror's meaning and essence lay, yet it was impossible to combine a wide definition

("Defend the revolution") with a constrictive one ("Exterminate the bourgeoisie"). The Red Terror become violent and ruthless. Not only were "counter-revolutionaries" put to death, but soon speculators, prostitutes, and informers were included as well. Statistical assessments on the exact scope vary, but the overall trend of a rise in violence was evident. Although this led to disagreements among the leadership, a large portion of this discord resulted from institutional and interpersonal rivalries, as the Ministry of Justice sought to regain its authority or as individuals attempted to limit Dzerzhinsky's influence. One of the few who opposed the detention of "innocent" persons was Kamenev. However, practically all Bolsheviks had the same view that state violence could be used effectively to achieve revolutionary ends. The CHEKA is notable for reasons other than the expansion of violence and coercion. Differences were a question of extent and methodology.

Along with the Red Army, the CHEKA rose to prominence as one of the state's primary administrative agencies during the civil war. It was a dependable instrument in times of crisis and limited resources because to its organised and effective operations. As the foundation of a new administrative structure, it started to replace pre-existing institutions and further displaced the components of public involvement and control from the proletarian dictatorship. The CHEKA got engaged in the prevention of crime and banditry, the regulation of guns, the eradication of infectious diseases, the enlistment and militarization of labour, and, perhaps surprisingly, the care of orphans. It started to play a major role in finding solutions to economic issues alongside the NKVD. During the civil war, the Red Army assumed the role of the main governing body. It was able to fill the void created by the deterioration of the civilian government because to its priority claim on resources, its people, and its hierarchical and centralised organisation.

However, the Red Army had a role in the erosion of local authority as well. The links between cause and consequence are neither obvious nor simple to explain. Trotsky kept up the pace of building a Red Army with conventional organisational structures even if the party continued to declare its support for a democratic people militia. The political commissar, who had enormous civil and military authority, served as the army's representation of and carrier of revolutionary principles and awareness. As the Red Army grew to be the centre of the Soviet state, the local autonomy of Soviets and other organs was gradually lost through this agency. The impact of the Red Army's and CHEKA's expanded roles was not just institutional; it also strongly accelerated the growth of bureaucratization and centralization in the system.

For many years to come, Soviet-style socialism would take on characteristics influenced by the systematic use of violence, political means to address economic issues, efforts to identify internal "enemies," and a general militarization of Bolshevik ideas towards decision-making and governance. These changes had a significant impact on both the central leadership and the middle strata of the administration.The dictatorship of the proletariat was marked by a widespread and growing authoritarian, military operational culture. The process of resurrecting the Russian state took place in the midst of "a disintegrating economy and a decomposing social fabric". Under these circumstances and within the framework of the military's and the CHEKA's central role, it was the local autonomy organs and the democratic practises ingrained in the Soviet systemthat suffered the greatest losses[6]–[8].

The Soviet state had become extremely bureaucratized and centralised by 1920–1921. As the All Russia Congress of Soviets convened less often due to being too big and cumbersome for quick decision-making in the context of a frantic battle for life, Sovnarkom and VTSIK became the primary decision-making organisations. The system as a whole followed the same procedure. The Soviets' standing as representatives of local autonomy and the people was

steadily diminished. The centralization processes that occurred during the civil war strengthened the shift away from a horizontal, territorially-based approach to administration and towards a vertical branch structure. As military goals gained precedence over local autonomy, the Red Army signified the expansion of centralised commands and control over local regions. The Soviets devolved into nothing more than "transmission belts" for centralised orders. The system's growing bureaucratization accelerated this centralization trend. According to Liebman, the system's official population expanded from around 14,000 in 1918 to 5,880,000 in 1920.

A stifling number of committees, organisations, and departments arose to manage the war. It would be incorrect to see this federal involvement as completely invasive of local democratic processes. Many local organisations argued that they needed more centralised assistance in managing their local regions. Indeed, the Soviets themselves underwent the same process, whereby the executive committees of local Soviets replaced the representative assembly as the decision-making organ in local areas.

This presents an interesting paradox, wherein the large numbers of personnel within the system increased levels of public participation in the administration (derived from a variety of motives idealism, careerism, heroism, self-interest), while concurrently witnessing a decline in the number of people who felt a sense of civic duty to participate. Elections and democratic centralism were supplanted by appointments, bureaucracy, and vertical centralism, greatly expanding the reach and nature of centralized control.

DISCUSSION

There is a challenging and fascinating chapter on Soviet economic planning in the history of economic theory and government. From 1921 through 1928, the Soviet Union had a period of centralised economic planning, which was marked by the establishment of the State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN). This extensive economic experiment's journey from conception to completion sheds light on the ideological, practical, and environmental factors that shaped its direction.

Ideological Debates and Influences: The evolution of Soviet economic planning was primarily driven by ideological conflicts about how to apply Marxist principles in a contemporary economic environment. The experiences of wartime communism, with their chaotic resource requisitioning and centralization drives, generated critical conversations on the role of planning in a post-revolutionary society.

During this period, Lenin and Trotsky engaged in extensive discussion over the value of a unified economic policy as opposed to localised ones. The ideas that made up the conceptual framework of GOSPLAN were influenced by both the history of Russian economic theory and foreign factors, particularly the German War Economy.

The State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN) was founded in 1921, marking an important turning point in the evolution of Soviet economic planning. The main institution in charge of developing and implementing economic plans was envisioned as GOSPLAN in order to ensure full coordination across all economic sectors. There were several objections to the formation of GOSPLAN.

Lenin and other political elites advocated for a united state plan, while others pushed for a more focused approach that focused on key issues. The adoption of the plans for transport and power demonstrated GOSPLAN's broad ambition [9], [10]. However, there were a number of impediments to thorough planning. The Civil War, which disrupted the first

planning efforts, necessitated the development of practical approaches to resource allocation and production. Food scarcities were a defining characteristic of this era, highlighting the tension between ideological goals and the requirements of war. The Bolsheviks' strategy for dealing with the peasants, which attempted to impose centralised control over the food supply and land tenure, encountered resistance and necessitated tactical revisions

The emergence of Committees of Poor Peasants (kombedy) and the subsequent shift in policy in support of middle peasants demonstrated how fluid the execution of policy is Legacy and Lessons: From 1921 until 1928, important modifications were made to Soviet economic planning, laying the groundwork for future developments.

The challenges faced and compromises made during this time period brought to light the inherent challenges of translating theoretical principles into practical legislation. Conflicts between centralization and local autonomy, ideological rigour and pragmatic adaptation, persisted throughout the evolution of Soviet economic planning. These ideas would continue to have an impact on the planned economy's growth in the years to come.

CONCLUSION

In the conclusion the Soviet economy's planning, from its infancy in 1921 to its complexity in 1928, provides important insights into the complicated interaction of ideology, pragmatism, and historical situation, the author concludes. The aims and difficulties of an ambitious experiment in consolidating economic power and directing a country's growth are made clear during this time in Soviet history. The ideological conflicts that characterized this time period highlighted the struggle to bring Marxist theory into harmony with the practical requirements of a post-revolutionary society.

The chaotic resource allocation and requisitioning of war communism led to serious considerations on the need of methodical planning. A diverse range of ideas, ranging from Russian economic theory to global precedents like the German War Economy, influenced the design for the evolving economic structure as the disputes between unified tactics and localized techniques developed.

REFERENCES

[1] A. G. Kosterev, “The Phenomenon Of Soviet Technocratism: To The Formulation Of The Problem (Political-Ideological And Socio-Cultural Dimensions),” *Vestn. Tomsk. Gos. Univ. Istor.*, 2019, Doi: 10.17223/19988613/58/5.

[2] M. Jull, “Toward A Northern Architecture: The Microrayon As Arctic Urban Prototype,” *J. Archit. Educ.*, 2016, Doi: 10.1080/10464883.2016.1197672.

[3] R. E. Ericson, “The Growth And Marcescence Of The ‘System For Optimal Functioning Of The Economy’ (Sofe),” *Hist. Polit. Econ.*, 2019, Doi: 10.1215/00182702-7903276.

[4] M. Liepa-Zemeša And D. B. Hess, “Effects Of Public Perception On Urban Planning: Evolution Of An Inclusive Planning System During Crises In Latvia,” *Town Plan. Rev.*, 2016, Doi: 10.3828/Tpr.2016.5.

[5] P. L. Patterson And R. W. Campbell, “The Failure Of Soviet Economic Planning: System, Performance, Reform,” *Russ. Rev.*, 1994, Doi: 10.2307/131332.

[6] H. H. Ware, “The Procurement Problem In Soviet Retail Trade,” *J. Mark.*, 1950, Doi: 10.2307/1247662.

[7] D. Didenko, “State Strategic Planning Experience In The Ussr In Theoretical And Empirical Studies,” *Econ. Soc. Chang. Facts, Trends, Forecast / Экономические И Социальные Перемены Факты, Тенденции, Прогноз*, 2019, Doi: 10.15838/Esc.2019.5.65.14.

[8] S. L. Sampson, “The Second Economy Of The Soviet Union And Eastern Europe,” *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 1987, Doi: 10.1177/0002716287493001009.

[9] S. L. Sampson, “The Second Economy Of The Soviet Union And Eastern Europe,” In *Occupational Crime*, 2018. Doi: 10.4324/9781003073666-19.

[10] T. A. Vorobyova And V. T. Yungblud, “Relations Within «Triangle» Usa – Ussr – Prc At The End Of Détente Period (1977–1980),” *Vestn. Mgimo-Universiteta*, 2019, Doi: 10.24833/2071-8160-2019-1-64-59-82.

CHAPTER 12

TRANSFORMATIONS WITHIN THE BOLSHEVIK PARTYCENTRALIZATION, FUNCTION AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The complex changes that the Bolshevik Party through at a crucial time in its history. The party experienced major changes that redefined its internal structure, purpose, and makeup from its early days of revolutionary fervour through the obstacles presented by the civil war. Power being more and more concentrated at the pinnacle of leadership, centralization developed as a recurrent issue. The party's transition from revolutionary agitators to the centre of the fledgling state government underlined the significance of this change in function. The party's prominence changed amid rising monopolistic tendencies, prompting a closer investigation of the internal processes that caused these changes. The party struggled with how to exercise power while maintaining the autonomy of the soviets as the civil war revealed the conflict between democratic principles and centralized rule. Further evidence that dissent remained despite the party's control and revealed a more nuanced reality came from opposition both within and outside the party. Furthermore, as the Bolshevik Party rapidly grew and diversified its membership from workers to peasants and white-collar workers, it experienced a fundamental transformation in terms of its socioeconomic composition. This abstract provides a view into the complex web of the Bolshevik Party's transformation, highlighting the interaction of centralization, changing social positions, and fluctuating demography.

KEYWORDS:

Bolshevik Party, Democratic Ideals, Internal Structure, Monopolistic Tendencies, Revolutionary Shifts.

INTRODUCTION

Within the party, changes took place along four primary axes. The party's internal structure and operation became ever more centralised, with more power concentrated at the top of the leadership. The party's function changed from being a group of revolutionaries to becoming the centre of the new state government. As the system grew less pluralistic and the party progressively took a monopolistic stance, the standing of the party changed. Finally, the party's social makeup underwent an irreversible change.The civil war exposed the conflict inside the party between democracy and centralism. The party was subject to the same dynamics that influenced the state apparatus. The Central Committee (cc), which was chosen by the Party Congress, and the Party Congress, which served as the pinnacle of the pyramidal system of party organs described in the party laws, served as the body's executive and decision-making bodies. The emergence of new power structures represented the concentration of authority at the party's leadership. The Orgburo was established and the Politburo was reformed during the 8th Party Congress in March 1919. The Secretariat was also established in 1920. The three bodies had the following roles[1]–[3].

The Politburo, a small group of (at first) five individuals. The Orgburo was a board of cc secretaries that reported to the Orgburo and was responsible for carrying out organisational and administrative duties, particularly the appointment and selection of personnel. The Secretariat was a board of cc secretaries that dealt with specific issues that did not require the intervention of the Orgburo.The cc met less frequently as time went on. Due to the overlap in membership on these new organs, a significant amount of power was effectively concentrated in the hands of a small number of influential people. By 1922, Stalin was the only individual who had membership in all four organisations. As the party started to establish a functioning machinery to allow it to carry out the duties of governing the nation, this process gave rise to a plethora of bureaux and committees. Nine distinct departments, including the Orgotdel, the Uchraspred, and the Informotdel, were created by the cc. Bureaux were developed to collaborate with non-Russian entities. The cc increased its level of control by tying local party committee work more closely to itself, appointing officials rather than having them chosen from below, and giving secretaries of party committees greater authority at all levels of the hierarchy.

Taken together, these changes represented a significant bureaucratization of party activity. The issues were handled administratively. The elected premise has been replaced by appointmentism. Democracy was controlled by centralism. Following the passing of Sverdlov, who had led both the party and Soviet bureaucracies, the party's position was changed during the 8th Party Congress. The "Organisational Question" Resolution, which tried to define the functions of the party and soviet organs, was adopted. A party fraction must be established in every soviet organisation, and these fractions must strictly adhere to party discipline. It is never acceptable to conflate the duties of party collectives with those of state institutions like the Soviets. The party must carry out its decisions through the soviet bodies, within the bounds of the Soviet constitution. The party seeks to guide rather than take over the activity of the soviets.

The challenge was political procedure. How might leadership be practised without weakening the soviets' autonomy? The decision-making centre shifted inexorably from VTSIK and the ARCS to sovnarkom, and particularly to the cc, as a result of a precedent set at the top level. The party made lower-level attempts to establish the foundation of all public organizations (via individual members). To guarantee that politically dependable people held the key roles, key persons were selected by the secretariat. In order to push for the acceptance of the party line, party divisions were to organise inside all non-party organisations. This functional separation proved tough to maintain. The chief representative in local regions was quickly replaced by the local party secretary. In the system as a whole, power was transferred from the state to the party. In the party, power shifted from the local levels and the lower ranks to the leadership and the full-time apparatus. The party had quickly taken over the role of the administration's "directing nucleus". The expansion of the Bolshevik monopoly of power continued the tendencies that were already in place before the civil war.

During the civil war, the other socialist parties were marginalised and persecuted, but the Mensheviks and the SRS managed to remain active at the local level. The Mensheviks had gained ground in elections to urban Soviets and were, in fact, the most well-liked movement inside the unions. In the countryside, the SRS continued to have a sizable following. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, dominated the elite. Elite-level opposition was mostly limited to party factions that started to develop. A number of opposition groups emerged between 1918 and 1920/21, challenging the leadership on a wide range of topics. The thrust of Bolshevik policy agitated and dissatisfied the Left Communists, the Workers' Opposition, the Military Opposition, the Democratic Centralists, and others. The important problem is the

continued public dissent, disagreement, and discussion in the middle of the civil war. At this juncture, the party's domination at the upper level did not necessarily mean that all opposition, both within and outside the party, had been put down. Finally, the party's social makeup underwent a drastic and permanent change. It developed into a major party during the civil war, going from having just a few thousand supporters at the beginning of 1917 to having almost 600,000 by March 1920. It is important to take notice of the social backgrounds, life experiences, and perspectives of the newcomers. According to Siegelbaum, the share of manual labourers increasingly decreased while that of peasants and white-collar employees increased. By January 1921, there were 240,000 workers (41% of the party), 165,300 peasants (28%), 138,800 employees (23.7%), and 41,500 people of unknown ancestry (7.1%). The majority of these individuals joined the party after the revolution, frequently for careerist reasons or to obtain limited rations or privileges, and they were imbued with ideas of militaristic methods of rule. Figes deftly describes how party members' ideologies moulded the post-revolutionary state's practises and the character of Bolshevik power. The party membership was mostly uneducated and pragmatist. The system grew more and more riven with corruption and cronyism at the local level, but the majority remained ideologically loyal to the cc's dictates. Significant changes had been made to the party. The (Less) Politics of War Communism Lenin said, "We have no doubt learned politics; here we stand as firm as a rock," during the 8th Congress of Soviets in December 1920. However, things are not good in terms of the economy.

The finest politics from now on will be the least political ones. Bring more engineers and agronomists to the fore, learn from them, monitor their work, and transform our congresses and conferences into bodies that will truly learn the business of economic development, not into propaganda meetings. Lenin promoted "less politics" in the context of his plans for electrification. Lenin began his speech by declaring: "This marks the beginning of that very happy time when politics will recede into the background, when politics will be discussed less frequently and at shorter lengths, and engineers and agronomists will do the majority of the talking." His earlier remarks were influenced in part by his growing frustration with the factional conflicts within the party. On a deeper level, however, it reveals a deep-seated aversion to "politics" and a preference for a technocratic, scientific method of managing society and for putting production first above all other considerations. The decisions and policies implemented during this time were influenced by this underlying worldview, which was virtually Saint-Simonian in nature. Bureaucratization, coercion, centralization, and hierarchicalization were all signs of the stratification of Soviet political life while they were taking place. Workers' control, local Soviets, and trade unions democratic institutions put in place in 1917were eliminated or badly weakened.There are several reasons for this stratification.

A vast process of institution-building and bureaucratization was required due to the severe lack of resources and manpower, which was often promoted from below by local authorities who were already straining to cope. Because of the conflict, authoritarianism and corrosive coercion were introduced into politics, along with the idea of an enemy. The accusation of counter-revolution may result from a failure to actively support the revolution. The same allegation would soon be used against everyone who disobeyed the leadership line. Excellent study has been done by social historians on the devastation and emigration of the industrial proletariat during the civil war. There were twice as many bureaucrats as workers in Russia in 1921, according to Figes.This had two effects. First, as their base of support shrunk, the Bolsheviks were more and more isolated[4], [5].

Second, the party began to see that the necessary socialist awareness that would allow the populace to take part in system governance was "missing." These factors greatly influenced the growth of coercion, bureaucratization, and the prioritization of the use of specialists and experts in the administration of the system. The party, its activists, its commissars, and its officials were forced to take the place of the people in the country's administration as the only ones with the "correct" socialist consciousness. less politicians and more agronomists. It would be incorrect to assume that either the leadership or the party as a whole accepts these developments without question. A number of opposition movements, including the Workers' Opposition, Democratic Centralists, Military Opposition, and a group of communists in Ukraine pushing for greater autonomy, attempted to revive the democratic impulse and the local, representative organs of Soviet society (though only within the confines of exclusive Bolshevik rule). As the military threat fluctuated, criticism crept in spasmodically. The ambition to position the democratic, emancipatory, libertarian branch of Soviet socialism at the heart of the post-revolutionary state served as the unifying theme of all this critique. The 8th Party Congress in March 1919 is when criticism from the Left-libertarian movement most likely peaked. Here, the party remained dedicated to industrial democracy via trade union membership and a popular militia. The leadership was well aware of the system's flaws. There were many solutions developed. Lenin started a series of party membership purges to get rid of those who were deemed "unsuitable." To prevent corrupt networks from solidifying their power, more frequent rotation of officials was also encouraged, both geographically and occupationally.

The public control of the state and party institutions was one of the most intriguing phenomena that illustrates the developing hegemony on the character of politics under Bolshevik leadership. To cut down on "red tape," the Bolsheviks established the People's Commissariat of State Control (NKGK) in May 1918. After another restructuring in 1919, the Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection (RABKRIN) was established in February 1920. Its goal was to encourage more public participation and control, which would lessen the bureaucratic aspect of government. RABKRIN attempted to include the general populace in the control of officialdom by a variety of techniques, typically aid cells and mass investigations. Its existence was rather tumultuous. Concurrently, new institutions were established to supervise the activity of the party. These party control commissions, both at the top and local levels, had a little effect on the party's trend towards centralization, appointees, and bureaucratization. Within the dictatorship of the proletariat, conflict still existed between elite revolutionary consciousness and public rule. The Bolshevik idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat was pushed farther towards centralization, elitism, and technocracy by the civil war, adding bureaucratization and coercion. However, this idea just reinterpreted the conflict between widespread involvement and centralised control, not its elimination.

Lenin made an unsuccessful effort to combine the two by converting Soviet society's organs into "transmission belts" for party doctrine, to the extent that the civil war's restrictions permitted, and by establishing public institutions to monitor the activities of party and state authorities. This amounted to the predominance of a technocratic method of managing society, supplemented with state-directed public engagement that would serve an educational purpose. One of the most striking findings from the study of the American Civil War is the amount of time and effort that was put into discussing and creating the state's cultural, educational, and social policies. It looks to be a diversion from the main priority of establishing authority and achieving military success, at least on one level. However, in the Bolshevik viewpoint, concern for society and culture was an integral component of the struggle to establish socialism and maintain power by instilling the regime's beliefs in the populace.

The system itself would change as a result of the transformation of the labourers and peasants. The main problem wasn't how to establish a socialist culture or how to build a society where communist principles predominated. No, the problem was how to create socialism via culture and social policy[6], [7].

Egality and inequality during war communism from an economic perspective, Soviet Russia saw higher stratification and inequality under war communism. The circumstances had a role in this to some extent. Rationing was a result of shortage caused by war. As a result, since they were so dependent on these groups for existence, the Bolsheviks inexorably gave them special treatment inside the system. As the party gradually renounced its commitment to the "maxima" (a ceiling on earnings, though given the collapse of the rouble, the benefits-in-kind were the most tangible and useful ones) during the civil war era, the following privileges emerged95. The primary beneficiaries of high wages were the specialist and technical staff in state enterprises. The trade unions' renunciation of the practise of minimising income differentials in March or April 1920 led to increased income differentiation. The primary beneficiaries of the system of rationing commodities and food were the manual labourers and the party/state officials. Rations were distributed in the following proportions: 4:1:2:1 to manual labourers, white-collar employees, and unemployed people. The Red Army members got special rations, making them the most privileged category. The distribution of special meals to individuals like CHEKA employees, chosen workers, political agitators, and others increasingly became commonplace. Additionally, other amenities like lodging, travel, and educational opportunities fell within the purview of discretionary spending.

DISCUSSION

The time under consideration, marked by changes within the Bolshevik Party, illustrates the intricate interaction between centralization, shifting roles, and changing social dynamics. These alterations altered the party's identity, function, and composition within the context of the Russian Revolution and the ensuing civil war.Power Concentration and Internal Structure: One of the most significant changes was the Bolshevik Party's growing power concentration. There was an urgent need for streamlined leadership as the turmoil of revolution gave way to the difficulties of nation-building. The establishment of organisations like the Central Committee (CC), the Politburo, the Orgburo, and the Secretariat served as a prime example of this centralization. These systems, which were originally designed to encourage effective government, progressively concentrated power in the hands of a small number of people. The party's internal structure was altered by the shift towards a more hierarchical leadership system, changing its methods for policy formation and execution.

The Bolshevik Party experienced a significant transformation in its role from a group of revolutionary agitators to the centre of the state administration. The demands of the civil war required a more structured and authoritative approach to governing. The party's function changed during this transition from advocating for revolutionary ideas to handling the complicated issues of government, including as resource distribution, social services, and administration. The party's original aim and its new position sometimes came into conflict as a result of the need to strike a balance between defending ideological beliefs and meeting the practical requirements of the young state.Social dynamics had a considerable impact on the Bolshevik Party's social makeup as well at this time. Due in part to the upheavals of the revolution and the civil war, the organization's membership rapidly increased from a few thousand supporters to hundreds of thousands, which resulted in a diversity of its socioeconomic base. The socioeconomic structure of the party was altered by the inflow of labourers, peasants, and white-collar workers. Workers once made up a significant section of the party, but as peasants and workers gained prominence, the party's composition changed.

Different social groups brought their own viewpoints and goals to the table, which extended the party's appeal and created new dynamics.Democratic principles vs. Centralised power: A key topic that arose was the conflict between democratic principles and centralised power. Although the Bolsheviks supported the idea of workers' democracy and the function of the soviets, they were forced to consolidate power by the need for quick decision-making in the face of both internal and foreign obstacles. Throughout this transformative era, striking a balance between protecting the autonomy of local soviets and consolidating power at the party's upper echelons remained a significant problem.

Internal and external criticism to the party's direction throughout these transitions emphasized the complexity and evolvability of the party. Workers' Opposition, Democratic Centralists, and Left Communists, among others, opposed the leadership's choices on a number of fronts. The party was not homogeneous, and arguments and conflicts continued even as the party underwent major centralization and reform, as seen by the range of opinions.Finally, the changes that occurred inside the Bolshevik Party during this crucial time period provide light on the complex interactions that underlie revolutionary rule. These changes provided the groundwork for the Bolshevik Party's eventual role in directing Soviet policy and its long-lasting influence on political history[8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

The changing socioeconomic makeup, the shifting role of the party from revolutionary supporters to state administrators, and the shifting balance between centralization and democratic principles all highlight the intricate interaction between ideology, pragmatism, and the practicalities of administration. Finally, the changes that occurred inside the Bolshevik Party during this crucial time demonstrate the complexity of revolutionary government. The history of the party and its ultimate impact on the Soviet Union were influenced by the difficult balance between centralization and democratic principles, the recalibrating of the party's position, and the evolving social dynamics. The ongoing interaction between revolutionary zeal, realistic governance, and the complex processes of society transformation is highlighted by this progression.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Denbeste-Barnett And E. Wood, “The Baba And The Comrade: Gender And Politics In Revolutionary Russia,” *Slav. East Eur. J.*, 1999, Doi: 10.2307/309572.

[2] A. Y. Livshin, “Communist Party In The Power System Of The Ussr,” *Outlines Glob. Transform. Polit. Econ. Law*, 2018, Doi: 10.23932/2542-0240-2018-11-3-13-35.

[3] A. A. Gentes, “ Closer To The Masses: Stalinist Culture, Social Revolution, And Soviet Newspapers , By Matthew Lenoe ,” *Can. J. Hist.*, 2005, Doi: 10.3138/Cjh.40.2.347.

[4] I. A. Anfertiev, “Methodological Frameworks And Methods Of Studying The Role And Scope Of Political Factor In The (A)-Rcp (B) – Aucp (B) Activities In State Management Of Social And Economic Process In 1920s – 1930s,” *Her. An Arch.*, 2018, Doi: 10.28995/2073-0101-2018-1-84-97.

[5] S. B. Smith, *Captives Of Revolution: The Socialist Revolutionaries And The Bolshevik Dictatorship, 1918-1923*. 2011. Doi: 10.1080/09668136.2012.691378.

[6] V. V. Sukhonos, “The Soviet Model Of Local Governance Of The Fate Of The New Economic Policy: The Political And Legal Aspects,” *Leg. Horizons*, 2019, Doi: 10.21272/Legalhorizons.2019.I18.P20.

[7] B. D. Nistad, “Was Lenin A Jacobin-Blanquist?,” *Scando-Slavica*, 2010, Doi: 10.1080/00806765.2010.530799.

[8] M. Mohanty, “Chinese Revolution And The Indian Communist Movement,” *China Rep.*, 1991, Doi: 10.1177/000944559102700103.

[9] A. Weiner, “The Making Of A Dominant Myth: The Second World War And The Construction Of Political Identities Within The Soviet Polity,” *Russ. Rev.*, 1996, Doi: 10.2307/131868.

[10] R. Hernandez, F. Brown, A. Dacal, J. A. D. Vazquez, And F. Rojas, “Cuban Discussion Of Why Eastern European Socialism Fell,” *Nature, Soc. Thought*, 2005.

CHAPTER 13

AN OVERVIEW OF INEQUALITY, LIBERATION OF WOMEN AND CULTURAL SHIFTS IN EARLY SOVIET RUSSIA

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

This review digs into the complex environment of early Soviet Russia, focusing on three essential factors that determined its course. First, it looks at the widespread problem of inequality, which has drawn criticism from both Left-libertarians and workers. Due to the two imperatives of survival and productive development, Lenin and party leaders understood the inequality and chose to priorities productivism above egalitarianism. The second half of the story examines the founding and development of the Women's Department of the CC Secretariat (Zhenotdel), a crucial project that was conceived during the civil war. Zhenotdel sought to develop a cadre of female workers across hierarchies with the purpose of emancipating women from conventional roles, but disputes developed between its vision and Bolshevik leadership. The research also sheds light on the subtle cultural changes that occurred inside Bolshevik ideology. As chances for a revolution in Europe diminished, a greater focus was placed on culture in order to close the economic and technical gaps and raise a citizenry capable of taking part in socialist rule. This investigation focuses on the Prolet'kult movement's attempt to create a proletariat culture by fusing changes in politics, the economy, and culture. In conclusion, this abstract offer a thorough looks at how inequality, women's emancipation, and cultural change interacted in the early Soviet period.

KEYWORDS:

Cultural Shifts, Early Soviet, Inequality, Liberation, Prolet'kult Movement, Social Transformation.

INTRODUCTION

Both workers and Left-libertarians found these practices to be quite offensive. Lenin and other party officials did acknowledge the unfavourability of this rising disparity. However, the leadership was obligated to encourage inequality and to place a higher priority on productivism than egalitarianism due to the dual imperatives of physical survival and the growth of the productive forces. It is intriguing to compare this steady rise in inequality with the seeming radicalism of the communist wartime economics. Can they be made to agree? In terms of Lenin's pre-revolutionary writings, in which he anticipated the necessity for uneven incentives, and with the overall tenor of transition economics (increasing output), there is unquestionably nothing abnormal.

The interpretations and theories of war communism about which more is given below might contain the solution. The founding of Zhenotdel Women's Department of the cc Secretariat, which was founded in November 1918, was the key initiative regarding views towards the liberation of women throughout the civil war. Zhenotdel was founded as a result of this Congress. Its initiatives aimed to educate and culturally enrich women in order to entice them into the public eye[1]–[3].

In order to link the liberation of women from the traditional roles they still played and the establishment of socialism, it was intended to build a sizable cadre of female workers who would work for the party and the state at all levels of the hierarchy. Radical differences between Zhenotdel activists and the Bolshevik leadership emerged. The zhenotdelovski advocated for a world of new women to develop a communalized society neighbourhood by neighbourhood, as Clements has pointed out. As the initial emancipatory and liberational elements in Bolshevik discourse faded, the technocratic, instrumentalist attitude of the leadership took hold. However, leading Bolshevik theoreticians (Lenin, Trotsky, and Bukharin) believed that huge centralised organisations would construct communism by rearranging economic structures, producing as a result the social transformation of which women's emancipation was a part. Zhenotdel developed became one of the party's transmission belts, mobilising women to carry out specific duties in the creation of socialism. This is not to imply that substantial developments that freed women or questioned ingrained societal mores did not occur. These changes took place as a result of the state's policy shifting to a more instrumentalist approach to the Zhenskii Vopros.

Inculcating a new worldview: education, propaganda, and the discussion of proletarian culture The Bolsheviks began to place more and more emphasis on culture as the possibility of an impending European revolution diminished. The development of socialism in Soviet Russia was hampered not only by the economic and technological backwardness of the country, but also by the workers' and peasants' cultural and social backwardness. Only with a competent workforce was rapid large-scale industrial growth and the application of science and technology to the production process conceivable. It was necessary for the public to be read and educated in order for them to participate in the administration of socialism. The low levels of socialist awareness in the populace were another growing danger to Bolshevik control.

In a nation where the petit bourgeois peasants are seen to be in control, it would be difficult to embed communist party authority. A remaking of the populace's worldview was attempted as a result of cultural advancements. The nature of this culture gave rise to disagreements, which expressed some of the more profound conflicts underlying the Bolshevik movement. With the rise of the Prolet'kult movement, the debate over the nature of culture after the revolution re-emerged. Drawing on the ideas of Bogdanov, Lunacharskii, and others (interestingly, Bukharin and Kollontai), the Prolet'kult movement worked to establish, develop, and spread a distinctly proletarian culture. For the prolet'kultists (a very wide and amorphous organisation), culture was independent of politics and economics, therefore a cultural transition had to take place concurrently with (or maybe even before) political and economic advances.

In fact, many extreme prolet'kultists want to completely reject all bourgeois cultural and scientific advancements while establishing a new proletariat culture. Bogdanov advocated for the "socialisation of science" at the Prolet'kult's inaugural conference in Moscow in September 1918 as the cornerstone for developing a genuinely proletarian culture. Despite being staffed primarily by intellectuals, Prolet'kult's goals included not only the development of a proletarian culture but also the advancement of workers themselves to oversee its growth. The Prolet'kult movement espoused a faith in the creative potential of both the workers themselves and in the autonomy and centrality of cultural transformation in the establishment of socialism in Russia. The Bolshevik who opposed it most vehemently was Trotsky. Along with Lenin, he sharply criticised those who wanted to abandon all bourgeois culture and values and placed a priority on economic developments.

Lenin and Trotsky considered increasing output to be the most important objective, to which all sectors of society had to participate. In making this claim, Trotsky in particular argued against the autonomy of the cultural realm and gave it a secondary place in the development of socialism[4], [5].

Lenin served as a kind of middleman (as he often did in other situations). Lenin agreed that a "cultural revolution" was necessary, but with two key caveats. His primary focus was with material culture, such as literacy and scientific knowledge. In creating a new proletariat culture, he had little time for avant-garde movements or creative experimentation. Second, Lenin fiercely disagreed with those who wished to counteract capitalism's advancements in the arts and sciences. The only way to overcome the cultural and educational backwardness of the Russian worker and peasant was to widely disseminate the most recent developments in human culture.This is how Lenin's theory that socialism is the offspring of capitalism and its heir is applied to the cultural sphere. Lenin's approach towards culture was strongly utilitarian due to the demands of modernisation and productivism. As the ambiguities and tensions within Bolshevism over culture were played out, the cultural sphere experienced struggles and disputes over the administration and substance of cultural policy throughout the civil war era (and later). The civil war era witnessed a huge expansion in the establishment of institutions to supervise cultural policy, as it did in so many other sectors. Under Lunacharsky, a Commissariat of Enlightenment (Narkompros) was established, which was charged with overseeing all facets of cultural policy, including the arts, literature, education, press, cinema, and theater.

As the party gradually broadened the scope of its operations, ideas, values, and policies were popularised and disseminated among the populace through various organisations (zhenotdel, Komsomol, trade unions). They also disbanded organisations that span class lines, most notably the Boy Scouts. Throughout this time, there was conflict between society autonomy and governmental authority. However, there was no conclusive remedy. The universities, the Academy of Sciences, scientists, and some well-known cultural figures maintained significant autonomy from the state while Prolet'kult's influence waned after 1920.

The content of cultural policy combined a number of distinct strands intended to inculcate a new worldview as well as to impart more specialised educational and technical values as part of the modernization of society. As part of the process of creating a new worldview, secular and religious explanations of the universe had to be destroyed, and a communist worldview had to be spread through an enormous propaganda network.

Expecting that as a result of industrialization and education, personal faith would inevitably wane, the party adopted a strategy of militant atheism and began to eradicate organised religion in Russia. Due to the expropriation of church property and the termination of governmental support, priests were destitute. Religious structures have been transformed for a variety of purposes, including atheist museums. The teaching of religion was forbidden and atheistic propaganda took its place. Festivals of religion were supplanted with communist and secular substitutes. To promote the atheistic gospel, a massive propaganda network was established, using film, theatre, the press, and posters. Censorship was used more and more throughout the civil war as opposing opinions were repressed. The widespread illiteracy in Russia was one of the greatest barriers to the achievement of this endeavour to build a socialist person. The Bolsheviks started an initiative to eradicate illiteracy. A network of literacy schools was developed, particularly in the Red Army, but also in workplaces and elsewhere[6]–[8].

Underlying these social and cultural activities was the Bolshevik goal to alter the world, and their trust in the potential of the human intellect to organise this process. This desire to engage in extensive social engineering was a manifestation of the constructivist tendencies of Bolshevism. The material circumstances of the civil war, where the Bolsheviks lacked the means to carry out this transition, repeatedly hindered and perplexed this aim. The civil war era is notable for the gradual ascendance of the Leninist utilitarian line on cultural policy, emphasising the struggle to overcome adversity and build socialism, reinforcing the technocratic, productivist line, over the democratic, libertarian approach that sought a proletarian culture created by the workers themselves. War communism: specifics and discussions There has been a lot of argument over how to understand it among Western and Soviet historians. Numerous writings provide excellent documentation of the distinctive characteristics of the Soviet state at this time. If these and the analysis above are summarized, the following characteristics can be found:

1. An increase in the statization and central control of all aspects of life; extensive nationalisation of industry; administrative allocation of goods, services, raw materials, and labour;
2. An effort to stifle private trade by eradicating market relations and by abolishing money;
3. An increase in the use of coercion, terror, and authoritarian practises;
4. A bureaucratization of political a. The argument between ideologies and conditions, or ideologies and circumstances, is the fundamental point of contention.

Early Soviet writers like Kritsman, who saw "war communism" as "an experiment in the first steps of the transition to socialism," emphasised the ideological component and referred to it as the "Heroic Period." Later Soviet texts instead emphasised the need and conditions that led to the creation of a variety of radical measures intended to handle an extreme predicament. The policies came to an end with the conclusion of the warnon-Soviet literature exhibits a similar tendency to choose one account over the other. Was War Communism a reaction to the war situation and collapse, or did it represent an all-out effort to jump into socialism? Nove sees it as a combination of the two. I've said before that it may be both of these things at once. Perhaps it should also be noted that it meant different things to various Bolsheviks, and this is a crucial factor in our understanding of how they perceived the about-turn in 1921.

Szamuely contends that the ideological legacy of Marxism did provide some general guidelines within which the Bolsheviks made their policy decisions.Boettke went further, contending that, this task of eliminating market relations and "taking over the whole process of social production from begin to finish" was a crucial However, a lot of the radical messianic interpretations came from the similarity of elements of the Bolshevik war economy with Kautsky's identification of the fundamental characteristics of a socialist economic system. War communism represents the conscious and deliberate attempt to realise Marx's utopia. This prompted academics to consider them to be enduring characteristics of the transitional era. Recent publications have claimed that Lenin's post hoc construction of military communism to support the NEP's shift towards moderation was all that it was. In contrast to Lars Lih, Siegelbaum has suggested that Lenin developed "war communism" in an effort to support NEP and discredit his detractors. Lenin described it as a frantic reaction to emergency situations on a few occasions. The experiences of Imperial Germany and Russia during World War II and their ideology both contributed to the processes of statization. It is clear from the analysis above that the policies implemented during the civil war were the result of a complex range of factors, and that each policy initiative needs to be carefully examined. According to this reading, there was nothing conceptually distinctive about this

time period. Explaining civil war events as either an effort to march directly towards communism or as a system conditioned only by exigency and desperation is overly simple and one-sided. On one level, the consistency throughout the time following October is impressive. One may see a fundamental continuity in the party's activities if one considers the goal to increase production as the overriding force influencing Bolshevik policy and takes into account the propensity to embrace large-scale, statist, and centralist solutions. The contradictions between Bolshevik theory and practise are not found at the level of their conceptions of the transitional period and actuality, but rather in the discrepancy between their political declarations in 1917 (such as workers' control of industry) and their subsequent deeds. Let's look at a couple policies to highlight the intricate elements at work. Increasing output was prioritised in several programmes, including the return to one-man management, the employment of experts, an unequal pay policy, foreign concessions, and strong worker discipline. The specifics of the civil war were what determined how these programmes would be structured.

However, the inspiration for the movement came from Bolshevik notions of the nature and aim of the transitional period. Some policies extended and deepened a particular notion by taking into account the national-specific circumstances of the transition. The post-revolutionary franchise serves as the greatest example of this. The necessity to establish a revolutionary democracy where the legislative and executive branches were combined and the proletariat was in charge was discussed in Marxist-Engelian thought on the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The franchise was not mentioned in detail. Due to the unique circumstances of the Bolshevik battle for survival, it was necessary to understand how the post-revolutionary state's authoritarian function included limiting the right to vote.

Lenin took care to emphasize that this was a national application of a fundamental idea and not a characteristic of the post-revolutionary state as a whole. Due to global circumstances, other policies were an expansion and strengthening of a certain notion. Due to Brest-Litovsk's aftereffects, the nationalization process was extended in June 1918, speeding a process that had been proceeding sporadically and gradually. The issue of abolishing money and establishing a system of direct exchange was a product of the civil war's circumstances; Preobrazhensky and others only explained it as an intentional choice made for ideological reasons after the fact.

The 1919 Party Programme and the ABC of Communism both outlined the long-term objective of a moneyless economy as well as an interim period in which money would be crucial: "In the first period of the transition from capitalism to communism, while communist production and distribution of goods is not yet organized, it is impossible to abolish money the All-Russian Communist Party strives towards the adoption of a series of measures which will render it possiblereadjustment was indicated by other policies, but one that remained within the overall productivity framework. This is especially clear when looking at the 1919 shift in favour of the middle peasants.

This "retreat" from the class war strategy (committees of poor peasants) was motivated by an acknowledgment of previous food procurement failures as well as a change of course in light of the fact that many impoverished peasants had transformed into middling peasants as a consequence of the revolutionary land settlement. The impoverished peasants continued to play a crucial part in the Bolshevik plan, especially when it came to establishing communal and cooperative farms. To put it simply, generalization is impossible. Each policy effort has to be carefully analyzed, with special attention paid to the ideological and contextual context in which it emerged. It does seem that the phrase "war communism" is a post-hoc, artificial creation that hides more than it discloses.

However, the term's intrinsic ambiguity, which draws attention to ideological and contextual elements, may imply that the notion may be rescued, although not in the way that Lenin and others had in mind. Perhaps of more relevance are the discussions taking place inside the party as a result of the experiences of leading during the Civil War. A new theoretical synthesis about the characteristics of socialism as a transitional society resulted from these. We must now proceed to a critique of this conception of socialism[9], [10].

DISCUSSION

Early Soviet Russia's historical setting offers an intriguing tapestry woven with intricate threads of inequity, women's emancipation, and cultural changes. The purpose of this debate is to clarify the importance and interaction of these three crucial factors, revealing light on the obstacles, inconsistencies, and transformational forces that influenced the development of the Soviet state.Egalitarianism vs Rising Inequality and Productivism: The early Soviet era was characterised by a contradictory conflict between the need for productivism and the recognition of growing inequality.

The leadership, including personalities like Lenin and party officials, struggled to balance the necessity for economic development and survival with the egalitarian ideals ingrained in communist philosophy. This conflict between emphasising productivity and supporting egalitarian values presented a crucial ideological conundrum. The idealistic goal of promoting social equality and the pragmatic imperative of boosting production often clashed, sparking internal disagreements and criticism from both workers and Left-libertarians.Women's liberation and Zhenotdel: In the midst of the civil war's tumult, the establishment of the Women's Department of the CC Secretariat, also known as Zhenotdel, was a turning point. Zhenotdel aimed to free women from societal expectations and incorporate them into society.

With the objective of changing public conceptions and integrating women's involvement in the development of socialism, the project sought to establish a cadre of female workers at all levels of the hierarchical structure. The disparities between Zhenotdel's expansive vision and the shifting position of the Bolshevik leadership, however, highlighted the difficult trade-offs that must be made between women freedom and the pragmatism of state-building.

The Prolet'kult Movement and Cultural Changes: As the likelihood of a European Revolution dwindled, the Bolsheviks came to understand the critical role that culture played in securing communist rule. The growth of socialism was hampered by the cultural and social illiteracy of the working class and peasantry. In an effort to create a uniquely proletarian culture that was independent of politics and economics, the Prolet'kult movement was born.

This movement, which drew inspiration from individuals like as Bogdanov, Lunacharskii, Bukharin, and Kollontai, sought to promote cultural shifts alongside political and economic transformation. However, this cultural reinvention produced discussions that reflected the more significant ideological conflicts within the Bolshevik movement. The early Soviet era saw a difficult balancing act between the needs for economic development, gender equality, and cultural change.

The difficulty in balancing these conflicting goals illustrates how difficult it is to develop a country while contending with both internal and external influences. We may better grasp the subtle growth of the Soviet experiment during its early years by using the difficulties involved in negotiating the paths of inequality, women's roles, and cultural reformation.

Early Soviet Russia had significant cultural changes, with the Prolet'kult movement serving as an example. These changes showed how important culture was in the consolidation of socialist authority. The struggles to synchronise political, economic, and cultural revolutions were made clearer by the attempts to create a uniquely proletariat culture.

The Prolet'kult discussions reflected the larger ideological conflicts within the Bolshevik movement, illuminating the complex negotiations necessary to create a new society consciousness. The interconnected stories of injustice, women's emancipation, and cultural transformation in early Soviet Russia, in conclusion, show a complex setting where revolutionary principles, practical considerations, and society ambitions coincided. This time period serves as a reminder that the path to a reformed society is paved with obstacles that call for compromise, negotiation, and adaptability. The influence of this time period is still felt today, serving as a reminder of how difficult it can be to implement large-scale social changes while juggling the complexity of human nature and historical context.

CONCLUSION

In the conclusion the complex interactions between inequality, women's emancipation, and cultural changes that defined early Soviet Russia's historical landscape provide a deep grasp of the difficulties, ambitions, and paradoxes that characterized the time. As we consider these three crucial factors, it becomes clear that they weren't independent occurrences, but rather intertwined threads in the intricate tapestry of Soviet society and ideology.

The leadership of the Bolshevik party confronted several ideological challenges as they attempted to strike a balance between the need of economic development and the ideals of equality. Productivism and egalitarianism's conflict highlighted the practical difficulties of applying Marxist doctrines in the severe conditions of a post-revolutionary country. Workers and Left-libertarians both criticise this conflict, but it really represents the complex choices needed to maintain and change the fledgling state. A big step towards gender freedom was made with the establishment of the Women's Department of the CC Secretariat, Zhenotdel. Women were to be liberated from their conventional roles and included in the creation of socialism as part of the effort. However, the disparities that surfaced between Zhenotdel's plan and the strategy adopted by the Bolshevik leadership serve as a reminder of how difficult it might be to advance female equality in a revolutionary setting when state-building needs clashed with social conventions.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Szostek, “Losing Pravda: ethics and the press in post-truth Russia,” *Russ. J. Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/19409419.2018.1564356.

[2] H. Goscilo, “Stacking national identity: The lucrative legacy of the Matreshka,” *Experiment*. 2019. doi: 10.1163/2211730X-12341340.

[3] S. Pawley, “Revolution in health: Nervous weakness and visions of health in revolutionary Russia, c.1900-31,” *Hist. Res.*, 2017, doi: 10.1111/1468-2281.12169.

[4] Anna A. Sirina, *Hunter-Gatherers in History, Archaeology and Anthropology*. 2004. doi: 10.5040/9781474214926.

[5] H. Goscilo, “Stacking National Identity,” *Experiment*, 2019, doi: 10.1163/2211730x-12341340.

[6] P. N. Wong, *Destined statecraft: Eurasian small power politics and strategic cultures in geopolitical shifts*. 2017. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-6563-7.

[7] A. Izotov, “Repositioning a border town: Sortavala,” in *The EU-Russia Borderland: New Contexts for Regional Cooperation*, 2013. doi: 10.4324/9780203095409-21.

[8] I. Dement’’ev, “From ‘Ancient Slavialand’ to ‘Paradise Lost’: Rehabilitation of Cultural Heritage in Kaliningrad (late 1940s to early 1980s),” *Acta Hist. Univ. Klaiped.*, 2015, doi: 10.15181/ahuk.v30i0.1183.

[9] W. Sperling, “‘Schlafende schöne’? Vom sinn und unsinn der Begriffsgeschichte Russlands. Ein diskussionsbeitrag,” *Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas*. 2012. doi: 10.25162/jgo-2012-0021.

[10] B. Eklof, L. E. Holmes, and V. Kaplan, *Educational reform in post-soviet Russia: Legacies and prospects*. 2004. doi: 10.4324/9780203318676.

CHAPTER 14

AN EXPLORATION OF FORGING SOVIET SOCIALISM

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The delicate interaction between ideology, practice, and theoretical synthesis that characterized the early years of the Bolshevik government is shown as this investigation digs into the complex process of creating Soviet socialism. It examines how the dialectical process that resulted from the blending of revolutionary ideology and the reality of Russian society helped to form the basis of Soviet socialism. The story moves through three essential phases: the development of ad hoc ideas and principles before to the revolution, the ideological filtering that affected political choices, and the implementation of these ideas in post-revolutionary government. Lenin, Bukharin, and Trotsky made significant contributions to the issue of how a thorough theory for the transitional era emerged. The debate over whether this theoretical foundation served as the foundation for the lasting Soviet model or constituted a unique notion of socialism is at the heart of the discussion. This investigation highlights the many conflicts involving ideology, rhetoric, politics, culture, and survival that together gave birth to the Soviet socialist orthodoxy. It is clear that by 1921, the dominant Marxist viewpoint placed a strong emphasis on modernization, productivism, technocracy, and rationality. This perspective saw socialism as a revolutionary stage necessitating the reform of the political, social, and economic institutions.

KEYWORDS:

Ideology, Marxist Perspective, Practice, Revolutionary Theory, Theoretical Synthesis.

INTRODUCTION

By the conclusion of the civil war, the Bolshevik party had started to improve its understanding of socialism as their goals and the realities of Russian society had a chance to interact. But how did this fusion of theory and practise function? It is best to think of it as a dialectical process:

1) The broad concepts and principles that were established prior to the revolution about the transition period represented a loose framework within which there were many unresolved conflicts and undeveloped ideas;
2) This framework served as a kind of ideological filter that caused the party leadership to favour some approaches over others, dictating the selection of particular policies; and
3) The application of these concepts and principles. In the first place, it eliminated a lot of the conflicts within the Bolshevik conception of socialism. Second, it gave many of the fairly nebulous Bolshevik ideology's guiding ideas a particular substance or meaning. The first comprehensive post-revolutionary theory of the transition period resulted from this process[1]–[3].

The contentious question here is whether the theoretical synthesis presented below serves as the foundation for the Soviet model of socialism, which was to stay largely unchanged until perestroika, or if it constitutes a historically and theoretically separate conception of socialism. Lenin, Bukharin, and Trotsky all made substantial contributions to theorizing the

transition process, despite their being discrepancies amongst them. The theoretical foundation of Soviet socialism: statism, technocracy, productivism, and collectivism. These opinions were also the target of strong critiques from divisions within the Bolshevik party. The Party Programme of March 1919; The ABC of Communism (written by Bukharin and Preobrazhensky); Lenin's "The Proletarian Revolution and the renegade Kautsky";Bukharin's "The economics of the transition period";and Trotsky's "Terrorism and Communism" were the most important theoretical works from this time period. The 1919 Party Programme, which updated the 1903 Programme, played a crucial component in the development of Bolshevik rhetoric by outlining both the party's long-term goals and its particular short-term policy pledges. The ABC of Communism was developed to popularise and thoroughly explain the Programme. The other three works were somewhat inspired by the debate that is still going on inside the global socialist movement. Lenin, Trotsky, and Bukharin continued in their polemical conflict with Karl Kautsky, an old foe.

These works are very important when considered as a whole. The key Bolshevik theorists believed it was crucial to start theorising their experiences in the midst of a devastating, destructive civil war in order to defend the ideological correctness of their position in the face of harsh criticism from both within and without and to reorient themselves on their path from capitalism to communism. However, it is by no means simple to interpret these passages.

Since these works were created for a variety of purposes and the context of the civil war itself changed as the military struggle waxed and waned, it is possible to identify the key elements of the emerging orthodoxy regarding the nature of the transition period. Lih has persuasively shown the flaws in the current views of the ABC that are in use. The numerous battles the party engaged in throughout this time ideological, rhetorical, military, political, cultural, and survival forged the orthodoxy that eventually emerged.

It is evident that by 1921, the Marxist perspective on socialism that had the upper hand in Bolshevik rhetoric was the one that emphasised modernization, productivism, technocracy, and rationalism. Soviet socialism was envisioned as a stage in which economic, social, and political systems would change and during which all available resources would be used to greatly expand the productive forces.

The only way to achieve dominance over nature and provide for fundamental human necessities was via modernization, quick large-scale industrialisation, and technical advancement. Thus, socialism and later communism were about altering systems to allow for human dominance over nature and eventual freedom. It wasn't about building a relationship-based society in which people would come together and live peacefully with nature and one another. As a result, the policies that accelerated the change of the economic, social, and political structures of Soviet society had to be implemented during the transition period. According to Bukharin, the communist mode of production would herald a tremendous expansion of the productive forces.

No worker in a communist society will be required to do as much labour as they did before. People will be more emancipated from the constraints placed on them by nature, and the working day will become shorter. Man will be able to dedicate more time to the task of mental growth if he is able to spend less time taking care of his own food and clothes. Human civilization will soar to previously unheard-of heights. It will stop being a class culture and instead develop into a really human culture. The tyranny of nature over man would end simultaneously with the end of man's tyranny over himself. This was liberation not obtained via productive activity. The "realm of freedom" according to Soviet socialism was free time. As a result, two key ideas became the foundation of Soviet socialism[4], [5]:

1) The maximization of productivity through the expansion of the productive forces was the main goal of socialism; and
2) The individual under socialism was defined as a bearer of labor-power, and the status of the individual under socialism was determined by their productive contribution. The Bolsheviks proposed that the state, as well as science and technology, play a crucial part in this process as a result of their productivist understanding of socialism. For this shift to occur, a tremendous amount of power was concentrated in the hands of the state. Huge reliance was placed in the capabilities of science, technology, professionals, and scientists to do it.

The Bolsheviks' own focus on modernization and their rationalist inclinations came into conflict with the reality of Russia's cultural and technological backwardness, giving rise to the technocratic aspect of Soviet socialism. Similar events led to the development of Soviet socialism's statist features. Due to the destruction of the civil war in Russia limited resources, low levels of awareness, exigencies related to the conflict, and the annihilation of the proletariat the state became the primary force behind social change. Centralism, compulsion, and hierarchy were the pillars of the Bolshevik idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Bukharin's "Economics of the Transition Period" offered the theoretical justification for this statist strategy. The proletariat's dictatorship, according to Bukharin and Trotsky, needed to become the most powerful state imaginable in order to bring about the social change necessary for the emergence of a stateless society. Trotsky best articulated this theme, which is present throughout Bukharin's "Economics": "The road to socialism lies through a period of the highest possible intensification of the principle of the state.

Just as a lamp before it goes out shoots up in a brilliant flame, so the state, before disappearing, assumes the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the most ruthless form of the state, which embraces the life of Bukharin outlined the theoretical justification for considering the state to be the agent of social and economic transformation under socialism: "it is an active force, a functioning organisation that uses every means to strengthen the productive base upon which it arises." He further argued that "the collective reason of the working class, in turn, is materially embodied in its highest and most universal organization in its state apparatus." The proletarian state apparatus was described as the "highest and most universal organisation that uses every the most universal organization the Soviet state of the proletariat is the entity to which all proletarian organisations must be subordinated in organisational terms. The underlying logic of the transformation process leads to the "statification" of the unions and the actual statification of all proletarian mass organisations. Even the smallest components of the workers' apparatus must be incorporated into the overall organisational structure.This phase presented a dual challenge: destroying the old and building the new. To defeat the counterrevolutionary forces, force and violence are needed. The turmoil of the revolutionary era and the fragmented character of post-revolutionary proletariat consciousness necessitate the employment of coercion in the transitional period for all classes.This is necessary for the establishment of the new.

However, Bukharin contends that since the state is the institutionalised awareness of society, coercion under a proletarian dictatorship is fundamentally different from that under a bourgeois dictatorship. It represents self-organization and self-discipline, not something imposed from without; rather, discipline is established by the collective will of all and is required of each. During the transitional period, the working-class experiences both self-regulation and coercion. All forms of proletarian compulsion, starting with executions and ending with mandatory labour service, are ways of creating communist mankind out of the raw materials of human beings.

The issue of labour was crucial to increasing productivity, combined with the application of technology in the production process. The whole history of humanity, according to Trotsky, is the tale of how people have been organised and educated collectively for work with the goal of increasing productivity. During the civil war, labour came directly under the jurisdiction of the government.

The state had dominion over the independent organisations that represented workers' interests. The introduction of universally required military service resulted in the militarization of work. Piece rates, one-man management, and strict workforce discipline were all implemented. These changes were all supported by the following arguments. In the beginning, humans were inherently indolent and required discipline to labour. Second, the building work was being done in a miserable, impoverished, and chaotic environment. Thirdly, the state, which served as the physical manifestation of the working class's collective reason, served as a bridge between the workers' individual interests and the unions' group interests and the class's ultimate collective interests. According to Trotsky, it is obvious that the state must provide the better employees with better living circumstances via the bonus system. However, this not only excludes, but rather assumes that the state and the trade unions, without which the Soviet state cannot develop industry, gain new powers of some kind over the worker.

Compulsion, militarization, and other methods were necessary in order to bind down the bourgeois anarchy, secure socialization of the means of production and labour, and reconstruct economic life on the basis of a single plan. By 1920/21, the foundations of the Soviet concept of socialism producer ownership of the means of production and worker subordination to the state were already in place. An edifice of characteristics, the institutional architecture of the transitional period, was starting to take shape on these foundations. Soviet-style socialism has the following characteristics: state ownership and control of the economy; centralised resource allocation and direction; elimination of market relationships; elimination of money and replacement of trade with direct product exchange; development of a single economic plan; maximum use and application of science and technology in the productive process; one man, appointed, management in the factories.

The exact meaning of these phrases was still up for debate in this conception of Soviet socialism. What would the centralization look like? What shapes might state economic dominance take? What function would the labour unions serve? What kind of preparation? Who would handle the preparation? What kind of structure would the agriculture sector have? The precise definition of socialism in practise wasn't yet thoroughly determined. Even while few organisations or individuals contested the prevailing view of the transition era, debates, conflicts, and controversies persisted inside the party. The differences mostly focused on the most effective ways to do this. The conflicts in pre-revolutionary Bolshevik rhetoric over the nature of the proletariat's rule had started to be addressed by 1920–21. As the universalization of state power accentuated the impulse towards centralization, hierarchy, coercion, and bureaucratization, the democratic impulse within the State and revolution popular participation and control in governing had been replaced and redefined.

In practise, this conflict was resolved in favour of state authority due to the imperatives of increasing output and winning the civil war. Social organisations and widespread engagement were added as a result, speeding up state operations. Trade unions, local Soviets, and the Communist Youth League were all expected to serve as "transmission belts" for party policies. The Red Army, for instance, was abolished, and discipline and hierarchy were reinstated in favour of democratic practises inside state institutions.

Lenin and other leaders, most notably Trotsky, had subtle disagreements over the breadth and depth of public engagement, but there was broad agreement on the general distribution of power and authority between the state and society. The rise of centralization, bureaucratization, compulsion, hierarchy, and monism over local autonomy, accountability, public engagement, and political pluralism dominated politics throughout the transition period. These advances were fueled by the immediate backdrop of war and disorder, but they were also hampered by the population's low levels of education and culture, which stood in the way of Lenin's goal of widespread public involvement in national governance. The reality of the civil war entered this equation and pushed elitism, centralization, and force as the remedy. Why was this hypothesised? Politics remained a relatively underdeveloped field in terms of theoretical development.

There were no comprehensive theoretical declarations on the allocation of power under socialism as a result of the proletariat's takeover of power, which was exercised by the party. In fact, Lenin maintained in "The proletarian revolution and the renegade Kautsky" that a separation between the state's and the nation's forms of administration was vital. The kind of governance was irrelevant once a class's rules were formed. The role of the law, the separation of powers between the federal government and local governments, and the legislative and executive branches of government did not receive in-depth discussion.

An examination of four key issues—the relationship between the state and the individual, the relationship between the state and society, the relationship between the state and the party, and the role of the party will reveal the general characteristics of the politics of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In a system where the individual did not have rights outside of or against the state, the state was seen as the embodiment of the working class's collective reason. This idea was further supported by the idea that self-transcendence was the means by which the person attained self realisation. The primary texts of this era revealed a top-down strategy in which the state was given authority over and granted people' rights and liberties. Liberal ideas of individual freedom were destroyed by the universalism of state authority and the preference for the collective above the individual. There may be no rights of individuals against the state. There was no independent realm within which the state was not allowed to invade. The Bolshevik ideology was concerned with the economic basis of the rights of the workers, not the "fictitious" freedoms arising from the legal and political rights that liberal democracy proclaimed.

According to this theory, the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is rule won and maintained by the use of violence by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Socialist liberties were class-based, not personal, and they applied to the proletariat as a whole. The interaction between the state and society, and specifically social institutions, was more nuanced. Theoretical works made an effort to preserve the harmony between public involvement and control and centralised elite direction and leadership on the one hand. In Lenin’s words, The Soviets are the direct organisation of the working and exploited people themselves, which helps them to organise and administer their own state in every possible way. In the 1919 Party Programme, there was a continued commitment to upgrade the role of the trade unions in the production process, in the midst of a wider debate within the party over their precise position within the system: Trade unions must actually concentrate in their hands the management of the whole system of public economy as an economic unit.

The participation of trade unions in the management of production and the attraction by them of the broad masses are the principal means to carry on a struggle against bureaucracy in the economic apparatus of the Soviet state, and afford the opportunity of establishing real democratic control over the results of production.Yet these ideas of popular participation in

the making and control of the system came into conflict with the universalization of state power, through which the state would use all resources, institutions and organizations to raise productivity, relegating social organizations to a subordinate role. All organizations would become state agencies as a result, even if this wasn't really the case after the conclusion of the civil war. There could be no autonomous groups outside of the state. The question that remained open was how much autonomy certain organisations may be able to obtain and use inside this statized framework. Trade unions, Soviets, and Komsomol all had specific roles, responsibilities, organisational structures, and memberships that were to be determined. The function of the party is the last point. The reasons given by Trotsky for the evolution of political monism and the gradual transformation of the Soviet Union into transmission belts as opposed to organs of local and governmental power are as follows: It is quite understandable that the Communist Party would play a monopolistic role in the circumstances of a successful proletarian revolution. The issue at hand is class tyranny. That class's makeup includes a variety of components, diverse moods, and developmental stages. The dictatorship, however, necessitates unanimity of purpose, direction, and action. The revolutionary supremacy of the proletariat necessitates within the proletariat itself the political supremacy of a party, with a crystal-clear action plan and impeccable internal discipline. We have frequently been accused of substituting our party's dictatorship for the Soviet Union's.

However, it is true to say that the party dictatorship was the sole thing that made the Soviet tyranny feasible. The party has given the Soviets the opportunity to change from being the formless parliaments of labour into the machinery of labour supremacy owing to the clarity of its theoretical vision and its powerful revolutionary organisation. There is nothing accidental about this trade-off between the strength of the party and the power of the working class; in fact, there is no trade-off at all. The basic interests of the working class are expressed by communists.It was becoming more apparent what the party's function was in the post-revolutionary order. The party was tasked with setting the direction of development and exercising overall leadership. Through the efforts of communist members inside those entities, it would create the programme to be pursued and direct the operations of every state agency. The communist party's monopoly position was supported by the following claims: political parties represent the interests of a class; the proletariat has a uniform, fundamental set of interests; the communist party alone represents the course of historical development; there is no justification for other socialist parties; and ensuring the communist party's dominance will ensure the proletariat's predominance. The various governmental organisations would be tasked with administration. The theoretical underpinnings of the party's rule were becoming clear from this reading of war communism and soviet socialism. There are well-known socioeconomic and cultural explanations for this. Theoretically, it may be summed up as follows:

1) The Communist Party represents the core interests of the working class.
2) The Soviet Union stands for the working class's unified will.
3) The proletariat's dictatorship, the Soviet Union's dominance, and the communist party's tyranny. QED! The overall characteristics of Soviet socialism, or the proletariat's dictatorship, were the supremacy of state authority, centralization, repression, and terror, monism, and a propensity towards technocratic methods[6], [7].

Although it continued to hold a significant place in the party platform, the tendency towards popular participation, democracy, and local autonomy had been eroded throughout the entire post-1917 period. This highlights the persistence of the democratic impulse in Bolshevik discourse and the attempts made by Lenin in particular to combine communist direction and

leadership with the participation of a society with a low level of culture and education. The connection between the party and the state organisations (Soviets, trade unions, etc.) was still an issue in this area. How could the party steer and lead without meddling with these institutions' daily operations? How may the bureaucratization issue be resolved? How could the party maintain a balance between democracy and centralism? Socio-cultural Aspects of Soviet Socialism the Bolshevik leadership saw the socio-cultural domain from an instrumental standpoint. The battle between the need to prioritise building the material and technological foundation of socialism above other goals like as emancipation and liberation, justice, and equality was decisively decided in favour of the latter. Inequality in pay was encouraged throughout the civil war to reward professionals and those doing crucial labour. Instead of eliminating the root causes of exploitation, gender equality was advocated in order to free women to participate to the process of expanding output. To prepare the workforce for the needs of a technologically sophisticated economy, cultural policy was created. It was constructivist as well as instrumentalist. By shaping the Soviet people's mentality, worldview, morals, and perspective, the party aimed to establish a socialist society. This had the advantage of uprooting the foundation of non-socialist thought.

The spread of atheism. Socialist principles were ingrained in the educational system. Morality was founded on ideas of class. The standards of socialism in the Soviet model predominated in the press. The Bolsheviks wanted to change people in order to change the world. Conclusion The Soviet socialist model that was emerging represented the triumph of rationalism, collectivism, productivism, and technocracy over the tendency towards democracy, libertarianism, moralism, and egalitarianism. However, it would be incorrect to overstate this point at this point. There are two in particular that should be included. First, Lenin was well aware of the issues with bureaucratization and centralization as well as the value of widespread involvement in system management. The Soviet state's issues with elitism and hierarchy were aggravated by its challenges with cultural and economic backwardness. Lenin's main concern, though, was the significance of widespread involvement.

Second, there were still a number of factions or organisations within the party that had particular grievances about how the system had evolved after 1917 and, on a deeper level, articulated various theories of socialism. The desire for more democracy and egalitarianism within the system was expressed by the Democratic Centralists (greater democracy within the party), the Workers' Opposition (revival of the Soviets as functioning democratic organisations and genuine workers' control in industry), and the Military Opposition (democratisation in the army).

These concepts would later serve as the inspiration for reform movements across Soviet history. However, the technocratic inclination won out towards the conclusion of the civil war. The New Economic Policy (NEP) was adopted in March 1921, and it is often considered that this marked the beginning of the system's transformation. It is debatable to what degree NEP represents an alternative Soviet socialism model or just a change in focus within the framework of the Soviet socialism model. We must now devote our attention to this query.

DISCUSSION

Ideology, practise, and theoretical synthesis were intimately woven together in the process of establishing Soviet socialism, which was diverse and dynamic. This talk digs into the nuances of this trip, emphasising how these factors interacted to form the basic structure of the Bolshevik government.The fusing of revolutionary theory with the reality of Russian society at the start of Soviet socialism was characterised by the dialectical process of ideology and

practise. The best way to understand this union is as a dialectical process. Unresolved disagreements and immature ideas were contained within the broad conceptions and ideals that were formed before to the revolution. These principles underwent ideological filtration as they addressed the difficulties of administering a post-revolutionary country, prompting the party leadership to choose certain strategies over others. This ideological filtering affected the choice of certain policies, which then affected how these ideas were applied. The internal tensions within the Bolshevik notion of socialism were resolved via this dialectical process, which also gave the party's founding principles weight. The first comprehensive post-revolutionary theory of the transitional era emerged as a result of this process[8]–[10].

Theoretical Synthesis and Major Participants

The formulation of a cogent theoretical framework for the transitional era was essential to the development of Soviet socialism. Lenin, Bukharin, and Trotsky, among other prominent Bolshevik leaders, made significant contributions to this effort. Although their opinions did not always coincide, their combined efforts contributed to a theoretical basis that attempted to understand the difficulties of transitioning from capitalism to communism. It is debatable whether this theoretical synthesis supports the lasting Soviet model of socialism or if it represents a different idea of socialism. This inquiry highlights the continuous discussions over the ideological roots and development of Soviet socialism.Technocracy, Productivism, and Modernization: The three theoretical pillars of Soviet socialism were productivism, modernization, and modernisation.

Early in the 1920s, the dominant Marxist viewpoint placed a strong emphasis on maximising production via the growth of productive forces. This socialist vision prioritised fast industrialization, technological development, and the efficient use of resources to accomplish economic, social, and political revolution. Technology, science, and the state were positioned as key enablers of this revolution. With this emphasis, the prior aspirations of creating a society based on relationships were abandoned in favour of human dominion over nature and the quest of freedom via useful work.

Statism and the Function of the State: The development of Soviet socialism also spawned statist elements. Due to the civil war's devastation and the demands of the fight, the state had to intervene heavily to promote social transformation. According to thinkers like Bukharin and Trotsky, the dictatorship of the proletariat required an incredibly strong state to guide the transition to a society without states. The statist aspect of Soviet socialism is reflected in the consolidation of power in the hands of the state and the emphasis on professionals, research, and technology. The state's centralization of authority and its power concentration were key factors in the development of the socialist trajectory.

CONCLUSION

The investigation into the creation of Soviet socialism highlights the complex interaction between theory, practice, and ideology. A thorough framework for the transition phase resulted from the dialectical interaction between revolutionary ideology and the practicalities of government. This framework placed an emphasis on modernization, productivism, technocracy, and statism and was formed by the contributions of important Bolshevik personalities. This investigation's legacy sheds insight on the difficulties involved in forging a revolutionary path, the conflicts that arise between idealistic ideologies and real-world problems, and the lingering doubts regarding the nature of Soviet socialism.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Wanner, “Money, morality and new forms of exchange in postsocialist Ukraine,” *Ethnos*, 2005, doi: 10.1080/00141840500419782.

[2] Z. Liu, “Decolonization Is Not a Dinner Party: Claudia Jones, China’s Nuclear Weapons, and Anti-Imperialist Solidarity,” *J. Intersect.*, 2019, doi: 10.13169/jinte.3.1.0021.

[3] H. Yaffe, “Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara: socialist political economy and economic management in Cuba, 1959-1965,” *London Sch. Econ.*, 2014.

[4] J. D. Clayton *et al.*, “Book Reviews,” *Russ. Rev.*, 2006.

[5] K. Lam, “Forging a Socialist Homeland from Multiple Worlds: North American Finns in Soviet Karelia 1921-1938,” *Rom. J. Balt. Nord. Stud.*, 2010, doi: 10.53604/rjbns.v2i2_5.

[6] P. Stronski, *Tashkent: Forging a Soviet City, 1930-1966*. 2010. doi: 10.1080/10630732.2011.648444.

[7] Marko Dumancic, “BOOK REVIEWS,” *Russ. Rev.*, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9434.2011.00626.x.

[8] M. Htun, “Gender equality in transition policies: Comparative perspectives on Cuba,” in *Looking Forward: Comparative Perspectives on Cuba’s Transition*, 2007.

[9] K. Lebow, “Kontra kultura: Leisure and Youthful Rebellion in Stalinist Poland,” in *Pleasures in Socialism: Leisure and Luxury in the Eastern Bloc*, 2010.

[10] S. Doyon and P. S. Brotherton, “Les redéfinitions d’une révolution,” *Anthropol. Sociétés*, 2008, doi: 10.7202/018889ar.

CHAPTER 15

EXPLORING THE COMPLEXITIES OF 'WAR COMMUNISM'

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The complex features of "War Communism," a crucial period in Bolshevik Russia from 1918 to 1921. The area was affected greatly by the Civil War at this time, which left immense destruction and misery in its wake. But this investigation goes beyond the well-worn Civil War story itself. Instead, it explores the complex framework of "War Communism," a phrase that refers to a combination of social, political, and economic acts. But this term's definition is still up for debate, with academics arguing over its meaning and ramifications. Contrasting perspectives on whether "War Communism" was an actual wartime economic plan, an ideological goal, or a retroactive foe are examined in this study. Dissected views from academics like Lih, Siegelbaum, Dobb, Malia, and Figes are compared and contrasted. The influence of "War Communism" on the Bolshevik vision of socialism's transition and its ideological foundations is examined in this research in addition to its economic implications. The study highlights the significance of this period by demonstrating how it affected debates regarding socialism's principles. Examining the economic effects of "War Communism" as it was implemented during the Civil War reveals trends towards centralization, nationalisation, and technocracy. Exploring the nationalization of businesses brings to light the intricate interaction between purpose and deed. Examined against the background of the impending prospect of foreign involvement is the process of "trustification," which results in full-scale nationalization. In the end, this investigation illuminates the nuanced aspects of "War Communism," highlighting its relevance in influencing Bolshevik policies, ideological discourse, and economic transformations.

KEYWORDS:

Civil War, Centralization, Foreign intervention, Nationalization, War Communism.

INTRODUCTION

The article "Exploring the Complexities of 'War Communism'" dives into a crucial period of history that is replete with complex interactions between ideology, economics, and government. This time period, which runs from 1918 to 1921, is inextricably linked to the turbulent Russian Civil War setting, when destruction, misery, and geopolitical demands combined. 'War Communism,' a mysterious word embracing a range of economic, political, and social measures used by the Bolsheviks to satisfy the pressing needs of wartime exigencies, is revealed in this book for its complex character. The contradictions between ideological foundations and practical requirements emerge as the discourse on "War Communism," with historians like Lih, Siegelbaum, Dobb, Malia, and Figes participating in a complex argument. The debate over the term's meaning reflects the difficulties of conceptualising a political and economic paradigm at a period of upheaval. The formation of state-controlled monopolies and the nationalization of enterprises as instruments to meet the demands of the time are at the heart of this investigation.

Beyond economic factors, the research sheds light on the ideological currents that guided the shift of Bolshevik socialism from capitalism to communist throughout this time. It becomes clear that "War Communism" encompasses more than just the economic restructuring of sectors; it also served as a catalyst for more in-depth discussions on the fundamental principles of socialism and how they may be applied in unusual situations. In conclusion, this investigation shows that "War Communism" is much more than just a set of policies; it embodies the complex negotiations between theory and practise, ideology and reality, and ultimately provides a profound lens through which to understand the complexities of a country struggling to overcome unanticipated obstacles on the road to a new socio-political order.

Between June 1918 and the winter of 1920–1921, the Civil War looms large and depressingly over the time frame. Massive destruction, horrific human suffering, starvation, poverty, and trauma overtook Russia and other countries. The focus of this study does not include that narrative, which has been told wonderfully elsewhere. There has been much debate over how the system was set up during the Civil War. The set of actions taken economic, political, and sociocultural have been dubbed "war communism" for their combination of elements. But there has been a lot of disagreement about this term's definition. According to Lih and Siegelbaum, "war communism" is a conceptual fallacy that has done more harm than good in explaining Bolshevik views and actions prior to 1921.

Others accept its existence but disagree sharply on its definition. Was it, as first outlined by Maurice Dobb, a practical set of measures designed to run a wartime economy? Others argue that the only reality assumed by War Communism was retrospective, serving as a foil against which more "realistic" or even "human" policies could be highlighted. Was there a deliberate aim "to march straight into communism"? Was there a subtle interaction between the two? Malia emphasizes the war communism's pristine ideological foundations and qualifications. Figes contends that both poles of the argument the ideology perspective and the pragmatic approach are seriously flawed. Additionally, Bertrand Patenaude has recently disputed Lih's position by claiming that "war communism" has a utopian essence. However, significant interpretive differences still exist. Lastly, a more general query. Does war communism represent a substantial shift from the Bolshevik concept of the nature of the transition period? Does it reflect one specific interpretation of the wide definition of socialism in Bolshevik speech, or is it a theoretically unique model of the transition from capitalism to communism? The relevance of this time period is not limited to the civil war-era policies[1]–[3].

The Bolshevik Party started discussing and theorizing the transitional phase and its characteristics in the context of actual national governance in 1919 and beyond. A more clear-cut understanding of socialism started to emerge from these discussions. The economics of "war communism" Brest-Litovsk's respite was only momentary. The Bolsheviks implemented a number of policies that further the tendencies towards centralization, nationalisation, concentration, hierarchy, and technocracy when the civil war broke out in May/June 1918. The theoretical discussions about the nature of Soviet socialism were informed by the Bolshevik experiences in managing the economy during the civil war. On June 28, a decree titled "On Nationalisation" was issued. This was partly prompted by the Brest-Litovsk Treaty. German investors bought heavy industrial interests in Russia quickly. It was necessary to quickly adopt a decree nationalizing a wide range of businesses, including mining, metallurgy, textiles, engineering, railroads, public utilities, and many more, in order to prevent control from falling into the hands of foreign people. The decree, however, was just a formal acknowledgement of the transfer of ownership on paper. The enterprises declared under this Decree to be the property of the RSFSR are regarded as being leased to their

former owners gratis; their boards and former owners continue to finance them and receive profits in the usual manner, according to Section 3 of the decree. Actual control by Vesenkha (VSNKh) awaited direct intervention from above. The long-term goal of quickening the process of "trustification" the development of big state monopolies run by the center lay underneath the urgency forced by German investors' activities. The necessary preconditions for this were established through nationalisation. But it wasn't a well-organized procedure. Local appropriations kept on, highlighting the ongoing disconnect between intentions and actions. The Bolsheviks tried to nationalize small rural businesses in the early months of 1919. Small-scale industrial enterprises were brought under central control in November 1920, which marked the completion of full-scale nationalization. Given the increasing threat of armed foreign intervention on Russian soil, the control of industry was seen as being of much greater importance than legal ownership.

Keeping up with demand and output throughout the civil war quickly raised the issue of how to effectively structure the economy. Particularly, three problems jumped out. What function should Vesenkha perform? What kind of connection would exist between Vesenkha and the regional institutions of economic power? What configuration would the main organs of power take? Trustification was seen by the Bolsheviks as the union of ideology and practicality. Socialism was seen to have its economic foundation in the development of massive state industrial trusts, modelled after the German wartime economy. However, they were also perceived as making the administrative procedures for the industrial sector simpler. The demands of a civil war made industrial administration easier by causing geographical contraction (facilitating central control) and by establishing a clear hierarchy of production objectives. Nearly 90 of these trusts had been established by the end of 1919. Under Vesenkha's general direction, they had to account to their neighborhood glavk. Vesenkha's position eventually changed from one that was mostly managerial and administrative to one that was more supervisory and regulatory (as originally intended).

This was supported by an August 1918 edict that said Vesenkha was to "administer all the enterprises of the republics". This more exacting administrative role changed how Vesenkha operated internally. This edict specified its organization and membership. Most importantly, a praesidium with nine members was established, with the president and vice president chosen by Sovnarkom. The praesidium swiftly replaced the broader council as the primary policy-making body as a result of its new status and the civil war. In fact, after the autumn of 1918, the full council did not convene again. As Vesenkha made more efforts to manage the economy by allocating resources, issuing orders, and establishing priorities, tensions between the various central committees and agencies grew. This was evidence of how the impulse for centralization started to conflict with the desire for economic efficiency.

In particular, the Council of Labour and Defense (STO), the Commissariat of Food Procurement (Narkomprod), and Sovnarkom created a proliferation of committees and agencies, bureaucratizing economic processes. Conflicts in the central were layered with disagreements about the specifics of the power structure between the center and the area, a problem that characterized the Soviet era as a whole. During the civil war, that branch of Bolshevism that had a natural tendency towards the centralization, concentration, and statification of socioeconomic processes started to consider what this really meant. The ongoing discussions and changes to party policies show the conflicts within the party between centralizers and decentralizes as well as between those with various views on centralization. Conflicts emerged about how businesses were run at the local and regional levels. Conflict between two methods arose[4], [5].

Glavkism is one that is built on a vertically organized structure that is separated into sectors of industry. The other was sovnarkhozy, a horizontal division focused on a geographic basis. At first, the glavki were intended to act as a barrier between the various Vesenkha components and the businesses themselves. Their job was to oversee all firms that belonged to a certain industry. They rapidly evolved into managerial organs as they started to take over the roles of Vesenkba's production divisions. Some Bolsheviks started to see the glavki as the foundation for a system of central economic planning during the civil war, as opposed to the regionalization that the sovnarkhozy required. Soon after the revolution, the sovnarkhozy, or regional economic councils, were established. The sovnarkhozy represented the democratic, participatory strand of industrial administration and emerged from local Soviets' desires to organise the chaotic post-revolutionary conditions (although it was frequently justified as a more efficient method due to being closer to the actual point of production and having more accurate information).

The sovnarkhozy developed its own hierarchy, but conflicts with glavki emerged as the leadership attempted to demarcate. The glavki increasingly accumulated greater authority at the cost of the sovnarkhozy due to the dominance of centralization. But the sovnarkhozy still had a place in the economic system, and they even had something of a comeback towards the end of 1919 when an effort was made to define a clear line of responsibility. In the backdrop of the civil war, the inclinations towards centralization were quite strong. The resulting proposal dividing firms into three groups represented somewhat of a compromise between centralization and provincial governance of the economy. However, it's crucial to keep in mind that similar patterns existed before the civil war, which eventually found its way into the Soviet economic structure. The battle for existence alone cannot account for the rising prevalence of glavkism. Trade, finance, and allocation patterns the capitalist market was seen by socialists as a source of waste, inefficiency, irrationality, and unfairness. There was significant debate about just what should be used to replace this.

The concept of central planning (and a specific conception thereof) gradually developed during the American Civil War as the Bolsheviks' confidence in their capacity to consciously and scientifically reorganize society and manage it combined with their knowledge of how to handle supply and distribution issues under war communism. Lenin's idea of the socialist economy included ideas of a centralized distribution of raw materials, completed commodities, and other items. He compared it to the postal service on a national and eventually worldwide scale. It would be misleading to assume that the growing role of the state in resource distribution is the result of a deliberate, planned process to replace market relations. During the civil war, scarcity, rationing, and the priority of military supply gave a great impetus to the growth of administrative allocation of goods, culminating in the attempt to eliminate private trade and establish a state trading monopoly.

During the civil war, there was a brutal fight to keep up production and feed the populace. Improvising everything along the process led to administrative uncertainty and bureaucratization. One of the key elements of war communism, the state's involvement in requisitioning agricultural products, will be covered in greater depth below. A "moneyless" economy was produced in the industrial sector as a result of the rouble's total collapse. Wages were often given in kind. Municipal regions provide free services. In order to control this process, private trade was outlawed and a state trading monopoly was established. Businesses within the state-controlled sector replaced money transactions with paper transactions: firms delivered supplies without cash payment and received goods in the same way. Bartering, set pricing, and rationing were soon commonplace in Russian commerce. This monopoly's administration was very challenging.

Vesenkha made an effort to allocate resources, but she was eventually replaced as other administrative bodies STO and the Commission of Utilization—began to wield greater power. By using co-operatives and local Soviets as key components of the distributive network, the conflicts between glavki and sovnarkhozy were replicated at the local level.

The idea of central planning was born out of this environment of centralization, administrative allocation, cashless economic transactions, bureaucratic turmoil, rationing, and the martial attitude encouraged by the civil war. The success of technocracy in management and labour under communism in war? The division of power inside the workplace and the government's treatment of the proletariat may have been the main causes of conflict throughout the Cold War. Within the party, there were lengthy discussions over one-man management, experts, labour policy, and the function of the unions. The technocratic, statist branch of Bolshevism won the war in a resounding triumph, which culminated in the emergence of Taylorism and the scientific administration of labour in the early 1920s. One-man management, expertise, and hierarchy During this time period, there was a trend towards one-man management in businesses as opposed to collaborative, participatory types of management. Once again, there were considerable differences at various periods and the pattern was not constant.

Neither of these developments was without opposition. In the party, the economic bureaucracy, the trade unions, and elsewhere, disagreements between individuals and factions within the party-state hierarchy punctuated this time. The trend towards hiring specialists, foreshadowed in State and revolution, picked up speed after March 1918. Carr reported a rise from 300 in March 1918 to over 6,000 in only two years. The justification for their usage was the importance placed on increasing output, which was particularly pressing during the civil war, and the ongoing lack of trustworthy Bolshevik specialists. The employment and uneven pay for these "bourgeois" professionals was determined by the proletariat's inability to advance economically and culturally in Russia. Even more fiercely debated was the topic of management. The discussion's focus collegial boards vs one-man management illustrates how far the argument had moved away from the pre-revolutionary Bolshevik slogan of worker power. The debate over whether to keep collegial boards (and how they should be composed) tore the party apart and widened the chasm between the technocratic and democratic strands of Soviet socialism.

The proponents of collegiality the trade unions, Tomskii, Osinskii, and, intriguingly, some specialists and Vesenkha members made their case from a variety of angles. It represented the persistence of components of economic democracy, involvement by workers and other representatives, and the ongoing independence of localist interests against centralization for the trade unions and Left-communists. It served as the finest method of managing centralization at the local level for technical personnel and Vesenkha members. Lenin and Trotsky disagreed, saying that this strategy would best secure local adherence to national directions and avoid the creation of management-labor disputes. Lenin believed that one-man management was the greatest (i.e., most effective and efficient) way to increase output, enforce rigorous discipline among employees, and make speedy judgements. As the Soviet industrial administration developed, collegiality was once again rationalised. Now was the moment to advance in the direction of one-man administration, according to Bukharin's theory.

The power of the plant manager represented the proletariat's rule and represented the interests of the workers. The 9th Party Congress in March 1920 served as the venue for the resolution of this dispute, where Lenin's viewpoint triumphed in the face of fierce opposition. One-man management eventually came to predominate, but not exclusively (especially in military

industries). At the conclusion of the Civil War in 1920–1921, there were still collegiate forms in use. In fact, four forms coexisted at this time, including experts, commissars, managers, and collegial forms, as observed by Carr, Nove, and others.One concept that emerged at this time was the incorporation of political direction at the level of the system's daily functioning. In order to combine the "Red" and "Expert" roles from inside their own ranks rather than from the proletariat as a whole, the Bolsheviks did this, which prepared the way for the later choice of experts from within the party. The debate over one-man vs. collegial management had significant implications for the development of the unions' function as well as the more general topic of labour policy under a socialist economy[6]–[8].

DISCUSSION

From 1918 through 1921, Bolshevik Russia experienced "War Communism," which is now regarded as an important and divisive period in history. This debate tries to explore the numerous nuances that defined this period, taking into account its economic, political, and ideological facets.

Economic and Sociopolitical Unrest

In the wake of the horrific Civil War, a period of unmatched carnage, misery, and upheaval, "War Communism" developed. The Bolsheviks had to manage an economy under pressure, which required dramatic action. As the administration attempted to concentrate control and resources amidst the upheaval, centralization, nationalisation, and technocracy-based policies were put into place during this time.

The ideological foundation and application of "War Communism" are a key topic of discussion. Scholars with different viewpoints include such like Lih, Siegelbaum, and Figes. As a conceptual mistake, "War Communism" is criticised by Lih and Siegelbaum for being used to justify Bolshevik behaviour. Figes, on the other hand, points out weaknesses in both the pragmatist and ideological views. The difficulties of balancing Bolshevik ideological objectives with the requirements of the wartime context is shown by this argument.

During the "War Communism" period, nationalisation aimed to establish state control over important industries and resources. As a result of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, which encouraged German businessmen to acquire industrial holdings in Russia, this strategy sought to avoid foreign dominance. However, nationalization's actual implementation was fraught with difficulties, resulting in inconsistencies between goal and practise. The slow shift towards full-scale nationalisation, which culminated in 1920, brought attention to how economic policies change over time.

The creation of state-controlled monopolies, or "trustification," was a key objective of "War Communism." The goal of this procedure was to create centralised authority over important economic sectors. The approaching possibility of foreign intervention emphasised how urgent this effort was. These centralised organisations were made possible by the "War Communism" policies, which also helped to define the economic environment after the Civil War.

"War Communism" is being investigated in more depth than only its economic aspects. It had a significant influence on Bolshevik views about the essence of socialism and the shift from capitalism to communism. The Bolshevik Party struggled to implement Marxist ideals in the face of catastrophe, which provoked deeper reflections on the nature of socialist rule. "War Communism's conflict between idealism and pragmatism sparked these struggles[9], [10].

Bolshevik policies and ideological discourse bear the scars of the "War Communism" period. Its complexity highlights the difficulties of guiding a revolutionary state through turbulent times and working towards the realization of socialist objectives. The arguments over its meaning and ramifications highlight how complex historical study and interpretation can be.

CONCLUSION

The examination of the difficulties of "War Communism" provides a thorough knowledge of a crucial moment in the history of Bolshevik Russia. This analysis has shown how complex this period was, with the interaction of political, ideological, and economic forces."War Communism" arose amid the turbulent Civil War's background of widespread suffering and loss. The Bolshevik government struggled to manage an economy that was under tremendous pressure, which led to the adoption of policies characterised by centralization, nationalisation, and technocracy.

These tactics were designed to protect resources, assemble power, and deal with the possibility of foreign intrusion.The complexity of balancing Marxist goals with the practical requirements of war has been made clear by the discussion over the philosophical underpinnings of "War Communism." Lih, Siegelbaum, Figes, and others' presentations of the academic debate around its definition highlight the complex nature of historical interpretation. Understanding the complexities of crisis management during times of crisis requires understanding the conflict between ideological goals and practical realities.

The enormous project of nationalisation and "trustification" was the "War Communism's" economic manifestation. These regulations sought to centralise businesses and create state-controlled monopolies, but they were difficult to execute. The discrepancy between intention and implementation highlighted the challenges of implementing comprehensive economic changes against a background of anarchy and violence.Beyond its effects on politics and economics, "War Communism" had a significant impact on discussions on the essence of socialism and the shift to communist. The Bolshevik Party had to struggle during this time period with how to apply Marxist ideals in a situation of crisis, exposing the conflict between intellectual purity and practical need.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Belloche *et al.*, “Re-exploring Molecular Complexity with ALMA (ReMoCA): Interstellar detection of urea,” *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2019, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201935428.

[2] A. Tárnok, “Exploring complexity,” *Cytometry Part A*. 2012. doi: 10.1002/cyto.a.22040.

[3] S. Cristancho, “Eye opener: exploring complexity using rich pictures,” *Perspect. Med. Educ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s40037-015-0187-7.

[4] E. Grill, M. Müller, and U. Mansmann, “Health--exploring complexity: an interdisciplinary systems approach HEC2016: 28 August-2 September 2016, Munich, Germany,” *Eur. J. Epidemiol. suppl. Suppl.*, 2016.

[5] R. D. Kouyos *et al.*, “Exploring the complexity of the HIV-1 fitness landscape,” *PLoS Genet.*, 2012, doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1002551.

[6] E. R. G. Pedersen, R. Earley, and K. R. Andersen, “From singular to plural: exploring organisational complexities and circular business model design,” *J. Fash. Mark. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/JFMM-04-2018-0062.

[7] S. Hildbrand and S. Bodhanya, “Exploring the complexity of sugarcane supply chains via systemic approaches,” *Kybernetes*, 2017, doi: 10.1108/K-05-2014-0094.

[8] M. den Heyer and D. Johnson, “Exploring the complexity of partnerships in development policy and practice: Upstairs and downstairs,” *Dev. Policy Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/dpr.12485.

[9] O. Oduntan and I. Ruthven, “Situational Information Behaviour: Exploring the Complexity of Refugee Integration,” *Int. J. Information, Divers. Incl.*, 2020, doi: 10.33137/ijidi.v4i2.34033.

[10] D. Stosic, D. Stosic, T. B. Ludermir, and T. Stosic, “Exploring disorder and complexity in the cryptocurrency space,” *Phys. A Stat. Mech. its Appl.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.physa.2019.03.091.

CHAPTER 16

NAVIGATING THE TRANSFORMATIVE LANDSCAPE OF LABOUR POLICY AND UNION DYNAMICS IN REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIA

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

In-depth analysis of union dynamics and labor policy in Russia's turbulent time of revolution is provided in the abstract. This book examines the complex interactions between the government, workforce, and labor unions throughout the transformational period from the early stages of the Bolshevik Revolution to the years after the Civil War. Soviet labor policy evolved in a variety of ways within the complex web of interconnections, from mass mobilization and militarism to voluntary labor service and repressive labor camps. The state started making attempts to organize work scientifically as the need to increase production and a respect for scientific methods gained popularity. Scholars continue to disagree over the degree to which the demands of the Civil War affected worker mobilization, especially in the context of the "war communism" period. The fundamental idea of labor as a universal necessity, resonating with Marx's philosophies, and expressed in the Constitution of July 1918 is the basis for this study. The Labour Code, which was subsequently established in October 1918, laid forth the specifics of job requirements but lacked rapid enforcement measures.

KEYWORDS:

Labor Policy, Revolutionary, Trade Union Controversy, Transformative Landscape, War Communism.

INTRODUCTION

Labour policy turned out to be a very contentious topic. This discussion included more general issues about the interaction between the government and the workforce as well as between the government and labour unions. In its interactions with workers (and other classes), Soviet labour policy took many different forms, including universal mobilisation, militarism, voluntary labour service, and punitive labour camps. As the need to increase productivity and the adoration of scientific and rationalistic approaches grew, the state started to implement policies to develop a scientific organisation of work. The degree to which the conditions of the civil war were to blame for the workforce mobilisation under war communism is a matter of debate among scholars. Labour was a universal obligation, according to Marx, and the Constitution of July 1918 affirmed this idea[1]–[3].

The Labour Code, which established the parameters of the responsibility to work, detailed the specifics in October 1918. What was missing at this time, however, were the penalties for violators: the concept was not enforced. Without government assistance, workers were en masse retreating to the countryside. The beginning of the most brutal phase of the civil war coincided with state-directed efforts to codify a universal duty to work. The trade unions were seen as the primary means of establishing the workplace discipline required for "the individual mobilisation of the entire population" at the 8th Party Congress in March 1919. Legislation quickly followed. A decree issued on April 10th, 1919, ordered a general mobilisation for military service.

As the rate of emigration from towns to the countryside picked up, the line between military duty and labour service became hazier and eventually blurred. The principle of universal labour conscription, however, was not established until a Sovnarkom decree was issued in January 1920. In addition to universal labour service, the state also adopted other policies in an effort to balance the revolutionary fervour of the committed proletariat with the use of labour as a punitive tool against the old classes and the regime's adversaries. The Bolsheviks established "Communist Saturdays" in May 1919, where workers voluntarily donated their labour to the government for a day.3The topic that would spark the most debate was the militarization of labour, which concerned the way in which labour was organised, disciplined, and mobilised. The initial actions were taken in January 1920, when the civil war was briefly at an end. Out of an existing military unit of peasant troops, a decree on 15 January 1920, created a "labour army". This practise was steadily expanded during the first half of 1920. They had a military organisational structure and performed hard physical tasks. The leadership started to disagree on the justification for militarization. Trotsky was the leading proponent of the militarization of labour as a tenet of economic reconstruction.

To achieve the fastest and most effective productivity improvements, the industrial workforce should be structured similarly to the labour armies. It was a possible "short-cut" to communism, as Figes contends. According to Trotsky, in his pamphlet Terrorism and communism: Weoppose capitalist slavery by socially regulated labour on the basis of an economic plan, obligatory for the entire people and consequently obligatory for every worker in the country.But obligation andcompulsion are essential conditions in order to bind down the bourgeois anarchy, to secure socialisation of the dominance of modernising, productivist ideas towards employment is shown by the labour armies. The creation of socialism saw the workforce as nothing more than a resource to be exploited. The mobilisation and militarization efforts brought the issue of the trade unions' function into stark light. The same battle lines were created, and this dispute consumed the party until its settlement in 1921. In a workers' state, the trade unions' primary role would be as producers. Trotsky emerged as the leading advocate for the statification of the unions. Since the dictatorship of the proletariat had been established, they were no longer required to play their customary function as protectors of workers' interests.

Trotsky's views, which were largely in response to the industrial proletariat virtually disappearing during 1920 (due to unemployment, migration, conscription, hunger, and other factors), were in line with his views on centralised control of the economy and the militarization of labor.Tomsky, the head of the trade unions, and the Workers Opposition faction within the party took up the defence of the unions. The discussion was started by a crucially important practical issue: the operation of the railroads. They wanted to see autonomous trade unions advocating for an increase in industrial democracy and supporting the interests of the workers. There were demands for "iron discipline" to be imposed on the rail unions as a result of the anarchy on the rails in 1919 and 1920. It was decided that a new central committee for the rail union, Tsektran, would take over after the 9th Party Congress in March 1920. Up to the winter of 1920, the conflict raged on, and it seized the party until the 10th Congress met in March 1921. The most significant change occurred when a number of platforms between Trostsky's statification and Shlyapnikov's independence stances emerged. Lenin and the "buffer group" (a group of people centred on Bukharin) both put up ideas for discussion. The trade union controversy was resolved at the 10th Party Congress[4], [5].

The intensity of the arguments shows how the Bolshevik party was able to theorise and argue crucial questions pertaining to the government of the nation and the character of the transition period, even in the middle of the civil war. There was hostility to the state's expanding

involvement in the control of labour and the economy. However, it is clear that the party also wanted to accelerate the utilisation of science and technology across all industries. Labour policy wasn't any different. The triumph of technocracy: Taylorism, scientific management, and GOELRO The Bolshevik party firmly believed that using science and technology consistently was the greatest and most effective way to change Soviet society and the economy. The Bolshevik vision of the transition period was progressively moving in a technocratic direction, emphasising the rationalist strand over the democratic libertarian one, integrating science and Soviet authority, in tandem with the rising dedication to planning and regulating social and economic processes. Examining the plans for electrification and the initiatives to implement Taylorist work practises will best demonstrate this. The American F.W. Taylor founded the Taylorism movement, which advocated for the scientific division of work under capitalism. Taylor researched the labour process to identify the best working procedures and impose them on the workforce. It was created with the goal of maximising effectiveness and output.

It symbolised, in the eyes of many socialists, further worker exploitation by capitalism. It did, however, also reflect the possibility for increasing productivity and advancing towards supposedly "higher" social forms inherent in the use of scientific principles. In this way, the Bolshevik stance on Taylorism served as an example of the larger question of how socialism negates capitalism while yet emerging from it. In 1914, Lenin wrote the following: "What does this scientific system consist of? While extracting three times as much labour from the worker in the same working day, Lenin also noticed the tremendous advances in productivity. "It ruthlessly drains all the strength, sucks every last drop of nervous and muscular energy from the wage slave at three times the normal speed." This ambivalence regarding Taylorism lasted in the post-revolutionary era, but it was muted by one significant distinction: proletarian state power. Because the proletariat was exerting political authority, Taylorist tactics could now be implemented and expanded over the whole industrial sector (rather than just in specific plants).

This brought Lenin into conflict with Alexander Bogdanov once more as they disagreed over whether bourgeois science, practises, and culture could be adopted and used to build socialism. As Sochor has argued, the "proposition which emerges from Lenin's discussion of Taylorism is that capitalist methods could be employed to build socialism". Bogdanov believed that a brand-new proletarian culture and science needed to be created. The metalworker’s union, in particular, made the first strides towards implementing Taylorism in 1918. A Central Labour Institute was established in 1920 to research the Scientific Organisation of Labour (NOT). It was led by Alexei Gastev, who would later head up the Taylorist movement in the Soviet Union. Gastev was a visionary technocrat, poet, and supporter of the harmony, balance, and coherence of an industrial society. He promoted a kind of machine collectivism, a utopia based on a culture of work, in which the person and society would undergo transformation[6]–[8].

Although Gastev held extreme views, Taylorism promised to increase productivity and aid in the longer-term transformation of Soviet society by fostering a set of cultural values and norms based on collectivism, technocracy, and the application of scientific rationalism. This was in response to the Bolsheviks' short-term problem of scarce resources and a culturally and educationally backward workforce. the extent to which the Bolshevik commitments to workers' control, industrial democracy, and the emancipation of the worker from capitalist exploitation and alienation had been replaced by the commitment to productivism and the mobilisation of science and technology for the construction of so-called "progressive" societies.

The discussions surrounding the implementation of Taylorism, set within the context of the mobilisation and militarization of labour and the statification of the unions, demonstrate this. Lenin's report at the 8th Congress is fascinating to read because it expresses the modernising, constructivist, and productivist ethos that underpinned Bolshevism during the civil war so clearly. Under Krzhizhanovskii's leadership, the electrification programme became a key component of the country's economic development, of the modernization of backward rural Russia, and of the provision of cultural enlightenment through the electric light bulb. This undertaking captured Lenin's attention. The "second programme of the party," he referred to it as. Communism is Soviet power with the electrification of the, he continued. full nation. We must ensure that every factory and electric power station becomes a hub of enlightenment; if Russia is covered with a dense network of electrified roads, then we will have achieved complete victory. However, until the country has been electrified and industry, agriculture, and transportation have been placed on the technical basis of modern large-scale industry, we will not have achieved complete victory. This proposal's organisational practicalities clearly served as a catalyst for the development of a formal planning process.

By the time the civil war was over, the electrification effort had made the creation of a single economic plan for the whole nation a hot topic in party debates. Soviet planning's emergence the establishment of the State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN) in April 1921 was the result of many connected events. There was a heated argument over what precisely was meant by "planning" after the experiences of war communism. There were few hints in Marx and Engels' writings. Guroff also argues that Lenin was greatly influenced by the heritage of Russian economic thought, which stressed the "necessity of viewing the economy in its totality, and investigating the interrelationships of all the sectors of the economy. Experience was also a great teacher. Lenin spoke generally about the need for the central organization and control of the economy, akin to a single factory. Larin, Bukharin, Lenin, and many other prominent members of the Bolshevik party had their imaginations and theoretical frameworks heavily influenced by the German War Economy, which was centralized, concentrated, and state-directed. Planning's purpose, though, remained unclear.

Some people in particular, Lenin and Trotsky have discussed the need of creating a unified economic strategy. Another argument supported the development of several departments or industries that would later be combined. Some argued in favour of a local emphasis. Early in 1918, Vesenkha took the first steps towards creating a public works project. The debate was split between a general single state plan, in which the broad strokes of state economic policy would be drawn up by a single economic authority, and a more focused approach that highlighted a number of key projects to be carried out. The civil war interrupted this process, and it wasn't until the lull in the spring of 1920 that it was resumed. The crucial decision to create a unified economic plan for Soviet Russia was made by the STO in December 1920, along with the adoption of the particular electrification and transport plans. Contrary to Lenin's opinion, who preferred the GOELRO method, sovnarkom ordered the creation of GOSPLAN in February 1921.This was the first step towards Soviet planning.

However, disagreements about the best ways to prepare remained unanswered and would ring throughout the years between 1921 and 1928. Agriculture under war communism the economics of the civil war were dominated by the food supply.The two main goals of Bolshevik policy towards the peasantry under war communism were the socialisation of land tenure and the centralised state control of the food supply. Due to the demands of the civil war and the massive peasant opposition to the expansion of party/urban authority into the rural, the Bolsheviks were compelled to moderate their ideological inclinations in both regions.

The scarcity of food is often seen as the main characteristic that defines communism during wartime. In the early months of May 1918, Bolshevik policy underwent a dramatic change. A decision was made to establish a dictatorship over the food supply and Committees of Poor Peasants (kombedy). According to Patenaude, the motivation for these actions was to increase the supply of grain, which was purely pragmatic[9], [10].

However, the Bolshevik class-based, urban, conflictual worldview influenced the technique that was ultimately selected. The previous practises of a governmental grain monopoly and centrally set pricing served as the foundation for the dictatorship over the food supply. Any excess grain had to be given to the state by the peasants. In times of civil war, the central authorities established armed food supply detachments to collect the grain59. The kombedy were founded with the purpose of obtaining grain for the state by inciting class conflict in the countryside. This served two purposes. As the kombedy gathered grain from the wealthy to contribute to the state, the quantity of grain collected for food would rise. Politically, it was thought that this would create class divisions among the farmers and boost support for Soviet control in the countryside. However, the kombedy were a complete failure. Late in 1918, the party started to change its attitude, becoming less antagonistic towards the "middle" peasants. Early in 1919, the party announced that it was ceasing its prioritisation of the kombedy's interests for the impoverished peasants and moved towards a "firm alliance" with the middle peasantry.

It was hard to reconcile this new accommodative strategy with the severe reality of the food supply during the civil war. Local authorities started requisitioning the full quantity of grain they needed starting in late 1918. The tactic of "requisitioning" grain from the peasants via rigorous quotas became known as razverstka. According to Lih, this practise represents a retreat from the confrontation of the food supply detachments. He describes razverstka as a quota assessment strategy that was put in place as a result of the kombedy's and the food supply dictatorship's glaring inability to provide grain to the cities. Officials in charge of the food supply understood that a governmental grain monopoly was both desirable and impractical given the circumstances of the Civil War. The razverstka meant dealing with the whole peasant village and levying a quota from it rather than attempting to fan the embers of civil conflict in the countryside. The party was still dedicated to the imposition of state rule and the abolition of market relations. In their interactions with the peasants, the civil war only enforced a feeling of realism. A similar trend was at play in the sphere of land tenure. The party was devoted to socializing the countryside. A socialist agricultural industry would be centered on large, mechanized communal farms.

They would expand state control, boost agricultural output, and spread socialist principles among the populace. However, the party understood that a forced or coercive collectivization programmed was foolish. The party sought a persuasion-based agenda by establishing model states and community farms. Three types of collective farms kommuna, artel, and TOZ were established alongside the already-existing state farms or sovkhoz by decree on November 2, 1918. In contrast to the state farms, which gave the peasantry no claims to the land itself and only provided compensation for the peasants who worked them, the various collective farm types displayed a variety of approaches to land tenure and compensation. The whole internal structure of the kommuna was socialist. All things, including land and crops, were distributed equally. The artel' served as a kind of bridge between the kommuna and conventional peasant agricultural techniques. A universal assembly managed the Artel. This gathering made a decision about how much time the artel's members will spend working on the communal projects. The remaining time might be used to work on their own plots. The assembly acknowledged private property, even if it was meant to be shared by everyone.

A decree from February 1919 stated that land formerly owned by the nobility that was not being farmed would pass to these new state and collective farms. The TOZ was a fairly loosely organized organization in which members farmed their landholdings together and received produce in proportion to the land they provided. The existing peasant farmers, who had ambitions for all noble lands, found this to be very unpopular. These model farms turned out to be anything but glowing illustrations of the perfection of socialist, collectivized agriculture. Most failed to produce any real economic dynamism and were typically run by either urbanites or non-agricultural specialists and comprised of the lazy, inebriated, and/or incompetent. To put the collectivization efforts during the civil war into perspective, in 1921, after significant state encouragement, less than 1% of rural residents were employed in the collective sector. At the conclusion of the civil war, the peasant dilemma, together with the problems of the global revolution and cultural backwardness, remained unaddressed. The politics of war communism Between 1918 and 1920, there was an increase in bureaucratization, militarism, and centralization, which was accompanied by a fall in democracy, public engagement, and local autonomy. The Soviet state's use of coercion became institutionalized, and the decision-making structures that would last for practically the whole of the Soviet era began to form. The discussion in western literature has centered on the relative contributions made by ideology, political decisions, and environmental factors in shaping these processes.

DISCUSSION

The Bolshevik Revolution caused enormous social changes in Russia, and this period of upheaval was reflected in the dynamic and convoluted landscape of labour policy and union dynamics. This conversation enlightens the intricate connections between the government, the workforce, and labour unions during a period of extraordinary change by probing the many facets of this transformational environment.As revolutionary fervour began to grow, the idea that labour is a universal duty to be performed echoed the core of Marx's theories. This concept was embodied in the Constitution of July 1918, which served as the foundation for later labour laws. The 1918 Labour Code set out duties at work, but there were no early methods for execution. The conflict between the theoretical need of the labour contract and the actual reality of workers fleeing to the countryside highlighted the difficulties in turning philosophy into practise during the turmoil of the Civil War.The research reveals the crucial part that trade unions play in influencing labour dynamics. Trade unions were recognised at the 8th Party Congress in March 1919 as tools for enforcing workplace discipline, a need for the envisioned "individual mobilisation of the entire population." This recognition sparked the creation of programmes like "Communist Saturdays," which highlighted the intricacy of labor-management interactions via contributions of volunteer labour.

However, discussions about the militarization of labour and the core function of trade unions in the developing workers' state have surfaced.The sensitive topic of militarization of labour is at the heart of this debate. The idea of a "labour army" first surfaced in January 1920 as the administration tried to increase output and quicken economic restoration. A change from traditional labour practises was made with the formation of militarised labour units with a military organisation. With people like Trotsky arguing for military's role in attaining economic improvements and others raising worries about its repercussions, the discussion around the basis for militarization includes a variety of opinions.The analysis of union dynamics and labour policy highlights the underlying contradictions within the labour movement. In the backdrop of the revolution, trade unions' function as guardians of workers' interests developed. These conflicts were most highlighted by the trade union issue, which culminated in the 10th Party Congress, where some, like Trotsky, argued for their statism

while others defended their autonomy. This argument reflected larger discussions about the role of labour in the socialist transition and how to strike a balance between worker representation and state control.

The complex interactions between union dynamics and labour policy during the Russian Revolution had a long-lasting influence on history. The arguments and policies of this period not only affected the development of labour management, but also revealed the more general difficulties the developing socialist state was facing. As case studies for controlling labour dynamics within the context of revolutionary transition, the arguments around labor's responsibilities, union autonomy, and the militarization of the workforce continue to ring true.

The story that emerges while traversing the revolutionary Russia's labour policy and union dynamics is filled with ideological goals, practical adjustments, and shifting power relations. The complexity of guiding a society through significant change is captured in this investigation, which also provides insights into the labour policy-making process, the responsibilities of unions, and the long-lasting effects of these choices on history.

The exploration of the revolutionary Russia's labour policy and union dynamics shows a tapestry woven with ideological fervour, practical adjustments, and the challenges of government in the face of unparalleled change. This investigation has clarified the complex relationship between governmental requirements, labour force mobilisation, and the changing labour union positions during a time of rapid transition.In hindsight, the Constitution of July 1918's stance on labour as a universal necessity served as a pillar in the development of later labour policy.

The development of the Labour Code and subsequent policies brought to light the difficulties in putting theoretical mandates into action, a task made more difficult by the turbulent circumstances of the Civil War.Trade unions were key players in this story, expanding the scope of their advocacy of worker interests to include workplace discipline and volunteer labour contributions. The "Communist Saturdays" and the discussions that followed about militarising labour served to highlight how complicated union-government relations are.

CONCLUSION

The debate over labor's militarization exhibited a range of opinions, from those who supported economic growth via a "labour army" to others who expressed scepticism about this departure from customary methods.The larger conflicts within the labour movement were summed up by the trade union issue, which culminated in the 10th Party Congress. It highlighted the difficulties of striking a balance between worker representation and state control and demonstrated the ideological conflicts over the function of trade unions in a workers' state.

These conversations' impact is still felt today in disputes about government, workers' rights, and socialist principles. Navigating the shifting terrain of labour policy and union dynamics in post-revolutionary Russia, in essence, shows a complex tale of policy change, ideological evolution, and the demands of governance in turbulent times.

Lessons learned from this investigation cut beyond historical borders and provide insights into the challenges of managing labour relations in the face of significant social change. As time passes, the echoes of these arguments and judgements continue to influence the way that people today talk about the relationship between the state, labour, and the quest of social change.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Cockburn, C. (Tally) G. Palmer, H. Biggs, and E. Rosenberg, "Navigating multiple tensions for engaged praxis in a complex social-ecological system," *Land*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/land7040129.

[2] D. M. Mertens, "Transformative Research and Evaluation," *Can. J. Progr. Eval.*, 2010.

[3] L. Hall, C. Maughan, M. Wilkes, T. Thorpe, J. Forrest, and A. Harrison, "Swimming not drowning –resilience as a key determinant of success for aboriginal and torres strait islander pre-tertiary students," *J. Multicult. Educ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1108/JME-12-2014-0045.

[4] R. Cramer, "Millennials Rising: Coming of Age in the Wake of the Great Recession," *Newamerica*, 2014.

[5] M. Collay, "Transformative learning and teaching: How experienced faculty learned to teach in the online environment," *J. Transform. Learn.*, 2017.

[6] T. J. Davis, G. Phillips, and G. Kulm, "Creativity and the Design of Music-Mathematics Activities in a Virtual Simulation Learning Environment," 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-72381-5_7.

[7] E. Dyke and J. El Sabbagh, "'It's an Americanization that's not working,'" *J. Educ. Hum. Resour.*, 2020, doi: 10.3138/jehr-2020-0006.

[8] L. Järnberg, E. Enfors Kautsky, L. Dagerskog, and P. Olsson, "Green niche actors navigating an opaque opportunity context: Prospects for a sustainable transformation of Ethiopian agriculture," *Land use policy*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.11.053.

[9] C. Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, "Introduction: The Collaborative Continuum," in *Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendent Communities*, 2008.

[10] D. MacDonald, J. Hilton, D. Elliott, S. Heiberg, H. Tulsidas, and C. Griffiths, "Transforming natural resource management for a sustainable planet," in *Proceedings - SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 2018. doi: 10.2118/191537-ms.

CHAPTER 17

IMPACT OF REPRESSION AND TRANSFORMATION DURING THE RUSSIAN CIVIL WAR

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The abstract explores the tremendous effects of repression and change that took place during this turbulent time, delving into the complex dynamics of the Russian Civil War. This research provides insights into the intricate development of Bolshevik power and its overall effects on society by focusing on the interactions between harsh repression, socio-political change, and the restructuring of governance institutions. Authoritarianism and centralized control were hallmarks of the Bolshevik dictatorship as a result of the Russian Civil War, which served as a battlefield for ideological battles and power conflicts. An edict from September 1918, known as the "Red Terror," signaled the start of a harsh campaign to quell opposition and support revolutionary activities. More than only "counter-revolutionaries" were involved in the subsequent violence and crimes, which were also committed by speculators, prostitutes, and informers. These actions were rationalized as a way to protect the revolution. The dissolving distinction between ideological goals and the unrestrained use of state violence was mirrored in this move towards indiscriminate retaliation.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Cheka, Repression, Red Terror, Red Army.

INTRODUCTION

During the civil war, repression and brutality were strongly ingrained in Bolshevik authority. A decree issued on September 5, 1918, officially recognized the "Red Terror" as having begun in the summer of 1918 (following the attempted assassination of Lenin and the execution of the Imperial family in July 1918).69 It continued until the end of the civil war and resulted in a number of horrifying crimes against people and groups as well as the establishment of numerous labour and concentration camps (under the control of the "Whites"). The justification was simple: to support the revolution. According to Dzerzhinsky, the Cheka is not a legal tribunal. The Red Terror was the continuation of the class struggle in times of war, as Latsis argued in a famous passage: We are not waging war against individuals. The Cheka, like the Red Army, is the defence of the Revolution, and just as the Red Army in the Civil War could not take account of the fact that it might harm particular individuals but had to concern itself solely with the victory of the Revolution over the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie as a class is being eradicated by us. Do not search for proof during the inquiry that the accused violated Soviet authority verbally or physically. What class does he belong to should be the first inquiry you ask. Where did he come from? What is his background or line of work? And the answers to these queries should decide the accused's destiny. This is where the Red Terror's meaning and essence lay, yet it was impossible to combine a wide definition ("Defend the revolution") with a constrictive one ("Exterminate the bourgeoisie"). The Red Terror become violent and ruthless.

Not only were "counter-revolutionaries" put to death, but soon speculators, prostitutes, and informers were included as well. Statistical assessments on the exact scope vary, but the overall trend of a rise in violence was evident. Although this led to disagreements among the leadership, a large portion of this discord resulted from institutional and interpersonal rivalries, as the Ministry of Justice sought to regain its authority or as individuals attempted to limit Dzerzhinsky's influence. One of the few who opposed the detention of "innocent" persons was Kamenev. However, practically all Bolsheviks had the same view that state violence could be used effectively to achieve revolutionary ends. The CHEKA is notable for reasons other than the expansion of violence and coercion. Differences were a question of extent and methodology. Along with the Red Army, the CHEKA rose to prominence as one of the state's primary administrative agencies during the civil war. It was a dependable instrument in times of crisis and limited resources because to its organised and effective operations. As the foundation of a new administrative structure, it started to replace pre-existing institutions and further displaced the components of public involvement and control from the proletarian dictatorship.

The CHEKA got engaged in the prevention of crime and banditry, the regulation of guns, the eradication of infectious diseases, the enlistment and militarization of labour, and, perhaps surprisingly, the care of orphans! It started to play a major role in finding solutions to economic issues alongside the NKVD. During the civil war, the Red Army assumed the role of the main governing body. It was able to fill the void created by the deterioration of the civilian government because to its priority claim on resources, its people, and its hierarchical and centralised organisation. However, the Red Army had a role in the erosion of local authority as well. The links between cause and consequence are neither obvious nor simple to explain. Trotsky kept up the pace of building a Red Army with conventional organisational structures even if the party continued to declare its support for a democratic people militia. The political commissar, who had enormous civil and military authority, served as the army's representation of and carrier of revolutionary principles and awareness. As the Red Army grew to be the centre of the Soviet state, the local autonomy of Soviets and other organs was gradually lost through this agency.

The impact of the Red Army's and CHEKA's expanded roles was not just institutional; it also strongly accelerated the growth of bureaucratization and centralization in the system. For many years to come, Soviet-style socialism would take on characteristics influenced by the systematic use of violence, political means to address economic issues, efforts to identify internal "enemies," and a general militarization of Bolshevik ideas towards decision-making and governance. These changes had a significant impact on both the central leadership and the middle strata of the administration. The dictatorship of the proletariat was marked by a widespread and growing authoritarian, military operational culture. The process of resurrecting the Russian state took place in the midst of "a disintegrating economy and a decomposing social fabric". Under these circumstances and within the framework of the military's and the CHEKA's central role, it was the local autonomy organs and the democratic practises ingrained in the Soviet system suffered the greatest losses.

The Soviet state had become extremely bureaucratized and centralised by 1920–1921. As the All Russia Congress of Soviets convened less often due to being too big and cumbersome for quick decision-making in the context of a frantic battle for life, Sovnarkom and VTSIK became the primary decision-making organisations. The system as a whole followed the same procedure. The Soviets' standing as representatives of local autonomy and the people was steadily diminished. The centralization processes that occurred during the civil war strengthened the shift away from a horizontal, territorially-based approach to administration

and towards a vertical branch structure. As military goals gained precedence over local autonomy, the Red Army signified the expansion of centralised commands and control over local regions. The Soviets devolved into nothing more than "transmission belts" for centralised orders. The system's growing bureaucratization accelerated this centralization trend. According to Liebman, the system's official population expanded from around 14,000 in 1918 to 5,880,000 in 1920. A stifling number of committees, organisations, and departments arose to manage the war. It would be incorrect to see this federal involvement as completely invasive of local democratic processes. Many local organisations argued that they needed more centralised assistance in managing their local regions. Indeed, the Soviets themselves underwent the same process, whereby the executive committees of local Soviets replaced the representative assembly as the decision-making organ in local areas. This presents an interesting paradox, wherein the large numbers of personnel within the system increased levels of public participation in the administration (derived from a variety of motives idealism, careerism, heroism, self-interest), while concurrently witnessing a decline in the number of people who felt a sense of civic duty to participate.

Elections and democratic centralism were replaced by appointmentism, bureaucracy, and vertical centralism, greatly expanding the extent and nature of centralised control. Building a one-party state with the communist party? Within the party, changes took place along four primary axes. The party's internal structure and operation became ever more centralised, with more power concentrated at the top of the leadership. The party's function changed from being a group of revolutionaries to becoming the centre of the new state government. As the system grew less pluralistic and the party progressively took a monopolistic stance, the standing of the party changed. Finally, the party's social makeup underwent an irreversible change. The civil war exposed the conflict inside the party between democracy and centralism. The party was subject to the same dynamics that influenced the state apparatus. The Central Committee (cc), which was chosen by the Party Congress, and the Party Congress, which served as the pinnacle of the pyramidal system of party organs described in the party laws, served as the body's executive and decision-making bodies. The emergence of new power structures represented the concentration of authority at the party's leadership. The Orgburo was established and the Politburo was reformed during the 8th Party Congress in March 1919. The Secretariat was also established in 1920. The three bodies had the following roles: The Politburo, a small group of (at first) five individuals. The Orgburo was a board of cc secretaries that reported to the Orgburo and was responsible for carrying out organisational and administrative duties, particularly the appointment and selection of personnel. The Secretariat was a board of cc secretaries that dealt with specific issues that did not require the intervention of the Orgburo[1]–[3].

The cc met less frequently as time went on. Due to the overlap in membership on these new organs, a significant amount of power was effectively concentrated in the hands of a small number of influential people. By 1922, Stalin was the only individual who had membership in all four organisations. As the party started to establish a functioning machinery to allow it to carry out the duties of governing the nation, this process gave rise to a plethora of bureaux and committees. Nine distinct departments, including the Orgotdel, the Uchraspred, and the Informotdel, were created by the cc. Bureaux were developed to collaborate with non-Russian entities. The cc increased its level of control by tying local party committee work more closely to itself, appointing officials rather than having them chosen from below, and giving secretaries of party committees greater authority at all levels of the hierarchy. Taken together, these changes represented a significant bureaucratization of party activity. The issues were handled administratively. The elected premise has been replaced by appointmentism.

Democracy was controlled by centralism. Following the passing of Sverdlov, who had led both the party and Soviet bureaucracies, the party's position was changed during the 8th Party Congress. The "Organisational Question" Resolution, which tried to define the functions of the party and soviet organs, was adopted. A party fraction must be established in every soviet organisation, and these fractions must strictly adhere to party discipline.

It is never acceptable to conflate the duties of party collectives with those of state institutions like the Soviets. The party must carry out its decisions through the soviet bodies, within the bounds of the Soviet constitution. The party seeks to guide rather than take over the activity of the soviets. The challenge was political procedure. How might leadership be practised without weakening the soviets' autonomy? The decision-making centre shifted inexorably from VTSIK and the ARCS to sovnarkom, and particularly to the cc, as a result of a precedent set at the top level. The party made lower-level attempts to establish the foundation of all public organisations (via individual members). To guarantee that politically dependable people held the key roles, key persons were selected by the secretariat. In order to push for the acceptance of the party line, party divisions were to organise inside all non-party organisations. This functional separation proved tough to maintain. The chief representative in local regions was quickly replaced by the local party secretary. In the system as a whole, power was transferred from the state to the party. In the party, power shifted from the local levels and the lower ranks to the leadership and the full-time apparatus.

The party had quickly taken over the role of the administration's "directing nucleus". The expansion of the Bolshevik monopoly of power continued the tendencies that were already in place before the civil war. During the civil war, the other socialist parties were marginalised and persecuted, but the Mensheviks and the SRS managed to remain active at the local level. The Mensheviks had gained ground in elections to urban Soviets and were, in fact, the most well-liked movement inside the unions. In the countryside, the SRS continued to have a sizable following. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, dominated the elite. Elite-level opposition was mostly limited to party factions that started to develop. A number of opposition groups emerged between 1918 and 1920/21, challenging the leadership on a wide range of topics. The thrust of Bolshevik policy agitated and dissatisfied the Left Communists, the Workers' Opposition, the Military Opposition, the Democratic Centralists, and others. The important problem is the continued public dissent, disagreement, and discussion in the middle of the civil war. At this juncture, the party's domination at the upper level did not necessarily mean that all opposition, both within and outside the party, had been put down. Finally, the party's social makeup underwent a drastic and permanent change. It developed into a major party during the civil war, going from having just a few thousand supporters at the beginning of 1917 to having almost 600,000 by March 1920.

It is important to take notice of the social backgrounds, life experiences, and perspectives of the newcomers. According to Siegelbaum, the share of manual labourers increasingly decreased while that of peasants and white-collar employees increased. By January 1921, there were 240,000 workers (41% of the party), 165,300 peasants (28%), 138,800 employees (23.7%), and 41,500 people of unknown ancestry (7.1%).The majority of these individuals joined the party after the revolution, frequently for careerist reasons or to obtain limited rations or privileges, and they were imbued with ideas of militaristic methods of rule. Figes deftly describes how party members' ideologies moulded the post-revolutionary state's practises and the character of Bolshevik power. The party membership was mostly uneducated and pragmatist. The system grew more and more riven with corruption and cronyism at the local level, but the majority remained ideologically loyal to the cc's dictates. Significant changes had been made to the party. The (Less) Politics of War Communism

Lenin said, "We have no doubt learned politics; here we stand as firm as a rock," during the 8th Congress of Soviets in December 1920. However, things are not good in terms of the economy. The finest politics from now on will be the least political ones. Bring more engineers and agronomists to the fore, learn from them, monitor their work, and transform our congresses and conferences into bodies that will truly learn the business of economic development, not into propaganda meetings. Lenin promoted "less politics" in the context of his plans for electrification. Lenin began his speech by declaring: "This marks the beginning of that very happy time when politics will recede into the background, when politics will be discussed less frequently and at shorter lengths, and engineers and agronomists will do the majority of the talking."His earlier remarks were influenced in part by his growing frustration with the factional conflicts within the party. On a deeper level, however, it reveals a deep-seated aversion to "politics" and a preference for a technocratic, scientific method of managing society and for putting production first above all other considerations.

The decisions and policies implemented during this time were influenced by this underlying worldview, which was virtually Saint-Simonian in nature. Bureaucratization, coercion, centralization, and hierarchicalization were all signs of the statification of Soviet political life while they were taking place. Workers' control, local Soviets, and trade unions democratic institutions put in place in 1917—were eliminated or badly weakened.There are several reasons for this stateization. A vast process of institution-building and bureaucratization was required due to the severe lack of resources and manpower, which was often promoted from below by local authorities who were already straining to cope. Because of the conflict, authoritarianism and corrosive coercion were introduced into politics, along with the idea of an enemy. The accusation of counter-revolution may result from a failure to actively support the revolution. The same allegation would soon be used against everyone who disobeyed the leadership line. Excellent study has been done by social historians on the devastation and emigration of the industrial proletariat during the civil war. There were twice as many bureaucrats as workers in Russia in 1921, according to Figes.

This had two effects. First, as their base of support shrunk, the Bolsheviks were more and more isolated. Second, the party began to see that the necessary socialist awareness that would allow the populace to take part in system governance was "missing." These factors greatly influenced the growth of coercion, bureaucratization, and the prioritisation of the use of specialists and experts in the administration of the system. The party, its activists, its commissars, and its officials were forced to take the place of the people in the country's administration as the only ones with the "correct" socialist consciousness. less politicians and more agronomists. It would be incorrect to assume that either the leadership or the party as a whole accepts these developments without question. A number of opposition movements, including the Workers' Opposition, Democratic Centralists, Military Opposition, and a group of communists in Ukraine pushing for greater autonomy, attempted to revive the democratic impulse and the local, representative organs of Soviet society (though only within the confines of exclusive Bolshevik rule). As the military threat fluctuated, criticism crept in spasmodically. The ambition to position the democratic, emancipatory, libertarian branch of Soviet socialism at the heart of the post-revolutionary state served as the unifying theme of all this critique.

The 8th Party Congress in March 1919 is when criticism from the Left-libertarian movement most likely peaked. Here, the party remained dedicated to industrial democracy via trade union membership and a popular militia. The leadership was well aware of the system's flaws. There were many solutions developed. Lenin started a series of party membership purges to get rid of those who were deemed "unsuitable." To prevent corrupt networks from

solidifying their power, more frequent rotation of officials was also encouraged, both geographically and occupationally. The public control of the state and party institutions was one of the most intriguing phenomena that illustrates the developing hegemony on the character of politics under Bolshevik leadership. To cut down on "red tape," the Bolsheviks established the People's Commissariat of State Control (NKGK) in May 1918. After another restructuring in 1919, the Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection (RABKRIN) was established in February 1920. Its goal was to encourage more public participation and control, which would lessen the bureaucratic aspect of government.

RABKRIN attempted to include the general populace in the control of officialdom by a variety of techniques, typically aid cells and mass investigations. Its existence was rather tumultuous. Concurrently, new institutions were established to supervise the activity of the party. These party control commissions, both at the top and local levels, had a little effect on the party's trend towards centralization, appointeeism, and bureaucratization. Within the dictatorship of the proletariat, conflict still existed between elite revolutionary consciousness and public rule. The Bolshevik idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat was pushed farther towards centralization, elitism, and technocracy by the civil war, adding bureaucratization and coercion. However, this idea just reinterpreted the conflict between widespread involvement and centralised control, not its elimination

DISCUSSION

A time of great upheaval, the Russian Civil War (1918–1922) saw the clash of political machinations, social change, and ideological fervour. This conversation explores the significant effects of both the repression and the transition that marked this turbulent time, illuminating the intricate interactions between these forces and their long-lasting effects[4], [5].

Repression and the "Red Terror"

The Bolshevik Party's stance abruptly changed during the Russian Civil War, moving in the direction of ruthless repression, as epitomised by the "Red Terror." In September 1918, when the "Red Terror" was formally recognised, a new era of state-sanctioned violence against supposed opponents of the revolution began. Assassination attempts and the murder of the Imperial family sparked the first reaction, which quickly turned into a brutal campaign that targeted not just counter-revolutionaries but also a broader range of people, such as speculators and informers. As unfettered state brutality and the ideological desire to preserve the revolution converged over time, they sowed the seeds of authoritarianism and left a path of destruction.

Social Transformation and Centralization

Both in terms of party dynamics and government systems, the Russian Civil War saw significant social transformation. The development of the Red Army and the Cheka as powerful governing forces served as a metaphor for the concentration of power. These institutions came in to fill the hole created when the civil government failed due to the demands of war.

The Cheka, originally charged with counterintelligence, developed into a powerful tool of state control, managing everything from orphan care to crime prevention. Although crucial to the war effort, the Red Army also helped to undermine local autonomy, progressively tipping the scales in favour of centralised command systems[6], [7].

Effect on Party Dynamics and Governance

Repression and change coming together had an impact on party dynamics and governmental systems. The Soviet state's bureaucratization was expedited by the Cheka and Red Army's consolidation of power, which changed the environment for local autonomy and democratic practises. Authority migrated to vertical branch structures as a result of this centralization, which resulted in the loss of horizontal, territorially oriented administration. Within the Bolshevik party, centralization and hierarchical decision-making simultaneously arose, resulting in the creation of a one-party state with concentrated power at the top echelons of the leadership.The effects of the Russian Civil War's suppression and change persisted long after the war's end. The "Red Terror"'s authoritarian inclinations and unrestrained brutality left a lasting impression on the Soviet state. Governmental institutions changed as a result of the concentration of power and the loss of local autonomy, resulting in a system that is more bureaucratic and top-down. These adjustments affected the development of socialism in the Soviet model, which helped to foster a more pervasive authoritarian, militaristic operational culture[8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Russian Civil War stands as a crucible that forged a new path for Bolshevik rule, marked by the duality of repression and transformation. The violent trajectory of the "Red Terror" altered the course of governance and authority, culminating in a centralized state with far-reaching implications. This discussion sheds light on the intricate interplay between these forces, revealing the complex nature of revolutionary change and its enduring legacy in shaping the future of Russia and its political trajectory.

Lenin made an unsuccessful effort to combine the two by converting Soviet society's organs into "transmission belts" for party doctrine, to the extent that the civil war's restrictions permitted, and by establishing public institutions to monitor the activities of party and state authorities. This amounted to the predominance of a technocratic method of managing society, supplemented with state-directed public engagement that would serve an educational purpose.

REFERENCES

[1] O. S. Porshneva And M. A. Feldman, “The Comprehension Of The Russian Civil War In The Context Of Two Anniversaries,” *Izv. Ural Fed. Univ. Ser. 2. Humanit. Arts*, 2018, Doi: 10.15826/Izv2.2018.20.3.042.

[2] S. Y. Tsohla, N. A. Simchenko, And P. P. Chyvatkin, “Institutional Environment For The Formation Of The Soviet Generation,” *Int. J. Eng. Technol.*, 2018, Doi: 10.14419/Ijet.V7i4.38.24627.

[3] Л. Синявська, “Soviet Historiography Of Researches Of The High Industry Of The Eastern Region Of Ukraine In The Conditions Of The First World War,” *Східноєвропейський Історичний Вісник*, 2018, Doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130667.

[4] J.-P. Depretto And M. Lewin, “The Making Of The Soviet System. Essays In The Social History Of Interwar Russia,” *Mouv. Soc.*, 1989, Doi: 10.2307/3778394.

[5] N. Potapova, “Evangelical Christians And Baptists Of Russia In The Revolutionary Process Of 1917-1922: Transformation Of Identity (Based On Materials Of The Confessional Press),” *Gos. Reli. Tserkov’ V Ross. I Za Rubezhom/State, Relig. Church Russ. Worldw.*, 2019, Doi: 10.22394/2073-7203-2019-37-1/2-396-416.

[6] M. Denbeste-Barnett And E. Wood, “The Baba And The Comrade: Gender And Politics In Revolutionary Russia,” *Slav. East Eur. J.*, 1999, Doi: 10.2307/309572.

[7] D. Healey, “Russian And Soviet Forensic Psychiatry: Troubled And Troubling,” *Int. J. Law Psychiatry*, 2014, Doi: 10.1016/J.Ijlp.2013.09.007.

[8] A. L. Kleitman, “‘Troubled Times In Russia In The Early 17th And Early 20th Centuries: Nature And Lessons’ International Scientific Conference (October 12-13, 2018, Volgograd),” *Vestnik Volgogradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, Seriia 4: Istoriia, Regionovedenie, Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniia*. 2019. Doi: 10.15688/Jvolsu4.2019.2.18.

[9] D. L. Sheremetyeva, “Professor Without Education: Social Lifts Of The Russian Society During The First Half Of The Xx Century In The D.I. Rosenberg’s Career,” *Vestn. Tomsk. Gos. Univ. Istor.*, 2016, Doi: 10.17223/19988613/44/4.

[10] R. Abramov, “Understanding Professionalism In The Soviet Union And Post-Soviet Russia: An Analytical Review,” *Am. Sociol.*, 2016, Doi: 10.1007/S12108-015-9294-5.

CHAPTER 18

ECONOMIC INEQUALITY, PRIVILEGE AND WOMEN'S LIBERATION IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

Due to rationing during the war, certain groups received preferential treatment, which had an impact on the formation of the socioeconomic hierarchy. Notably, labor unions' rejection of economic equality resulted in greater income difference. The privileged recipients ranged widely, including professionals, manual laborer's, government employees, and even members of the Red Army. The story reveals how the Communist leadership tolerated inequality while admitting the discrepancy in order to priorities economic development and survival. Lenin's pre-revolutionary works are examined alongside this seeming contradiction, highlighting the intrinsic conflict between incentivization and radical economic theories. The research also looks at the origins of Zhenotdel, the Women's Department, and how it has changed in its support of women's freedom. Exploring the divergent viewpoints of Zhenotdel activists and Bolshevik officials sheds insight on how emancipatory goals became a technocratic instrumentalist approach. In the end, the research highlights how complexly privilege, economic restructuring, and gender freedom interacted during a crucial period in Soviet history.

KEYWORDS:

Economic Inequality, Rationing, Scarcity, Trade Union, Women's Liberation.

INTRODUCTION

In terms of economic inequality and stratification, war communism increased them in Soviet Russia. The circumstances had a role in this to some extent. Rationing was a result of shortage caused by war. As a result, since they were so dependent on these groups for existence, the Bolsheviks inexorably gave them special treatment inside the system. As the party gradually renounced its commitment to the "maxima" (a ceiling on earnings, though given the collapse of the rouble, the benefits-in-kind were the most tangible and useful ones) during the civil war era, the following privileges emerged. The primary beneficiaries of high wages were the specialist and technical staff in state enterprises. The trade unions' renunciation of the practise of minimising income differentials in March or April 1920 led to increased income differentiation. The primary beneficiaries of the system of rationing commodities and food were the manual labourers and the party/state officials. Rations were distributed in the following proportions: 4:1:2:1 to manual labourers, white-collar employees, and unemployed people. The Red Army members got special rations, making them the most privileged category. The distribution of special meals to individuals like CHEKA employees, chosen workers, political agitators, and others increasingly became commonplace. Other advantages, like as lodging, travel, and educational opportunities, also fell under the control of discretionary allocations[1]–[3].

These actions outraged both workers and Left-libertarians. Lenin and other party officials did acknowledge the unfavorability of this rising disparity. However, the leadership was obligated to encourage inequality and to place a higher priority on productivism than

egalitarianism due to the dual imperatives of physical survival and the growth of the productive forces. It is intriguing to compare this steady rise in inequality with the seeming radicalism of the communist wartime economics. Can they be made to agree? In terms of Lenin's pre-revolutionary writings, in which he anticipated the necessity for uneven incentives, and with the overall tenor of transition economics (increasing output), there is unquestionably nothing abnormal. The interpretations and theories of war communism about which more is given below might contain the solution.

The founding of Zhenotdel (The Women's Department of the cc Secretariat), which was founded in November 1918, was the key initiative regarding views towards the liberation of women throughout the civil war. Zhenotdel was founded as a result of this Congress. Its initiatives aimed to educate and culturally enrich women in order to entice them into the public eye. In order to link the liberation of women from the traditional roles they still played and the establishment of socialism, it was intended to build a sizable cadre of female workers who would work for the party and the state at all levels of the hierarchy. Radical differences between Zhenotdel activists and the Bolshevik leadership emerged. The zhenotdelovski advocated for a world of new women to develop a communalized society neighbourhood by neighborhood, as Clements has pointed out. As the initial emancipatory and liberational elements in Bolshevik discourse faded, the technocratic, instrumentalist attitude of the leadership took hold.

However, leading Bolshevik theoreticians (Lenin, Trotsky, and Bukharin) believed that huge centralised organisations would construct communism by rearranging economic structures, producing as a result the social transformation of which women's emancipation was a part. Zhenotdel developed became one of the party's transmission belts, mobilising women to carry out specific duties in the creation of socialism. This is not to imply that substantial developments that freed women or questioned ingrained societal mores did not occur. These changes took place as a result of the state's policy shifting to a more instrumentalist approach to the Zhenskii Vopros.

Inculcating a new worldview: education, propaganda, and the discussion of proletarian culture The Bolsheviks began to place more and more emphasis on culture as the possibility of an impending European revolution diminished. The development of socialism in Soviet Russia was hampered not only by the economic and technological backwardness of the country, but also by the workers' and peasants' cultural and social backwardness. Only with a competent workforce was rapid large-scale industrial growth and the application of science and technology to the production process conceivable. It was necessary for the public to be read and educated in order for them to participate in the administration of socialism. The low levels of socialist awareness in the populace were another growing danger to Bolshevik control. In a nation where the petit bourgeois peasants are seen to be in control, it would be difficult to embed communist party authority. A remaking of the populace's worldview was attempted as a result of cultural advancements[4], [5].

The nature of this culture gave rise to disagreements, which expressed some of the more profound conflicts underlying the Bolshevik movement. With the rise of the Prolet'kult movement, the debate over the nature of culture after the revolution re-emerged. Drawing on the ideas of Bogdanov, Lunacharskii, and others (interestingly, Bukharin and Kollontai), the Prolet'kult movement worked to establish, develop, and spread a distinctly proletarian culture. For the prolet'kultists (a very wide and amorphous organisation), culture was independent of politics and economics, therefore a cultural transition had to take place concurrently with (or maybe even before) political and economic advances. In fact, many extreme prolet'kultists want to completely reject all bourgeois cultural and scientific advancements while

establishing a new proletariat culture. Bogdanov advocated for the "socialisation of science" at the Prolet'kult's inaugural conference in Moscow in September 1918 as the cornerstone for developing a genuinely proletarian culture. Despite being staffed primarily by intellectuals, Prolet'kult's goals included not only the development of a proletarian culture but also the advancement of workers themselves to oversee its growth. The Prolet'kult movement espoused a faith in the creative potential of both the workers themselves and in the autonomy and centrality of cultural transformation in the establishment of socialism in Russia. The Bolshevik who opposed it most vehemently was Trotsky. Along with Lenin, he sharply criticised those who wanted to abandon all bourgeois culture and values and placed a priority on economic developments. Lenin and Trotsky considered increasing output to be the most important objective, to which all sectors of society had to participate. In making this claim, Trotsky in particular argued against the autonomy of the cultural realm and gave it a secondary place in the development of socialism. Lenin served as a kind of middleman (as he often did in other situations).

Lenin agreed that a "cultural revolution" was necessary, but with two key caveats. His primary focus was with material culture, such as literacy and scientific knowledge. In creating a new proletariat culture, he had little time for avant-garde movements or creative experimentation. Second, Lenin fiercely disagreed with those who wished to counteract capitalism's advancements in the arts and sciences. The only way to overcome the cultural and educational backwardness of the Russian worker and peasant was to widely disseminate the most recent developments in human culture. This is how Lenin's theory that socialism is the offspring of capitalism and its heir is applied to the cultural sphere. Lenin's approach towards culture was strongly utilitarian due to the demands of modernisation and productivism. As the ambiguities and tensions within Bolshevism over culture were played out, the cultural sphere experienced struggles and disputes over the administration and substance of cultural policy throughout the civil war era (and later). The civil war era witnessed a huge expansion in the establishment of institutions to supervise cultural policy, as it did in so many other sectors. Under Lunacharsky, a Commissariat of Enlightenment (Narkompros) was established, which was charged with overseeing all facets of cultural policy, including the arts, literature, education, press, cinema, and theater. As the party gradually broadened the scope of its operations, ideas, values, and policies were popularised and disseminated among the populace through various organisations (zhenotdel, Komsomol, trade unions)[6]–[8].

They also disbanded organisations that span class lines, most notably the Boy Scouts. Throughout this time, there was conflict between society autonomy and governmental authority. However, there was no conclusive remedy. The universities, the Academy of Sciences, scientists, and some well-known cultural figures maintained significant autonomy from the state while Prolet'kult's influence waned after 1920. The content of cultural policy combined a number of distinct strands intended to inculcate a new worldview as well as to impart more specialised educational and technical values as part of the modernization of society. As part of the process of creating a new worldview, secular and religious explanations of the universe had to be destroyed, and a communist worldview had to be spread through an enormous propaganda network. Expecting that as a result of industrialization and education, personal faith would inevitably wane, the party adopted a strategy of militant atheism and began to eradicate organised religion in Russia. Due to the expropriation of church property and the termination of governmental support, priests were destitute. Religious structures have been transformed for a variety of purposes, including atheist museums.

The teaching of religion was forbidden and atheistic propaganda took its place. Festivals of religion were supplanted with communist and secular substitutes. To promote the atheistic gospel, a massive propaganda network was established, using film, theatre, the press, and posters. Censorship was used more and more throughout the civil war as opposing opinions were repressed. The widespread illiteracy in Russia was one of the greatest barriers to the achievement of this endeavour to build a socialist person. The Bolsheviks started an initiative to eradicate illiteracy. A network of literacy schools was developed, particularly in the Red Army, but also in workplaces and elsewhere. Underlying these social and cultural activities was the Bolshevik goal to alter the world, and their trust in the potential of the human intellect to organise this process. This desire to engage in extensive social engineering was a manifestation of the constructivist tendencies of Bolshevism. The material circumstances of the civil war, where the Bolsheviks lacked the means to carry out this transition, repeatedly hindered and perplexed this aim. The civil war era is notable for the gradual ascendance of the Leninist utilitarian line on cultural policy, emphasizing the struggle to overcome adversity and build socialism, reinforcing the technocratic, productivist line, over the democratic, libertarian approach that sought a proletarian culture created by the workers themselves.

War communism: specifics and discussions There has been a lot of argument over how to understand it among Western and Soviet historians. Numerous writings provide excellent documentation of the distinctive characteristics of the Soviet state at this time. If these and the analysis above are summarised, the following characteristics can be found:

1. An increase in the statization and central control of all aspects of life;
2. Extensive nationalisation of industry;
3. Administrative allocation of goods, services, raw materials, and labour;
4. An effort to stifle private trade by eradicating market relations and by abolishing money;
5. An increase in the use of coercion, terror, and authoritarian practises; and
6. A bureaucratization of political.

The argument between ideologies and conditions, or ideologies and circumstances, is the fundamental point of contention. Early Soviet writers like Kritsman, who saw "war communism" as "an experiment in the first steps of the transition to socialism,"emphasised the ideological component and referred to it as the "Heroic Period." Later Soviet texts instead emphasised the need and conditions that led to the creation of a variety of radical measures intended to handle an extreme predicament. The policies came to an end with the conclusion of the war. Non-Soviet literature exhibits a similar tendency to choose one account over the other.Was War Communism a reaction to the war situation and collapse, or did it represent an all-out effort to jump into socialism? Nove sees it as a combination of the two. I've said before that it may be both of these things at once. Perhaps it should also be noted that it meant different things to various Bolsheviks, and this is a crucial factor in our understanding of how they perceived the about-turn in 1921.

Szamuely contends that the ideological legacy of Marxism did provide some general guidelines within which the Bolsheviks made their policy decisions.Boettke went further, contending that, this task of eliminating market relations and "taking over the whole process of social production from begin to finish" was a crucial However, a lot of the radical messianic interpretations came from the similarity of elements of the Bolshevik war economy with Kautsky's identification of the fundamental characteristics of a socialist economic system. War communism represents the conscious and deliberate attempt to realise Marx's utopia. This prompted academics to consider them to be enduring characteristics of the transitional era.

Recent publications have claimed that Lenin's post hoc construction of military communism to support the NEP's shift towards moderation was all that it was. In contrast to Lars Lih, Siegelbaum has suggested that Lenin developed "war communism" in an effort to support NEP and discredit his detractors.

Lenin described it as a frantic reaction to emergency situations on a few occasions. Others may see this as a hasty effort to enter communism. Lenin imposed an interpretation of post-revolutionary developments that, according to Siegelbaum and Lih, cannot be sustained: October 1917-May/June 1918 = State Capitalism [MODERATION] May/June 1918-March 1921 = War Communism [RADICALISM] March 1921- = NEP [MODERATION]. To start, they contend that there is no underlying justification for associating state capitalism with moderation. Second, there were several examples of pre-Civil War ambitions being scaled down, such as the 1919 decision to turn to middle peasants and the foreign concessions programme. The experiences of Imperial Germany and Russia during World War II and their ideology both contributed to the processes of statization. It is clear from the analysis above that the policies implemented during the civil war were the result of a complex range of factors, and that each policy initiative needs to be carefully examined. According to this reading, there was nothing conceptually distinctive about this time period.

Explaining civil war events as either an effort to march directly towards communism or as a system conditioned only by exigency and desperation is overly simple and one-sided. On one level, the consistency throughout the time following October is impressive. One may see a fundamental continuity in the party's activities if one considers the goal to increase production as the overriding force influencing Bolshevik policy and takes into account the propensity to embrace large-scale, statist, and centralist solutions. The contradictions between Bolshevik theory and practise are not found at the level of their conceptions of the transitional period and actuality, but rather in the discrepancy between their political declarations in 1917 (such as workers' control of industry) and their subsequent deeds. Let's look at a couple policies to highlight the intricate elements at work. Increasing output was prioritised in several programmes, including the return to one-man management, the employment of experts, an unequal pay policy, foreign concessions, and strong worker discipline. The specifics of the civil war were what determined how these programmes would be structured. However, the inspiration for the movement came from Bolshevik notions of the nature and aim of the transitional period.

Some policies extended and deepened a particular notion by taking into account the national-specific circumstances of the transition. The post-revolutionary franchise serves as the greatest example of this. The necessity to establish a revolutionary democracy where the legislative and executive branches were combined and the proletariat was in charge was discussed in Marxist-Engelian thought on the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The franchise was not mentioned in detail. Due to the unique circumstances of the Bolshevik battle for survival, it was necessary to understand how the post-revolutionary state's authoritarian function included limiting the right to vote. Lenin took care to emphasise that this was a national application of a fundamental idea and not a characteristic of the post-revolutionary state as a whole.

Due to global circumstances, other policies were an expansion and strengthening of a certain notion. Due to Brest-Litovsk's aftereffects, the nationalisation process was extended in June 1918, speeding a process that had been proceeding sporadically and gradually. The issue of abolishing money and establishing a system of direct exchange was a product of the civil war's circumstances; Preobrazhensky and others only explained it as an intentional choice made for ideological reasons after the fact. The 1919 Party Programme and The ABC of

Communism both outlined the long-term objective of a moneyless economy as well as an interim period in which money would be crucial: "In the first period of the transition from capitalism to communism, while communist production and distribution of goods is not yet organised, it is impossible to abolish money...the All-Russian Communist Party strives towards the adoption of a series of measures which will render it possible readjustment was indicated by other policies, but one that remained within the overall productivist framework. This is especially clear when looking at the 1919 shift in favour of the middle peasants. This "retreat" from the class war strategy (committees of poor peasants) was motivated by an acknowledgment of previous food procurement failures as well as a change of course in light of the fact that many impoverished peasants had transformed into middling peasants as a consequence of the revolutionary land settlement. The impoverished peasants continued to play a crucial part in the Bolshevik plan, especially when it came to establishing communal and cooperative farms. To put it simply, generalization is impossible. Each policy effort has to be carefully analyzed, with special attention paid to the ideological and contextual context in which it emerged. It does seem that the phrase "war communism" is a post-hoc, artificial creation that hides more than it discloses. However, the term's intrinsic ambiguity, which draws attention to ideological and contextual elements, may imply that the notion may be rescued, although not in the way that Lenin and others had in mind. Perhaps of more relevance are the discussions taking place inside the party as a result of the experiences of leading during the Civil War. A new theoretical synthesis about the characteristics of socialism as a transitional society resulted from these. We must now proceed to a critique of this conception of socialism.

DISCUSSION

The topic of "Economic Inequality, Privilege, and Women's Liberation in Soviet Russia" provides a thoughtful examination of the complex interaction between economic forces, social stratification, and gender norms at a critical juncture in Soviet history. This discourse tries to analyse the complex effects of War Communism on the socioeconomic structure of Soviet Russia while also illuminating the progress made in the fight for women's emancipation.

War Communism

Due to the disparity in wages distribution, a layer system of privileges developed, with state officials, the Red Army, manual labourers, and specialised personnel emerging as the main benefactors. The topic of discussion examines the elements that led to the paradoxical presence of egalitarian ideals in a setting characterised by clear economic inequality.The discourse examines the intellectual foundations of the Bolshevik leadership, contrasting the radicalism of Lenin's pre-revolutionary writings with the practical requirements of economic survival. Lenin's prediction of unequal incentives and the execution of measures that made inequality worse create a conflict that provides a forum for examining ideological concessions made in the face of difficult circumstances. Although hesitant given the twin imperatives of physical survival and economic expansion, the leadership's acknowledgment of the widening inequality raises concerns about the malleability of ideological commitments during times of crisis[9], [10].

The Zhenotdel Initiative and Women's Liberation

This conversation goes beyond economic factors to include the developing story of women's freedom in Soviet Russia. One significant effort to reshape gender norms and encourage women's participation in public life is the creation of Zhenotdel, the Women's Department of the cc Secretariat. The conversation, however, reveals the opposing viewpoints held both

Zhenotdel activists and the Bolshevik leadership. The complicated debate between idealism and pragmatism within the revolutionary framework is shown by the shift of women's liberation from an emancipatory vision to a technocratic, instrumentalist approach.Gender Dynamics and Socio-Economic revolution: As the conversation goes on, it becomes clear that the socio-economic revolution that was put in motion during the Cold War had an impact on gender dynamics. The quest for women's freedom intertwined with the changing nature of privilege, the function of unions, and the ideological revisions within the Bolshevik leadership. The discourse provides understanding of the conceptual and practical effects of the shifting economic environment on the trajectory of gender equality and women's empowerment.

CONCLUSION

Economic Inequality and Privilege in the Context of War Communism, which developed as a reaction to the demands of the First World War and the Russian Civil War, set the stage for a complicated situation of economic privilege and inequality in Soviet Russia. Because of the lack of resources, rationing was implemented, which unintentionally resulted in preferential treatment for certain groups and maintained a hierarchy of economic superiority. economic gaps were made worse by the trade unions' decision to give up the idea of economic equality.

The debate on "Economic Inequality, Privilege, and Women's Liberation in Soviet Russia" concludes with a thorough examination of the complex interrelationships between economic inequality, privilege, and gender emancipation during the turbulent time of War Communism. This discourse underscores the difficulties involved in promoting gender equality and socio-economic change within a revolutionary environment by addressing the collision of ideological ambitions with practical requirements.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Bloch, “Longing for the Kollektiv: Gender, power, and residential schools in central Siberia,” *Cultural Anthropology*. 2005. doi: 10.1525/can.2005.20.4.534.

[2] R. Kay, “A liberation from emancipation? Changing discources on women’s employment in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia,” *J. Communist Stud. Transit. Polit.*, 2002, doi: 10.1080/13523270209696368.

[3] R. B. Neary,“Celebrating women: gender, festival culture, and Bolshevik ideology, 1910-1939,” *Choice Rev. Online*, 2002, doi: 10.5860/choice.40-2346.

[4] C. Wanless-Sobel, “Sexual Revolution in Bolshevik Russia,” *Arch. Sex. Behav.*, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s10508-008-9451-9.

[5] B. E. Clements, “The Women’s Liberation Movement In Russia. By Richard Stites. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978. Pp. 464 $37.50), Women in Soviet Society: Equality, Development and Social Change. By Gail Warshofsky Lapidus. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978. Pp. x, 381. $17.50),” *J. Soc. Hist.*, 1980, doi: 10.1353/jsh/13.3.505.

[6] S. Ashwin, “‘Awoman is everything’: The reproduction of soviet ideals of womanhood in post-communist russia1,” in *Work, Employment and Transition: Restructuring Livelihoods in Post-Communism*, 2005. doi: 10.4324/9780203994351-16.

[7] “Late Modern,” *History*. 1989. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-229X.1989.tb01483.x.

[8] A. Stephan, “Zwischen ost und west: Die unabhängige frauenbewegung in Leningrad 1979-1982,” *Arch. Sozialgesch.*, 2005.

[9] R. G. Suny, “Sexism and the Soviets - Vera Broido: Apostles into Terrorists: Women and the Revolutionary Movement in the Russia of Alexander II. (New York: The Viking Press, 1977. Pp. 238. $15.00.) - Richard Stites: The Women’s Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism, 1860–1930. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978. Pp. 464. $37.50.),” *Rev. Polit.*, 1979, doi: 10.1017/s0034670500028849.

[10] Richard Spall, “Book Reviews,” *Hist.*, 2000, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6563.2000.tb01463.x.

CHAPTER 19

ECONOMIC VIEWS OF BUKHARIN, TROTSKY AND STALIN IN THE POST-REVOLUTIONARY ERA

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

This book explores the diverse economic viewpoints of influential individuals throughout the post-revolutionary period in Soviet Russia, including Bukharin, Trotsky, and Stalin. The examination reveals how the complex interactions between Bolshevik principles and practical considerations influenced their economic theories. The study analyses how these leaders handled the difficulties of converting a war-torn nation into a socialist state, with a focus on the time after the Russian Revolution. Their various points of view were crucial parts of the larger Soviet narrative as they debated issues related to industrialization, agrarian policy, planning, and market dynamics. The abstract examines how Stalin created a synthesis of both ideologies by emphasizing fast industrialization and worldwide revolution while Trotsky prioritized gradualism and market-oriented socialism. This research sheds light on the subtle development of economic theory within the post-revolutionary environment by investigating their approaches to economic transformation, class struggle, and foreign involvement. It emphasizes how these economic viewpoints had a significant effect on the development of Soviet socialism and how they continued to have an impact on later historical interpretations.

KEYWORDS:

Bukharin, Planning, Stalin,Socialist construction, Trotsky.

INTRODUCTION

The difficulties present in the Soviet vision of socialism between 1917 and 1924 were resolved with Stalin's triumph in the factional battles of the 1920s. This idea predominated the CPSU's thought and actions up to Gorbachev's arrival in 1985. As coercion, terror, and the disproportionate use of state power over society and the economy replaced the NEP's relative calm and pluralism, it is frequently claimed that the central themes and characteristics of the Stalinist model of socialism were a revived version of the civil war policies. This marked a radical "break" with NEP policies. But as time goes on, it becomes more obvious that the various stages of the post-revolutionary period are synthesises of the battle between Bolshevik ideals and Russian reality. The Stalinist model was developed via a process like to this, emphasising certain elements of Bolshevik theory (distilled from the disagreements with Trotsky, Bukharin, Preobrazhensky, and others) and establishing the practical application of many of its goals (such as "planning"). It is necessary to expound on the alternatives proposed by Bukharin and Trotsky before turning to look at the Stalinist model.

After Lenin, was Bolshevism trinitarian or unitarian? How different were the varied perspectives on the transitional phase that the top Bolshevik leaders evolved following Lenin's death? The highly politicised character of historical texts from both the East and the West about this time period has a tendency to confuse and muddle the key points in discussions of economic policy, party democracy, and relationships between the peasants and the workers.

The popularity of Bukharin's rehabilitation after 1985, Trotsky's disputed position in Marxist discourse (both East and West), and the relative lack of focus on Preobrazhensky's ideas are all examples of how this period's history has been subject to the shifting sands of highly politicised historiography. The opinions of Trotsky, Bukharin, Preobrazhensky, and Stalin are outlined in the analysis that follows. Two things should be kept in mind at all times. First, the economic viewpoints presented here were created in the midst of a bitter political civil war. Second, from 1924 to 1939, the primary characters' perspectives evolved and altered. The person who is most often cited as having changed his opinion is Stalin, although he was by no means the only one. The key components of Bukharin, Trotsky, and Stalin's platforms may be distinguished from the discussions and vacillations of the factionalism of the 1920s. Bukharinism and Soviet socialism According to some, Bukharin is the champion of the New Economic Policy (NEP), gradualism, the peasantry, and a "national" or "separate" path to socialism.1 Trotsky and the other "super industrializers," on the other hand, place a strong emphasis on rapid industrialization, the workers, and the global revolution.

According to reports, Bukharin supports the socialist market and a worker-peasant socialist worldview that is non-class specific and all-encompassing. Can this opinion be upheld? Here, it is only possible to sketch down the general themes of Bukharin's philosophy. Extrapolating from his writings from 1921 to 1939, Bukharin was a persistent supporter of a centralised, unified economy. Bukharin was a consistent adherent to the basic concepts of Bolshevism about the transition phase. He saw planning as having intrinsic excellence. Building socialism required industrialization, and the development of the capital goods sector was a need for the establishment of an industrial society.

It was necessary to preserve the Bolshevik party's rule. Arguments and disagreements about the best way to accomplish this aim arose. Particularly, disagreements about the strategies, constraints, and paces of socialist construction occurred. The balance of plan/market, urban/rural, industry/agriculture, worker/peasant, production/consumption, international/national, democracy/bureaucracy in this transitional period are only a few of the conflicts that Bukharin created in his unique and distinctive synthesis of the Bolshevik ideology.

The core of Bukharinism is the harmony of market and strategy. The market was to be a key component in the development of socialism in Bukharin's ideas. However, it was just a minor component of the socialism-to-socialism transition, not the lower communist era that followed. In the NEP framework of a mixed economy (state industrial sector and private agricultural and industrial sector), the creation of an affluent peasants would boost demand for consumer products. Bukharin regarded a growing consumer market as the key to industrial growth. Because of its better efficiency, competitiveness, economies of scale, etc., the state-run industrial sector would profit from this, progressively displacing the private sector and bolstering socialist forces at the cost of capitalist ones.

The creation of rural consumer cooperatives by the poor and middle-class peasants for the purpose of purchasing commodities would be promoted in the agricultural sector. They would have a competitive edge over the kulaks' individual farms as a result of this. These cooperative organisations would ultimately prove to be more effective in the long run, replacing individual private farming and instilling collectivist economic principles in the peasants as co-operation spread into both production and consumption. First, as Lih, Cohen, and others have pointed out, Bukharin described subduing the market "through the market". There was no notion of a future "assault" on market relations and the private sector via the quick, forced growth of the state sector. In other words, Bukharin was in favour of an evolutionary, gradualist method of socialist creation.

It would take a while to complete this. Second, the class conflict would now take place in this form of economic rivalry between the private and public sectors, mediated by the market. Bukharin supported the development of socialism by peaceful means. Thirdly, Bukharin emphasised the sphere of circulation over the sphere of production, overturning the traditional Bolshevik emphasis upon production as the key process in the construction of socialism. The centrality of market relations inexorably shaped Bukharin's views on planning. Although Bukharin supported planning, he emphasised that the plan ought to be practical, scientific, adaptable, and made to maintain the economy's proportionality and balance. Planning would make it possible to govern the economy more logically and tightly, and via a flexible framework, it would engage the market's irrational impulses. By the late 1920s, Bukharin had grown more and more persuaded of the advantages of a more extensive form of planning, but he was still critical of methods that were overly bureaucratic or centralist.

According to Bukharin, planning would expand organically as the socialist sector grew and the market was replaced. It shouldn't be seen as an instantaneous procedure that included the state's whole economic existence. Many Bolshevik presumptions were flipped on their heads by Bukharin's approach to the issue of the interaction between workers and peasants, as well as between town and country. Bukharin aspired to develop socialism via civic harmony between peasants and workers, not war, and proclaimed trust in their revolutionary potential. The core of his philosophy was the preservation of the smychka. In Russia, socialism could not be built without the peasantry's backing. The peasantry, according to Bukharin, has two "souls": a labouring soul and a proprietorial soul. The objective of the party was to provide the economic and cultural frameworks necessary for the former to eventually supplant the latter.Bukharin identified the middle peasants as the most important category of peasants.

The agriculture industry would develop in a socialist direction if they could be persuaded to embrace collectivist principles. If not, capitalism would probably come to pass. This explains why, in the long run, Bukharin preferred cooperation over collectivization since cooperation would show that collectivism is preferable to individuality without damaging the peasants' entrepreneurial inclinations. Large-scale, mechanised farming would ultimately replace individual farming, but only if it proved to be more successful and productive. Bukharin backed measures to rein in the kulaks, but they were to be non-coercive and economic in nature. Despite adhering to the fundamental principles of Bolshevism the proletariat's priority Bukharin had a far more hopeful and favourable attitude of the peasants. Bukharin also changed the foundation of Bolshevik thought regarding the international sphere. In his opinion, Soviet society was a more inclusive, complex, and differentiated organism than traditional Bolshevik class categories usually set out. Bukharin is credited for transforming Bolshevism from an internationalist to a nationalist stance and with creating the concept of "socialism in one country" with Stalin. The phrase was initially used by Stalin in December 1924, but Bukharin enlarged on its theoretical implications.

This idea has been misrepresented to some extent, mostly as a result of the heated arguments between the "Left" and the "Right" in the 1920s. Many of these skewed and biassed viewpoints need to be corrected. First, Bukharin never ruled out the prospect of a proletariat revolution in western Europe in the future. He did contend, nevertheless, that a change in strategy for constructing socialism in rural, isolated Russia was required given the failure of the German uprising and the seeming stabilisation of the western economy. Bukharin revised the party's internationalist vision in light of this new circumstance. He thought that socialism could be established in Russia, or more particularly, that Russia could modernise and industrialise independently.

Through the smychka, Russia would develop towards socialism through the aforementioned economic processes. Bukharin replied in a variety of ways to the criticism that he was endorsing a nationalist version of socialism. First, he contended that revolutions overseas were necessary for socialism to ultimately succeed in Russia.

Second, the character of socialism in Russia would be a reflection of the archaic socioeconomic structure of the peasantry. Socialism would exhibit a great degree of variability on a worldwide scale due to variations in cultural levels, racial makeup, economic development levels, social structure, etc. Thirdly, Bukharin theorised the smychka on a worldwide scale. Socialism may be built in Russia, but it would not adhere perfectly and right away to the ideal promoted by Marx and Engels. The peasants may not turn out to be worldwide revolutionary friends if they can be considered properly as revolutionary allies inside Russia. Beginning with the non-capitalist colonies, Bukharin spread the idea that the peasants might be a powerful force for revolution and, therefore, that a peasant-based, non-capitalist road to socialism would be possible. However, he switched the emphasis from Europe to Asia and from the proletariat to the peasantry. Bukharin's place within the conceptual framework of Bolshevism is an intriguing one. Bukharin gave a unique answer to many of the unsolved disputes in Bolshevik thinking on the structure of the whole transition era while adhering firmly to the broad elements of the transition period.

Bukharin stands out from his predecessors with his comprehensive socio-class analysis, focus on balanced development and flexible planning, the growth of socialism via the market, and the potential to establish socialism in one nation. However, it would be incorrect to overstate how unique Bukharin's position is. He continued to support a planned, heavily concentrated, centralised industrial economy. Bukharin cannot be seen as the champion of market socialism or market relations under socialism. He detested the chaos and impulsiveness of market forces. But he was also against the economy's excessive centralization and bureaucratization. He continued to support unequal franchise systems that privileged the worker over the peasant in an effort to create the political hegemony of the proletariat. However, Bukharin wholeheartedly endorsed the one-party system, therefore this was hardly a platform for socialist political plurality. The state should play the role of educator. Consensus, revolutionary legality, and persuasion should all be used as the foundation for political action.

As with Lenin, Bukharin sought to steer a course between pluralist (socialist) democracy and a bureaucratized state standing above the masses, unaccountable, and undemocratic. He believed that the key to combating bureaucracy without undermining the role of the party was to involve the masses more fully in the work of local Soviets. Trotsky and Preobrazhensky Trotsky's opinions are just as contentious and contested as Bukharin's. Trotsky is sometimes referred to as a "super-industrializer" since he always advocated for fast industrialisation, centralised planning, class conflict in rural areas, and global revolution. To put it another way, Trotsky is often depicted as the "heroic," "socialist offensive" legacy of "war communism." Though the terms "Leftist" and "Rightist" might lead one to believe otherwise, a detailed examination of Trotsky's beliefs shows a far higher degree of similarity between Trotsky and Bukharin's views. On markets and planning, Trotsky adopted a similar strategy to Bukharin. Throughout the socialist revolution, Trotsky remained a proponent of capitalism.

The NEP's three primary pillars the market, tangible rewards, and the smychka with the peasantry were to be maintained. Despite the fact that Trotsky emphasised the need to develop the socialist industrial sector and move towards a planned economy, he believed that these goals could only be achieved through the market.Trotsky claimed that: "We must adapt the Soviet state to the needs and strength of the peasantry, while preserving its character as a workers state; we must adapt Soviet industry to the peasant market.

It would be possible to refine planning techniques and adapt them to the peasant market economy by limiting the plan's application to the socialist manufacturing sector. Even though Trotsky maintained that industrialization was important and needed, in 1923–1924, this was to be accomplished via the market. After 1926-7, when Trotsky started to criticise the gradualist, pro-peasant orientation more and more, the two men really started to diverge. As the international situation deteriorated and the peasants started to withdraw from the market, industrialization, pro-workerism, and central planning became more and more necessary. Here, it is clear where the two theories place a distinct focus. Trotsky put a larger emphasis on the necessity to industrialise as soon as was economically feasible and was far less tolerant of the market and comfortable with the expansion of capitalism in rural areas. Within the NEP framework, Trotsky wanted to industrialise, but he planned to do it by taking advantage of the agrarian industry. The industrial sector was to be given priority. The views that Trotsky and Bukharin had towards the world scene revealed significant contrasts between them.

During the factional conflicts of the 1920s, Trotsky was branded as a supporter of "permanent revolution" in contrast to Stalin and Bukharin, who were said to have advocated "socialism in one country" (more on this below). Trotsky's philosophy consisted of two distinct yet interconnected parts. First, Lenin fundamentally believed in 1917 that Russia's anti-feudal struggle would evolve into the proletariat revolution. Second, Trotsky believed that the revolutionary impulse would leave Russia and spread to the rest of the globe, necessitating the success of the global uprising. Trotsky rejected the implications of "socialism in one country" for a variety of reasons. First, he rejected the idea that the Soviet economy could advance on its own. Economic autarky was a mistake since Russia had to buy products from the West to make up for consumer goods shortages and to provide capital goods for industrialisation. The improved efficiency and economic demands of the western economies were too much for the Russian economy to handle on its own. Second, Russia's technological and cultural illiteracy meant that autarky would condemn the country to ongoing underdevelopment.

Thirdly, "socialism in one country" made foreign policy defensive by avoiding capitalist involvement so that Russia might grow on her own terms, as opposed to instigating and supporting revolution in the West. Trotsky never disputed that it was feasible to start the process of socialist building in Russia, and that doing so would help to ultimately defeat the global revolution. Additionally, he didn't think that the global revolution was about to happen. Like Bukharin, Trotsky agreed that the universal revolution remained a crucial goal. Although there seems to be agreement on fundamental ideas, there are variations in emphasis: Trotsky's focus is primarily internationalist against Stalin and Bukharin's emphasis is mostly nationalist. The disagreements with Stalin will be noted below. Although Trotsky's view of the future was more industrialised, modernist, centralising, and technocratic and this affected the way he conceptualised the transitional period, it is clear that he shared many fundamental beliefs with Bukharin. Differences in emphasis, subtlety, pace, and degree were present. In fact, it would seem that Trotsky and Preobrazhensky, one of his former "Leftist" comrades, disagree more than they do. Preobrazhensky specifically emphasised the necessity of prioritising the expansion of state industry.

In doing so, the forces of socialism were strengthened, the groundwork for a collectivised, mechanised agriculture was laid, and it was possible to take advantage of the organisational benefits of planning the key to socialist economic superiority. Preobrazhensky believed that heavy industry needed to be prioritised above light industry in order for the state industry to thrive.

The means of supplying the resources would be "primitive socialist accumulation": acquiring the materials needed for industrialisation from the agricultural sector and through entanglement in the socialist world economy. In other words, Preobrazhensky was opposed to the notion of "socialism in one country" because of the necessity to take advantage of the peasants and the advancements in the global economy. He was also profoundly persuaded of the need for assistance from the western proletariat. In conclusion, Preobrazhensky's emphasis on the need for immediate development of comprehensive planning, the importance of heavy industry, and the absolute necessity of an international revolution places him at the opposite end of the spectrum from Bukharin, with Trotsky occupying something of a middle position. The main tenets of economic policy and the development of socialism were widely agreed upon throughout this discussion. Labels like "super-industrializer" and "permanent revolutionary" or "communist populist" were applied as a result of the internal party squabbles. They conceal the common set of presumptions shared by the primary characters.

However, there were also genuine disparities regarding priorities, accents, and threat judgements. The execution of Stalin's platform was made possible by the defeat of Trotsky and Bukharin in the factional battles that took place between 1927 and 1929. The formation of a Stalinist model There is no disputing Stalin's role in creating a distinctive model of Soviet socialism in practise. Stalin's actions gave the Bolshevik ideas of planning, centralization, and industrialization a particular meaning. Based on this, Stalin plays a crucial part in developing the conventional understanding of Soviet socialism in. More debatable is his theoretical contribution to the growth of Soviet socialism. The originality, breadth, and significance of Stalin's occasional forays into theory have often been questioned by academics. Can this opinion be upheld? Stalin, Trotsky, and "socialism in one country": "Like a cat avoiding hot porridge" Stalin's contributions to the theoretical discussions of the 1920s are closely interwoven with the factional conflicts.

Only within this context is it possible to comprehend how a minor technical disagreement over the definition of terms like "building," "completion," or "victory" became the foundation for a significant doctrinal dispute between Stalin and Trotsky. Only within this context is it possible to comprehend how Stalin's idea of "socialism in one country" emerged. Although Stalin is credited with coining the term in December 1924 (in an essay titled "October Revolution and the Tactics of Russian Communists"), Bukharin's concept of "growing into socialism" included the implication that socialism might be built in Russia. The words started to form a little randomly. In a series of "Foundations of Leninism" lectures delivered in April 1924 at Sverdlov University, Stalin outlined that, "does it mean that with the forces of only one country it is possible to fully guarantee that country against intervention and, consequently, against restoration?" Not at all, no. This requires that the revolution succeed in at least a few different nations.

This was a restatement of orthodoxy about the link between the establishment of socialism and its dependency upon assistance from the European proletariat. As a result, the development and support of revolution in other countries is an important job of the successful revolution. Stalin argued that a socialist revolution might succeed inside a single nation, nonetheless. This marked the beginning of Stalin's determined campaign to dissociate Trotsky from Lenin and position himself as Lenin's legitimate successor, claiming that the concept of perpetual revolution was anti-Leninist. "Socialism in one country" first appeared in this setting the fight to discredit Trotsky. Stalin started revising the "Foundations of Leninism" concepts in December 1924, putting more emphasis on the potential for creating "socialism in one country."

Stalin stated that the foundation for the construction of socialism already existed in Russia rather than the Russian proletariat being dependent on developments abroad, quoting Lenin from 1915 ("the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country, taken singly"). For many months, the concept was left unfinished while Stalin persisted in his argument for the need for a global revolution. With the publication of two books, the results of the work of the Fourteenth Party Conference (May 1925) and on the problems of Leninism (January 1926), Stalin started to develop his ideas more fully as he realised the slogan's political potential and popularity. Stalin's core philosophy was that there were two sets of problems in the modern world that needed to be resolved.

The first was inside Russia, between the proletariat and the peasants. The second debate included the USSR and the capitalist nations. Stalin said that although socialism could and should be fully implemented in Russia, it could not be assured that socialism would ultimately triumph there. Russia was able to build socialism because she possessed the necessary resources, knowledge, and revolutionary fervour to finish the job. The West's capitalist nations had to stabilise before socialism could be developed, leaving only two options: advance with socialist building or decay. Despite this, there was no way to assure success since capitalist interference remained a possibility. Still required was a global revolution. Stalin's key differentiation concerned the causes of the failure to guarantee the total triumph of socialism. Stalin said that while Trotsky and Zinoviev supported the process of building socialism in Russia, they both thought that it would not be successful due to the country's economic and technological backwardness. In other words, the Russian employees were unable to complete the task at hand. Stalin, in contrast, claimed that the hostile international environment was the only reason socialism was unable to fully achieve victory.

There were little ideological disagreements between the protagonists. Their religion was what set them apart. Confidence in the potential of the Russian people to establish socialism. Without this possibility, socialism would be developed without any prospects and without any assurance that it would be built. Without being certain that we can establish socialism and that our nation's technological backwardness is not an impassable barrier to the construction of a fully socialist society, there is no use in attempting to do so. Denying such a possibility would be a sign of lack of trust in the socialist cause and a rejection of Leninism. Trotsky's viewpoints were defeatist and gloomy, while Stalin's were upbeat and hopeful. Stalin said that Russia was no longer reliant on the West and made an appeal to pride in the revolution's accomplishments. In fact, Russia would now become the helm of the global revolutionary movement. The socialist revolution has now centred on Russia. The pivot point of the revolution was now the weakest link in the imperialist chain. How important was this idea? It advanced Stalin to the forefront of the ideological conflict in terms of party developments. It also played a crucial role in Stalin's efforts to discredit Trotsky: he was called a defeatist, a pessimist, an adventurist, a Menshevik, and an anti-Leninist. Deutscher's words, "Stalin became an ideologue in his own right," were used to describe Stalin.

This was due to Stalin's contention that the philosophy of "permanent revolution" necessitated perilous overseas expeditions while showing little trust in Russian workers. Similar to how "permanent revolution" deviated from Leninism, it was most accurately characterised as a kind of Menshevism. "Socialism in One Country" carried a powerful message for the party: it promised stability, continuity, and progress towards socialism. This approach synthesised Marxist and Leninist orthodoxy with nationalist goals, connecting Russian particular with Marxian universals, and its relevance stretched well beyond the initial intention to undermine Trotsky.

The belief that Russia was at the forefront of the global revolution and would serve as the epicentre of the emerging post-capitalist civilisation was supported by the focus on Russia's independence and self-reliance. However, Stalin went to great efforts to underline the Leninist credentials of "socialism in one country": it was the continuation of the process of creating socialism began under NEP by Lenin. This looks to be Russian exceptionalism with a Marxist face. However, as Carr has argued, it also signalled the end of the New Economic Policy (NEP). The shift away from a stated reliance on the West to industrialise was now accompanied by a belief in Russia's domestic ability to industrialise. In this manner, it was also possible to get rid of the NEP's fundamental reliance on the peasants. "Socialism in one country" indicates a new approach to resolving the conflicts that existed within Soviet socialism, merging traditional proletarian privileges and a focus on nationalistic-patriotic themes with the conventional belief in industrialization[1]–[3].

DISCUSSION

The debate on "The Economic Views of Bukharin, Trotsky, and Stalin in the Post-Revolutionary Era" provides a thorough examination of how these key members of the Bolshevik leadership dealt with the complexities of economic policy during a pivotal time in Soviet history. This discussion looks into the various economic worldviews each of these individuals holds and their significant influence on the development of the fledgling Soviet state.The debate begins with a look at Bukharin's economic beliefs, which are characterized by his support for a measured, progressive approach to economic development. The New Economic Policy (NEP), which supported a mixed economy that included both the public and private sectors, was at the core of his thinking. It analyses Bukharin's focus on market dynamics and the expansion of a consumer market as a driver of industrial growth. This conversation also highlights Bukharin's support for agricultural cooperatives as a method of progressively establishing collectivist values and displacing private farming[4]–[6].

The Global Revolution and Industrialization in Trotsky's Thought

The conversation then turns to Trotsky's economic viewpoint, emphasising his unrelenting concentration on fast industrialization and the expansion of revolution across the world. Examined is Trotsky's preference for a centralised and coercive approach to industrial expansion, as well as his notion of the state sector's suzerainty over the private sector. Key elements of his economic philosophy that are examined in this context include his belief in a "permanent revolution" and his focus on the global nature of socialism.Stalin's Synthesis of Pragmatism and Socialist Ideals: The debate goes on to examine Stalin's changing economic stance, which resulted from the fusion of the aforementioned philosophies. Following the factional fighting of the 1920s, Stalin was able to consolidate his control and shape economic policy to suit his goals. His economic theory mixed gradualism and market dynamics with elements of central planning and governmental control. The discussion closely examines Stalin's focus on quick industrialization, agricultural collectivization, and the establishment of a socialist state that could fend for itself.

Impact on Soviet Socio-Economic Trajectory

Throughout the talk, it becomes clear how intricately various economic ideas interact with one another and how that affects how Soviet society develops economically. It is shown that the various methods of industrialization, agricultural policy, market processes, and class strife had a significant impact on the structure of the Soviet state. This section also looks at how the Communist Party's internal ideological conflicts and the consolidation of power were influenced by the intersection of these economic ideas with more general political concerns[7]–[10].

CONCLUSION

The discussion ends by underlining the malleability of historical interpretation and the impact of political developments on how these economic perspectives are perceived. Historical interpretation and ideological transformations. It is shown how these individuals' economic viewpoints are still vulnerable to the shifting currents of political discourse and history by discussing the diverse degrees of rehabilitation and acknowledgement of these individuals within various historical settings.As a whole, the study of "The Economic Views of Bukharin, Trotsky, and Stalin in the Post-Revolutionary Era" offers a thorough examination of how these leaders' economic ideologies influenced the socioeconomic environment of early Soviet Russia. This discourse gives insight into the dynamic interaction between ideological ambitions and practical realities in a turbulent moment of revolutionary transition by studying the subtleties of their views and the ensuing ramifications for policy and historical interpretation.

REFERENCES

[1] C. H. M. Kelly, “Protest and discipline: Shostakovich and the revolutionary self,” *Vestn. Sankt-Peterburgskogo Univ. Istor.*, 2018, doi: 10.21638/11701/spbu02.2018.409.

[2] P. Boobbyer, *The stalin era*. 2012. doi: 10.4324/9780203134030.

[3] G. Shaw and R. Burns, “German Cultural Studies: An Introduction,” *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1998, doi: 10.2307/3733752.

[4] R. Sakwa, “Red sunset: the failure of Soviet politics,” *Int. Aff.*, 1994, doi: 10.2307/2625328.

[5] D. Healey, “Homosexual Existence and Existing Socialism New Light on the Repression of Male Homosexuality in Stalin’s Russia,” *GLQ A J. Lesbian Gay Stud.*, 2002.

[6] R. A. French, “Plans, pragmatism and people. The legacy of Soviet planning for today’s cities,” *Plans, pragmatism people. Leg. Sov. Plan. today’s cities*, 1995, doi: 10.2307/131828.

[7] D. J. B. Shaw and J. D. Oldfield, “Soviet geographers and the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945: Lev Berg and Andrei Grigor’ev,” *J. Hist. Geogr.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jhg.2014.06.002.

[8] R. Legvold and V. Tismaneanu, “Stalinism for All Seasons: A Political History of Romanian Communism,” *Foreign Aff.*, 2004, doi: 10.2307/20033944.

[9] O. A. Voronina, “‘Gender’ holidays: The transformation of symbolic meanings,” *Woman in Russian Society*. 2017. doi: 10.21064/WinRS.2017.3.1.

[10] S. S. Radchenko, “Mongolian Politics in the Shadow of the Cold War: The 1964 Coup Attempt and the Sino-Soviet Split,” *J. Cold War Stud.*, 2006, doi: 10.1162/152039706775212021.

CHAPTER 20

BALANCING BOLSHEVIK IDEALS AND PRAGMATIC REALITIES IN THE POST-REVOLUTIONARY ERA

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

This abstract explores the complex interplay between Bolshevik ideals and practical reality that defined Soviet Russia's post-revolutionary period. This research investigates how Joseph Stalin, who played a crucial role, managed the challenges of balancing the demands of the socialist state's construction with the revolutionary ideal. To build an industrial, centralized, and collectivist society, Stalin first seems to be in line with classic Bolshevik beliefs. His dedication to racial inequality, outlawing party divisions, and upholding the party's monopoly on power are all compatible with Bolshevik ideals. But a closer look shows small changes in his strategy. We examine the development of the "socialism in one country" theory and its impact on industrialization, self-sufficiency, and economic goals. This abstract demonstrates how the character of socialist industrialization and transition was altered by this inward orientation, with significant ramifications for the link between ideology and reality. Technological progress, modernization, and productivity improvement all had a specific goal thanks to Stalin's fusion of Marxism and nationalism: preserving national sovereignty while laying the groundwork for socialism.

KEYWORDS:

Joseph Stalin, Industrialization, Pragmatic realities, Post-revolutionary, USSR.

INTRODUCTION

On one level, Stalin seems to agree with traditional Bolshevik views about the nature of the transitional period. He was dedicated to building an industrial, collectivist, centralised, and technologically sophisticated society. Industrialization would transform peasants into proletarians and provide the material and technological foundation for communism's plenty. The issue of the party in power in a nation of farmers would be resolved by the development of a proletariat that was both politically and numerically dominant. He was against private ownership and the market. He vocally supported measures that stoked class conflict in rural areas. He supported the prohibition on party factions as well as the maintenance of the communist party's monopoly on power. However, a deeper examination of Stalin's writings and speeches from the years 1925 to 1939 reveals that he profoundly and subtly changed the way the party thought. In particular, the development of the "socialism in one country" theory, although connected to the factional conflicts, also had important theoretical ramifications.

The Bolsheviks' commitment to the growth of the productive forces in the USSR was reevaluated as a result of the autarky and self-sufficiency ideas inherent in this doctrine. These ideas also influenced the priorities for industrial development, which in turn influenced the nature of the economic foundation of Soviet socialism. "Socialism in One Country" had a lot of major implications due to the "inwards" shift it entailed. Technical sluggishness,

industrialization, collectivization of agriculture, and the abolition of the market were all current problems that needed to be handled in order to make the transition to socialism and communism. These tasks now had to be completed domestically. For the purpose of achieving self-sufficiency, this imposed a new set of priorities and guidelines. The transition itself changed as a result. It was now necessary to build a socialist society via the means of national self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency required a certain industrialisation and modernisation process. As we have already shown, although methods might justify goals, ends shape the means. By merging Marxism with nationalism, Stalin's plan gave the main transitional processes technological advancement, modernization, and increased productivity a specific substance. These processes were not to be driven just by the necessity to build the foundation of socialism: the urge to protect the nation now entered the picture, according to Stalin. "It is not just any kind of increase in the productivity of labour of the people that we need," he said. The focus on independence influenced the transition's character in a variety of ways. In terms of economic growth, Stalin chose to give special attention to large-scale capital goods sectors.

Stalin stated in 1928: "Our theses proceed from the premise that a fast rate of development of industry in general, and of the production of the means of production in particular, is the underlying principle of, and the key to, the industrialization of the country," and "Our theses proceed from the premise that a fast rate of development of industry in general, and of the transformation of our entire national economy along the lines of socialist development," Manufacturing the primary producer products was the top priority if the USSR was to industrialise independently in order to provide the groundwork for future industrialisation, national defence, and, most importantly, collectivization of agriculture. Stalin was aware of the Bolsheviks' inclination towards heavy industries. The industrialization process required the collectivization of agriculture. Grain supply had to be consistent and increased as industry grew. It was determined that Russia's dispersed and small-scale system of land ownership was unable to provide an increase in grain production. The Bolsheviks' favoured answer was a large-scale mechanised agriculture sector. Peasants with a collectivist mindset and ideals were necessary for a socialist society.

The conversion of the peasants into proletarians was necessary for the Soviet state to be politically viable in the long run. However, collectivization required industrialisation to function. Collective farms couldn't function without agricultural equipment. The manufacture of the means of production was given priority as a result of the symbiotic relationship between collectivization and industrialisation. The demands of defence strengthened this priority, and this goes beyond the development of socialism. In light of the capitalist encirclement, it also applies to the independence of our nation. Our nation's independence cannot be maintained without a strong industrial base for defence. And if our industry is not more technologically advanced, such an industrial base cannot be established. The 1927 war scare, which fueled the perception of a hostile capitalist encirclement, also infused the Stalinist programme with ideas of haste or speed.

A crash programme of modernization and industrialization entailed prioritising key economic sectors such as fuel, metallurgy, machine-tools, and chemicals rather than advancing a broad social agenda. In terms of socioculture, the need for self-sufficiency replaced the NEP's focus on social harmony and class consensus with resurrected Bolshevik ideas of class warfare and war. Stalin wanted to continue the "offensive" against components of capitalism, rejecting the Bukharinite strategy that called for its abolition via the market. The policy should be to awaken the working class and the exploited masses of the countryside, to increase their fighting capacity and develop their mobilised preparedness for the fight against the capitalist

elements in town and country, for the fight against the resisting class enemies.41 In fact, Stalin claimed that the proletarian elements must be mobilised for a struggle against capitalist elements (i.e., the kulaks). The intensification of the class struggle has been heavily demonised by Stalin's opponents due to its later use in the justification of the terror of the 1930s. This is because they feel that their final days are drawing near precisely because they are becoming weaker, and they are forced to resist with all the forces and all the means in their power. However, it was really a restatement of the Trotskyist/Leftist viewpoint towards the end of the 1920s. The assertion by Trotsky that state power is at its peak just before it disappears reflects the position inherent within the doctrine of permanent revolution: the problem for the proletariat within Russia would be to consolidate power, not the seizure of power itself. A new kind of warfare would be required due to the peasantry's dominance. As part of the process of building socialism, the capitalist forces in the nation kulaks, bourgeois professionals, and entrepreneurs would have to be vanquished. Class conflict was necessary by industrialization. The Soviet attitude to the global revolution also changed as a result of Stalin's insistence on the necessity for self-sufficiency. This wasn't left behind. A revolutionary is someone who is prepared to protect and defend the USSR without reservation, without qualification, openly and honestly. This is because the USSR is the first proletarian revolutionary state in the world and a state that is constructing socialism. Stalin revised the definition of internationalism to prioritise the national interests of the USSR.

An internationalist is someone who is prepared to defend the USSR unconditionally. This is because the USSR serves as the foundation for the global revolutionary struggle, which cannot be supported and advanced without USSR defence. The cause of world socialism was best served by building socialism in the USSR and defending the revolutionary victories of 1917. Whoever thinks of defending the global revolutionary movement apart from, or against, the USSR, goes against the revolution and must inevitably slide into the camp of the revolution's enemies. The interests of the global working class and those of the Soviet state now perfectly coincided. But now, instead of the other way around, the promotion of the latter was given priority over the former. Nationalism and Marxism have united together. Finally, in terms of politics, the desire for independence enhanced the inclinations towards political and ideological monism, discipline, and party cohesion. The escalation of the class conflict brought to light the political risks posed by the concurrent modernization and industrialization processes. Stalin emphasised three problems.

First, the combination of capitalist encirclement and economic and technical backwardness constantly generated “deviations” within the party of different political hues, And since our proletariat does not live in a vacuum, but in the midst of the most actual and real life with all its variety of forms, the bourgeois elements arising on the basis of small production “encircle” the proletariat on every side with petit-bourgeois elemental forces, by means of which they permeate and corrupt the proletariat…thereby introducing into the ranks of the proletariat and of its Party a certain amount of vacillation, a certain amount of wavering… There you have the root and basis of all sorts of vacillations and deviations from the Leninist line in the ranks of our party. Stalin emphasized that while the dangers of the “Right” and “Left” were different (the former underestimated the strength of capitalism, the latter overestimated it), the outcome of either in power would be the same: the restoration of capitalism. Stalin maintained that there could only be one right course of action in an isolated circumstance.

A swerve from that course would encourage factionalism, weaken the party, and jeopardise the proletariat's power. Monolithism and unity were essential. Stalin also cautioned against the perils of routine and bureaucratic lethargy among bureaucrats. Stalin prescribed a return

to the Leninist ideal of public involvement in the governance of the state, although one that was funnelled, mobilised, and controlled by the party. Stalin emphasised the value of "selfcriticism" and criticism coming from the bottom up. In isolation, the dictatorship's ability to maintain its revolutionary purity depended on its ability to keep its employees politically aware. Given that the Communist Party is the only party in charge of the proletariat's dictatorship and that it cannot and will not share power with other parties, this could only be accomplished from within the party itself. Is it not obvious that if we want to advance, we must acknowledge and correct our own mistakes? Is it not obvious that there is no other way to achieve this than by working within the party itself? Comrades, is it not obvious that self-criticism must be one of the driving factors behind our development? Self-criticism was intended to be coupled with criticism from below. The general populace's criticism of the party leaders was intended to keep them from becoming apart from the people and from having interests separate from those of the Soviet Union. Additionally, it was intended to raise the political awareness of the employees themselves, making them more cognizant of issues, open to criticism, and invested in how the system functions.

Stalin, though, clearly defined boundaries for criticism. Contrary to "promotion" from below, about which Stalin had more to say elsewhere, this was not the same thing. It is not a matter of elevating new leaders to the fore, despite the fact that this merits the party's most serious consideration, as Stalin contended. It is important to maintain the most prestigious and prominent leaders by establishing ongoing, unbreakable communication between them and the people. The second restriction was the nature of the criticism. Only criticism that sought to improve the apparatus of Soviet government, our industries, and our activity in the parties and unions. In order to enhance the Soviet rule, criticism is necessary. It's notable that the closeness to truth was left out of the list of requirements for criticism. The class origins of the critics and the criticism's class substance were crucial. How can you expect an ordinary worker or an ordinary peasant, with his or her own painful experience of shortcomings in our work and in our planning, to frame his or her criticism according to all the rules of the art? is a classic example of Bolshevism, with its class-tinted spectacles displacing norms of truth and falsehood. Demanding that criticism be entirely accurate will eliminate any opportunities for criticism from below and for self-criticism.

Because of this, I believe that criticism should be received, given careful consideration, and its valid points taken into account, even if they are just 5 or 10% correct. Otherwise, I'll say it again, you'd be stifling the hundreds of thousands of supporters of the Soviet Union who, despite their lack of proficiency in the art of critique, proclaim the truth on their lips. (I emphasise) This has evident ramifications. Regardless of truth or appropriateness, criticism from below that the leadership thought acceptable would be released in an effort to "correct" flaws. This approach didn't really come into its unsettling implications until the 1930s. Establishing a synergy between leadership by the vanguard and involvement by the people, as outlined in State and revolution, is perhaps a strategy with a definite Leninist heritage. Despite being a considerably more constrained and restricted idea of participation than Lenin had initially envisioned, it is consistent with a political framework that aims to combine public engagement with a one-party monopoly of power. The criticism campaign underlines how uneasy Bolshevism's relationship with "truth" has always been.

The class-based worldview, which influenced Bolshevik opinions on a wide variety of topics, was deeply ingrained in the movement's ideology. Last but not least, the party reiterated the crucial need for developing red experts: to oppose bourgeois experts as part of the escalation of the class war, replacements who were both Red and Expert were required. The need for self-sufficiency gave the development of technically sound, politically aware cadres a new

sense of urgency. Combining these various political tactics was intended to draw attention to systemic problems, including factions and leadership deviations, bureaucratic stagnation, mistakes and inadequacies in officials' work, and the class and national backgrounds of important persons. The atrocities and purges of the decade that followed had deep historical origins in Bolshevism. But the primary distinguishing element of the Stalinist synthesis was the coexistence of nationalist and Marxist elements in Bolshevik speech. The effects of this union have mostly gone unappreciated and untheorized. Stalin's ambition was justified by fusing modernisation, which provided the material foundation for communism's plenty, with modernization, which addressed the age-old problem of Russia's technological behind.

The speech Stalin gave on 4 February 1931 at the First All-Union Conference of Managers of Socialist Industry was the most direct example of this. It is worth repeating: Sometimes, the question of whether or not the pace might be slowed down is raised. Comrades, the answer is no. Slowing down would put us behind schedule. Those who fall behind are also punished. However, we do not want to be defeated. One aspect of ancient Russia's history was the constant abuse she received for her laggard ship and backwardness. The Mongol khans thrashed the woman. The Turkish beys beat her up. The mediaeval lords of Sweden beat her. She was defeated by the nobility of Poland and Lithuania, by British and French businessmen, and by Japanese lords. All defeated her as a result of her backwardness: in the military, culturally, politically, industrially, and agriculturally. However, now that capitalism has been overthrown and the working class is in control, we have a fatherland and we will fight to preserve its independence. Do you wish to defeat and lose our socialist fatherland's independence? If you do not want this, you must put an immediate stop to its sluggishness and adopt a really Bolshevik pace in developing its socialist economic system.

There is no other option since we lag behind developed nations by 50 to 100 years. In 10 years, we must close this gap. There are no fortresses the Bolsheviks cannot conquer.49 When one considers how nationalism and Marxism coexisted in the Stalinist synthesis of Soviet socialism, it is interesting to note that the quest for self-sufficiency marked the beginning of a shift in the philosophical foundation of Bolshevism. The emphasis placed on fragility, isolation, and the fight against backwardness gave the transitional period a new focus. Self-sufficiency needed to be attained immediately, and that was the first objective. This was a crucial prerequisite for the development of socialism. The latter objective, however, continued to be the stated goal of the transition and was often cited. In the Bolshevik interpretation of the transitional period, "self-sufficiency" coexisted alongside "the construction of socialism," rather than replacing it. The demands for quick national modernization clashed with, and in some instances undermined, the values and tenets of the preeminent view of socialism as a result of this coexistence of goals, which led to a number of new conflicts and difficulties. The Stalinist programme for the transformation of Russia adopted this policy of overcoming backwardness as its "official ethos" (Lewin, 1950).

This emphasis on immediate tasks and the choice of policies that would achieve this goal marked a significant shift in the communist party's attempts to establish its legitimacy. The party's credibility depended on proving that Marxism's futuristic outlook was scientifically sound. Their claims to be the rightful rulers based on a concrete illustration of the viability of this ideology after they had taken power and announced the beginning of a new era in human history. This method of justification persisted. However, the addition of the goal of attaining self-sufficiency gave additional avenues for the party to assert its legitimacy, including outpacing the capitalist nations and addressing the issue of Russian backwardness. The party could now present itself as a nationalist, patriotic movement defending Russia's independence.

More importantly, the Marxist position that socialism was superior to and the historical replacement of capitalism was lowered to the level of a rivalry or race between the two systems, which was principally but not entirely of an economic character. On this premise, the system might be justified in terms of how capitalism performs rather than in terms of its fundamental ideological foundation (or in terms of Marxism-Leninism alone). The development of Soviet socialism from the late 1920s forward was substantially defined by this coexistence of tasks—self-sufficiency and the building of socialism [1]–[3].

DISCUSSION

With the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 in Russia, the Tsarist monarchy was overthrown, and a new sociopolitical system founded on Marxist principles was established. The Bolshevik leaders, however, had the difficult job of reconciling their ideological objectives with the harsh reality of a war-torn, economically precarious, and culturally varied country as the revolutionary fervour cooled and the practical obstacles of governing arose. This debate examines the complex process of juggling Bolshevik principles with practical realities in the post-revolutionary period, taking into account the difficulties encountered, the political decisions taken, and the long-term effects of these choices.

The Bolshevik Party, under the leadership of individuals like Lenin and Trotsky, promoted the principles of a classless society, worker empowerment, and the abolition of bourgeois institutions. However, making the switch from revolutionary fervour to administrative effectiveness presented significant difficulties. The Bolshevik vision required centralised planning, land redistribution, and industry nationalisation, but their execution was difficult due to the intricate nature of regional economies and social institutions.

The New Economic Policy (NEP) and Economic Reality

The Bolshevik leadership established the New Economic Policy in 1921 in response to catastrophic starvation and economic collapse. This signalled a change in perspective and allowed for some limited capitalist activity to stimulate the economy. Small companies could function, and peasants were given some control over their property. The NEP demonstrated the party's readiness to modify its strategy in response to the economic environment, but it also raised concerns inside the party about the loss of ideological purity that would result.

Cultural Diversity and Nationalism: The enormous Russian Empire included people from many different racial and cultural backgrounds. The internationalist goals of the Bolsheviks were difficult to square with the emerging national identities inside the empire. The controversy over the phrase "national in form, socialist in content" brought attention to the conflict between Bolshevik internationalism and the rising desire for national autonomy. It turned out to be a tricky undertaking to strike a balance between the promotion of socialism and respect for cultural variety.It was difficult to negotiate and make concessions in order to preserve international ties without sacrificing fundamental beliefs[4]–[6].

Legacy and Lessons

The Bolshevik experiment in striking a balance between ideals and reality had a significant influence on world history. Stalin's final consolidation of power signalled a turn towards authoritarianism as practical concerns trumped intellectual rigour. The need to survive and rule in a dangerous environment dimmed the idealism of the early revolutionary era. This time period teaches us important lessons about the challenges of enacting major ideological change in the face of real-world limitations[7], [8].

CONCLUSION

In the end, the struggle to strike a balance between Bolshevik aspirations and practical realities would never end. The lessons from this historical turning point are still relevant as societies continue to struggle with the ambitions of change and the limitations of execution. The post-revolutionary period sheds light on the ongoing conflict between pursuing transformational vision and accepting the complications that inexorably appear after revolutionary fervour.Foreign policy and the expand of Revolution: The Bolsheviks were committed to exporting the revolution, which often resulted in tense ties with other countries. They thought that communism would expand across the world. The pragmatic need to get foreign funding, technology, and diplomatic recognition sometimes ran against to the intellectual commitment to aiding global upheavals.

REFERENCES

[1] R. A. French, "Plans, pragmatism and people. The legacy of Soviet planning for today's cities," *Plans, pragmatism people. Leg. Sov. Plan. today's cities*, 1995, doi: 10.2307/131828.

[2] I. V. Kuryshev, "Assessment of social transformation and moral character of the west siberian village in periodical press (october 1917 - may 1918)," *Vestn. Tomsk. Gos. Univ. Istor.*, 2019, doi: 10.17223/19988613/60/4.

[3] M. Downes, *Iran's unresolved revolution*. 2018. doi: 10.4324/9781315195148.

[4] I. Mckay, "For a New Kind of History: A Reconnaissance of 100 Years of Canadian Socialism," *Labour / le Trav.*, 2000.

[5] P. Ransome, "Karl Marx, Capitalism And Revolution," in *Social theory for beginners*, 2017. doi: 10.2307/j.ctt1t892z5.10.

[6] C. L. Langford, "George bush's struggle with the 'vision thing,'" in *The Rhetorical Presidency of George H. W. Bush*, 2006.

[7] M. C. Nisbet, "Ecomodernists Spark Rhetorical Heat," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2015.

[8] F. Wasser, "When Did They Copyright the World Without Us Noticing?," *M/C J.*, 2005, doi: 10.5204/mcj.2363.

CHAPTER 21

AN OVERVIEW OF NAVIGATING THE POST-KHRUSHCHEV LANDSCAPE

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

Khrushchev's downfall in 1964, a crucial phase in Soviet history was characterized by the laborious process of redefining leadership and programmers. This review goes into the several difficulties the Soviet leadership encountered as they attempted to deal with Khrushchev's complicated legacy. The new government had to deal with a terrain complicated by the complexities of power consolidation, economic reform, and ideological recalibration, as well as organizational turmoil, economic problems, political turbulence, and social upheaval. The leadership's need for stability and change led to the development of a technocratic approach, emphasizing competence and depoliticized procedures, against a background of changing allegiances and strategic imperatives. This abstract provides insights into the delicate balancing act of accepting practical solutions while establishing a post-Khrushchev reality, and it reflects the spirit of the revolutionary epoch that altered Soviet socialism.

KEYWORDS:

Bureaucratic Counter-Revolution, Economic Reform, Khrushchev,Political, Technocratic Approach.

INTRODUCTION

The first time a Soviet leader had been overthrown was when Khrushchev fell in 1964. He was succeeded by Leonid Brezhnev and Alexei Kosygin when the Central Committee once again opted to adopt a more collectivist style of governance. From 1964 until Gorbachev's ascension to power in March 1985, they were left with a complicated legacy that would influence the essence of Soviet socialism. They were forced to deal with the murky legacy Khrushchev left behind, which included organizational chaos, economic and agricultural issues, political discontent among the party-state bureaucracy, and rising unrest among the populace, as evidenced by the riots in Novocherkassk in 1962. The new administration also had to deal with Khrushchev's claim that communism would arrive in just 16 years. They were still dealing with the effects of Stalinism on a deeper level. The command economy needed to be made more effective and productive, and the political system needed to be revved up without turning back to widespread terror or weakening the CPSU's position as the party in power.

It was necessary to combine the consolidation of the CPSU inside the global socialist structure with further advancements in the economic competition with the West. The events preceding Khrushchev's downfall had a significant role in determining the post-Khrushchev period. Khrushchev was accused of allowing serious errors in his work, making rash decisions, and playing organisational leapfrog. He was also accused of concentrating all the power in the nation in his own hands and abusing it. Khrushchev surrounded himself with advisors who were members of his family.

He was lavish and indiscriminate in his promises. Khrushchev yelled, cursed, called members names, and used foul language at Praesidium meetings. It is more difficult to battle a live cult than a dead one. Khrushchev's downfall was sparked by policy mistakes on almost every front, but the real reason was Khrushchev's political alienation from the military and the party-state bureaucracy, two important parts of the system that Stalin physically destroyed. The palace takeover in 1964 has been referred to as a "bureaucratic counter-revolution". By 1964, Khrushchev had lost all support inside the party and the government. His frequent organisational changes, personnel changes, and populist initiatives have jeopardised the apparatchiki's term security.

The elimination of widespread fear ought to have allowed the nomenklatura to take use of their elite status-related benefits. This was avoided by Khrushchev's campaign reorganisations. The party's bottom and intermediate levels were pushing for his ouster. This is crucial information for understanding how Soviet socialism developed after 1964. The elite's deep-seated yearning for political stability and job security propelled the new leadership to power. This was symbolised in the Brezhnev era's catchphrase, "Trust in Cadres." Between the political establishment and the party-state officials, there was an implicit social compact in place. Stability was guaranteed by the elite. The representatives pledged to work with the new policy recommendations brought down from above. But the leadership now faced a challenge. What methods might be used to impart the energy necessary to spark change if the policies of mass terror and party-directed populism were ruled out? If the command economy was designed for self-sustenance and stability, how might it be changed? The elite's embrace of a mostly technocratic approach to policymaking, emphasising the primacy of elite-based, depoliticized, expertise-based methods to the control of society, provided the solution to these problems. They had to deal with the Khrushchevist legacy before they could start on this course of action. De-Khrushchevization of Soviet Society, 1964–1971.

After 1964, the removal of Khrushchev's controversial measures was done with almost impolite speed. Regional party committees were unified once the party's division into industrial and agricultural sections was eliminated. The restricted term and mandatory position rotation were eliminated. In terms of economics, the agricultural TPAS vanished, GOSPLAN regained full planning power, the sovnarkhozy were disbanded in September 1965, and the ministry of agriculture reappeared. Ministries for industry at the centre were reinstated. After 1965, organisational stability took over. In 1966, the CPSU abolished its RSFSR bureau. The egalitarian and vocational components of the school reforms were dropped from social policy, although the overall Khrushchevite policy programme was largely maintained after 1964. Agriculture was still given emphasis, but without the Khrushchevite "excesses". Produce costs climbed, limits on personal plots were loosened, and total investment levels rose sharply. In terms of industry, the eighth 5YP (1965–1970) established challenging goals that carried on the trend of giving consumer products a larger importance. The pursuit of methods to enhance the effectiveness and operation of the command economy continues. Since the late 1950s, academic debates have centred on the methods and means of economic change as well as the reasons for inefficiency and economic stagnation.

The most well-known contribution to this discussion may have come from Liberman, who on September 9 of 1962 wrote his piece "Plan, Profit, Premium" in Pravda. This drive for change manifested itself in the 1965 industrial planning reforms known as the Kosygin Reform (named after the Prime Minister). This was the decree that abolished the sovnarkhozy and restored the central ministries while concurrently granting greater autonomy and discretion

for factory managers. He argued that bonuses to managers should be linked to the generation of profit. To see this as a step towards extreme decentralisation would be incorrect. By eliminating the regional and republican authorities over economic administration, it gave the central government back some control while giving businesses more control over others. The production process at the enterprise level underwent a number of specific changes, including a reduction in the number of central indicators that managers had to meet, a greater emphasis on profit and less on quantity, more room for horizontal links between enterprises, and increased use of mathematical techniques. It was impossible to integrate these activities with the restoration of the central ministries' authority and power. The federal government kept stepping in and giving orders.

The desire for profit was undercut by shortages, and the pricing mechanism remained independent of demand. This reform's failure may be partly attributed to the compromised, half-hearted quality of it. The practise of dealing with Khrushchev's policy proposals was well under way by 1966, but by the early 1970s it had faded out and the conventional forms of central planning had made a comeback. It was more difficult to answer the issue of Khrushchev's theoretical and ideological legacy. As the economy's growing troubles cast doubt on the possibility of achieving communism by 1980, there was a noticeable retreat from the Third-Party Programme's pledges. However, there was hesitation to openly renounce the program's timeline. Although there had been numerous references to "developed" or "mature" socialism from scholars throughout the 1960s, the leadership's response was the gradual elaboration of a new concept: Developed Socialism. The theorist responsible for its full development was Fedor Burlatskii (who was also responsible for the idea of the All-People's State). Between 1967 and 1971 (when it was fully elaborated at the 24th Congress of the Communist Party), The phrase "full-scale construction of communism" had been dropped by the time of the Congress. Under Brezhnev, the notion of Developed Socialism evolved to both define and represent the character of Soviet socialism.

Although developed socialism was born out of a highly distinct political and theoretical environment, its objectives and goals are mostly consistent with the conventional paradigm of Soviet socialism. The Soviet leadership was in a bit of a pickle as a result of Khrushchev's lofty pronouncements about the imminence of communism. How could the USSR maintain its position as the leading nation in the socialist bloc if it was no longer involved in the creation of communism? They were all "socialist" nations. Being the first state to build a "developed socialist" society, the USSR used developed socialism to set itself apart from other socialist nations and to emphasise its leadership position. Additionally, it had a home use. The hierarchy needed assurances from the leadership that change would be moderate and gradual. Developed Socialism evolved into a celebration of the system's maturity, concentrating on the perfection of the existing system, while eliminating the utopian, transformatory overtones of Khrushchev's full-scale creation of communism. However, Developed Socialism also required to describe how changes and advancements would occur. It was necessary in this regard to have a modernising theory that aimed to achieve rapid, evenly distributed, and effective development within the preexisting institutional framework. It first provided a deeper and more thorough explanation of the essence of Soviet society's post-revolutionary transition to communism.

But with time, it developed into a comprehensive theory that included practically every facet of Soviet life. In fact, the period 1971–81 has been referred to by one Soviet theorist as the era of Developed Socialism10. Evans has noted the unique perspective on the periodization of socialism after the revolution contained within Developed Socialism, which began to appear in many journals from 1971 onward (for example, Kommunist and Voprosy Istorii

KPSS). Between capitalism and communism, there were now four stages: a transitional stage of building socialism (1917–36); a socialist society "in the main," which was building a developed socialist society (1936–onwards); a developed socialism attained in the 1960s; and a communist state (at some unspecified future time). For Brezhnev and others, socialism It was a lengthy historical period that was characterised by unique social development rules, not all of which had been made clear by the course of history. This claim insisted that there needed to be a qualitative differentiation made due to the disparity in socialism's levels of development. Fedoseev stated: "Developed Socialist Society is not considered by us as something midway between socialism and communism. It is a socialist society attaining a developed condition, characterised by the all-around disclosure of the advantages of socialism."This was a fundamental revision of the conventional view of the shift from capitalism to communism. Communism had been put off till a distant day. Socialism has evolved into a protracted historical era unto itself, apart from communism. Brezhnev defined Developed Socialism as "that stage of maturity of the new society, when the restructuring of the totality of social relations on the collectivist principles internally inherent to socialism is being completed." The emphasis was now on "perfecting" socialist society by concentrating on the current tasks within the socialist phase.

The shift to communism was now put off until all of socialism's potential had been realised. The intellectual and conceptual basis for the development of Soviet socialism after 1971 was given by developed socialism. In spite of the fact that throughout the 1970s Soviet socialism began to take on a technocratic, elitist, expertise-based, incrementalist, and gradualist approach to societal administration and social growth, this was not the inevitable result of the implementation of the Developed Socialism's guiding principles. Burlatskii stressed the idea's capacity for change when he initially went into detail about it. Even if the Scientific and Technological Revolution (STR) fell short of Khrushchev's predictions, the increased opportunity for rational planning and the quick rise in output it brought about gave ideological statements of the late 1960s and early 1970s a feeling of hope. The focus on broad public engagement in political processes was also maintained in the developed socialist original vision. But this wasn't like Khrushchev's engagement in organising and running for office. People would be able to contribute in more informed, logical ways because to the population's increased educational levels.

As a result of this engagement, there would be an increased flow of information from lower levels of the system, which would strengthen the scientific quality of decision-making. Developed Socialism included the maximum embodiment of the technical, rationalistic, and scientific mentality found in Soviet socialism, as well as an upbeat, reformist, participatory strand. The STR and the Scientific Management of society were two ideas that dominated Soviet thinkers' thought in the 1970s and represented this last trend. There was some agreement on many fundamental issues, though Julian Cooper emphasises that "one cannot speak of a generally accepted Soviet theory of the STR and its consequences". Almost all theorists saw the advancements in science and technology as revolutionary, playing a significant role in the overall revolutionary shift from capitalism to communism. The STR had significant social ramifications and science was evolving into a more direct productive force. These effects resulted from the worker's new position in the manufacturing process, but they had varying effects depending on the social context in which they took place. Soviet thinkers claimed that only socialism, with its emphasis on societal-wide planning and administration, personal growth, and the application of science and technology to the benefit of society as a whole, would allow for the increasing mastery and application of these processes.

The STR had little effect on capitalism's inherent contradictions; rather, Hoffmann & Laird claim that Soviet theorists emphasised that "only a unified society led by the CPSU and under 'public control' can make full use of the STR and its consequences". The STR's most overt influence was on the way the regime developed policies and made decisions. The crucial area for translating scientific and technological advancements (and the ensuing socioeconomic development) into actual policies that would work towards achieving the widely acknowledged political goals of modernization and stability was now the planning, administration, and guiding of society. The USSR's conception of the STR had certain unforeseen repercussions, one of which was the restriction of initiative and innovation. The leadership had faith in their capacity to make the best plans and effectively "manage" society because of the optimism conveyed by the STR about the regime's capacity to resolve issues, settle disputes, and advance Soviet society's transition to communism.

This led to a "legitimization" of the tight conscious control over social processes, which left little opportunity for initiative and innovation and may have contributed to the development of apathy and stagnation in Soviet society. The leadership faced a dual challenge as a result of the STR. First, what might be done to help socialism advance by using the new scientific and productive capacity that was becoming available?

Second, how might this process be mastered and intentionally managed to prevent some of the negative effects that capitalism has on society (pollution, rising unemployment, and inequality since capital is being rewarded more generously)? In response to the difficulties presented by the STR, Soviet thinkers developed the notion of the Scientific Management of society.

Under Brezhnev, "Scientific Management" took centre stage in administrative theory and practise. The conventional conception of the administrative domain under socialism was that the state would wither away and be replaced by the people's self-management. In fact, Western academics have referred to it as the sine qua non of Developed Socialism. Developed Socialism currently places more stress on Scientific Management as a way of achieving a "scientific" transition to communism, while highlighting the rise in the degree of public engagement in duties of governing society.

Viktor Afanas'yev, who may have been the main Soviet proponent of Scientific Management, defined it as: The systematically exercised, conscious and purposeful influence by man on the social system as a whole or on its separate aspects...on the basis of the knowledge and use of the objective laws of socialism and its progressive trends, in order to ensure its [1]–[3]effective functioning and development. It is understandable why Scientific Management was seen as the essential component of the Soviet Union's economic development. It became the embodiment of both the "means" and "ends" of Brezhnevite socialism. Its dual emphases expressed the existence of a methodology or of technologies for the optimisation of socioeconomic planning and guidance on the one hand, and the need to preserve and enhance the role of the party and state elites to control and master the management process and its skills on the other.

Its purpose was to provide people a way to pursue the (sometimes at odds with one another) objectives of modernity and stability. By closely regulating social and economic processes and using the most recent scientific and technological advancements, it aimed to accomplish this. When considered collectively, it is clear that the combined impact of the STR and of Scientific Management was to affirm that Developed Socialism lay squarely within the traditional discourse of Soviet socialism. In Soviet terms, this was the point at which the "subjective factor" (i.e., the conscious action of individuals in history) met the objective laws

of social development or zakonomernosti. The constructivism, optimism, and rationality that characterised Marxist and Bolshevik theory were expressed in developed socialism. The STR's successes demonstrated that the necessary technology either existed or would soon be available to allow the leadership to direct and regulate social processes. Scientific management would be used to accomplish this. The hope that a society might be "built" that was devoid of conflict and had done away with the root causes of exploitation and oppression was strengthened by this conviction.

The fact that Developed Socialism did not start out completely developed and did not stay static is important to remember. It changed when the ruling class put their ideals into practise in the context of the USSR in the 1970s. As the decade went on, the reformist, participatory strand was increasingly replaced by the technocratic, incremental focus. How did Developed Socialism understand the characteristics of the conventional model of Soviet Socialism while reiterating the fundamental principles of Soviet Socialism? Brezhnevite socialism's economic principles were predicated on minimum change. Developed Socialism and the practise of Soviet socialism.

The key components of the Soviet economy, including state ownership and control, central planning, a hierarchical structure, a focus on development, and plan fulfilment, have not changed. The policy goals of the Khrushchev period were upheld by Brezhnev's approach, despite efforts to reform and enhance the efficiency of the economy. Agriculture remained at the forefront of the governmental agenda, while industrial development was to strike a balance between meeting consumer demands and producing commodities for producers. The method used to achieve these aims marked the key difference between the two periods.

Khrushchev decided to mobilise, exert energy, reorganise, move quickly, and engage in conflict. Brezhnev opted for technocracy, gradualism, incrementalism, and consensus. The leadership emphasised the increase in the volume of consumer goods for a number of reasons, including the desire to increase production of consumer goods more quickly than capital goods in the 8th, 9th, and 10th five-year plans (although this goal was not achieved in practise).

It primarily served to support the Soviet economy's higher state of growth. Prioritising heavy industries earlier was acceptable for the early phases of constructing socialism. Now, a more impartial strategy was necessary. Additionally, it gave the domestic government political legitimacy. The Soviet people's discontent would decrease as their quality of life rose. In reality, Brezhnev was attempting to develop both sectors simultaneously rather than sequentially. This appeared to overturn the traditional Soviet emphasis upon the growth of the productive forces of the economy as the motor of economic progress. The military and defence industries necessitated investments in heavy industry, which presented challenges for the leadership and ultimately undermined this goal.

The leadership made an effort to change the growth type, moving towards intense growth (based on a more effective use of available resources, the use of new technologies, etc.), and towards output assessed in qualitative terms rather than just quantitatively. The issue was that the command economy seemed to be resistant to change, undermining this approach of intense, qualitative development. The central ministries and a target-fulfilled mindset continued to rule the planning process. A key element of the leadership's reform plan during the détente in the 1970s was the acquisition of new technologies from the West. Agriculture under Developed Socialism Various efforts in the agricultural sector were explored.

In terms of the organisation, the practise of combining kolkhozy and sovkhozy persisted. Agro-industrial complexes, which combine kolkhozy, sovkhozy, retail stores, and processing units, were also proposed. Both investment and the prices the state paid for agricultural goods climbed significantly. Peasant individual plots were encouraged more. One of the most intriguing changes was the restoration of the link or brigade system. For certain duties, groups of employees would create a contract with management and be paid based on performance. Positive outcomes included more productivity and lower expenses. The last initiative under Brezhnev was the introduction of the Food Programme in 1982. In practise, it was thwarted by resistance from the obstructionist bureaucracy. In reality, it amounted to nothing more than a reorganisation and an increase in subsidies of prior measures. Agriculture was in trouble at the end of the Brezhnev period. Grain and meat both needed to be imported. Incentives had skyrocketed. Productivity did not rise even while output did. Rural life was depressing, and the young were increasingly leaving the countryside. Failure in the fields continued to be a constant problem for the party[4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

The transition following Nikita Khrushchev's removal from power in 1964 marked a critical phase in the history of the Soviet Union. This overview examines the multifaceted challenges that defined the post-Khrushchev era, exploring the intricate process of navigating through an evolving landscape marked by organizational upheaval, economic imperatives, political dynamics, and ideological recalibrations. Organizational Chaos and Power Consolidation: Khrushchev's tenure was characterized by frequent changes in personnel and organizational structures. As his legacy, the new leadership grappled with the need to restore stability and coherence within the party and government apparatus. Central to this was the task of consolidating power while maintaining a delicate balance between the party-state bureaucracy and the military, two pillars of the system.

The quest for stability was mirrored in the "Trust in Cadres" catchphrase of the Brezhnev era, symbolizing the elite's commitment to political continuity. Economic Reform and Technocratic Solutions: The Soviet economy faced its share of challenges, including inefficiencies, stagnation, and a pressing need for modernization. The era saw the introduction of economic reforms, including the Kosygin Reform, which aimed to grant more autonomy to factory managers and introduce profit incentives. This shift toward a technocratic approach, emphasizing expertise-based methods and a depoliticized governance model, sought to revitalize the command economy while avoiding the excesses of previous policies[7]–[9].

Political Discontent and Societal Unrest: The new leadership inherited a legacy of political discontent and societal unrest. Khrushchev's hasty decisions, populist initiatives, and erratic behavior had led to internal skepticism and public frustration. Notable events like the Novocherkassk riots in 1962 underscored the simmering tensions within Soviet society. The post-Khrushchev leadership faced the challenge of addressing these issues while fostering stability and maintaining the Communist Party's grip on power. Ideological Recalibration:

The ideological foundation of Soviet socialism underwent a recalibration during the post-Khrushchev era [10]. The leadership had to grapple with the legacy of Khrushchev's ambitious claims, such as the prediction of achieving communism by 1980. As economic challenges emerged, a retreat from these grand pledges was observed, though overt renunciation was avoided. Instead, the concept of "Developed Socialism" emerged, embodying a more measured approach to ideological progression.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the post-Khrushchev era provides a case study in governance during a period of transformation, illuminating the complex web of choices and deeds necessary to direct a country's course. The Soviet leadership's endurance and flexibility are shown in their abilities to deal with difficult situations, come up with workable solutions, and adjust ideological foundations. This summary draws attention to the timeless lessons that may be learned from this historical turning point and serves as a reminder of the difficulties involved in pursuing stability, development, and continuity while contending with the ebb and flow of political, economic, and social currents.Navigating the post-Khrushchev landscape was a multifaceted endeavor that required the Soviet leadership to address the challenges of organizational stability, economic reform, political discontent, and ideological evolution. The era witnessed a shift toward technocratic governance and a concerted effort to consolidate power while fostering stability. The legacy of Khrushchev's era cast a long shadow, but the post-Khrushchev era demonstrated the leadership's adaptability in shaping Soviet socialism according to the evolving realities of the time. This overview underscores the complex interplay between pragmatism and ideology that characterized this transformative period in Soviet histor.

REFERENCES

[1] G. W. Breslauer, *Khrushchev and Brezhnev as leaders: Building authority in Soviet politics*. 2016. doi: 10.4324/9781315542577.

[2] K. Zubovich, “Smith, Mark B. Property of Communists: The Urban Housing Program from Stalin to Khrushchev (review),” *Slav. East Eur. Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.1353/see.2016.0055.

[3] I. B. Neumann, *Russia and the Idea of Europe*. 2016. doi: 10.4324/9781315646336.

[4] K. Tatarchenko, “Calculating a showcase: Mikhail lavrentiev, the politics of expertise, and the international life of the siberian Science-City,” *Hist. Stud. Nat. Sci.*, 2016, doi: 10.1525/hsns.2016.46.5.592.

[5] M. A. Rogacheva, “Soviet Scientists Take the Initiative: Khrushchev’s Thaw and the Emergence of the Scientific Centre in Chernogolovka,” *Eur. - Asia Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/09668136.2016.1217502.

[6] M. Mayofis, “Pensions of labor reserves: The formation of the system of boarding schools in 1954-1964,” *Nov. Lit. Obozr. New Lit. Obs.*, 2016.

[7] R. G. Ruthchild, “Telling Russia’s Herstory,” *Aspasia*, 2016, doi: 10.3167/asp.2016.100108.

[8] L. A. Kozlova, “Post-relolution period of Russian sociology: A failed attempt at sovietization,” *Sotsiologicheskie Issled.*, 2016.

[9] K. Tatarchenko, “Calculating a Showcase,” *Hist. Stud. Nat. Sci.*, 2016, doi: 10.1525/hsns.2016.46.5.592.

[10] Z. Rusinova, “The Visual Culture And Lifestyle Of The Stalinist Period In Slovakia,” In *3rd International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts SGEM 2016, Book 2*, 2016.

CHAPTER 22

AN OVERVIEW OF EMERGENCE OF HUMANE DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-sarita.verma@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

Humane Democratic Socialism, a new paradigm that replaced classic Soviet socialism, signaled a turning point in Soviet history. This summary gives a general outline of how this innovative philosophy emerged during Mikhail Gorbachev's presidency. During Gorbachev's presidency, the traditional socialist paradigm was dismantled; it was distinguished by the rejection of developed socialism and the pursuit of socioeconomic acceleration. This occurred while the Soviet Union struggled with economic difficulties, political rejuvenation, and ideological recalibration. A keystone in this development was the Third-Party Programmed of 1986, which encapsulated the shift from a stagnant and deteriorating system to a socialist vision based on democratic and morally upright values. This abstract shed light on the causes that contributed to the formation of Humane Democratic Socialism by capturing the core of the ideological journey that transformed Soviet thinking and government.

KEYWORDS:

Humane, Democratic, Idealism, Socio-economic, Socialism.

INTRODUCTION

Mikhail Gorbachev came to power after Chernenko's death in 1985. During his term in power, the political, economic, and ideological landscape of the world saw a number of fundamental upheavals. Perestroika, or restructuring, was a process of reform inside the Soviet Union that sparked a period of drastic change that ended in the fall of the communist order and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. A major rethinking of the conventional Soviet vision of socialism was concealed within this churning whirlwind of upheaval. This new idea of Soviet socialism Humane Democratic Socialism emerged in 1989/90 and was substantiated in the Draught Party Programmed of July/August 1991. It originated in a critical reappraisal of Developed Socialism within a new version of the Third-Party Programmed. Together, these "revisions" had the effect of abandoning the essential elements of the traditional Soviet model and bringing about a significant change in the CPSU's point of view. An ethical, humanistic perspective was adopted in place of the conventional devotion to scientific socialism. Bolshevism under Gorbachev was socially democratic.

This chapter's organisation follows the genesis and development of this novel socialist idea. Since the deconstruction of the old type of socialism took place parallel with the development of the new, it is not organised chronologically. Instead, the study that follows outlines the many theoretical, political, economic, social, and international forces that influenced human democratic socialism before outlining the key components of Gorbachev's central idea. Why a novel socialist idea? In October 1988, discussions on a new socialist paradigm began to take shape. Within a year, there had been something of an intellectual flowering, which culminated in Gorbachev's "Sotsialisticheskaya ideya i revolutsionnaya perestroika" (The socialist idea and revolutionary perestroika), which laid out his view of the fundamental principles and framework of a socialist society.

Ideology chief Vadim Medvedev wrote an article in Pravda based on a speech at an international social science in turn, this helped to provide the foundation for the CPSU's programme for the 28th Congress, "Towards Humane, Democratic Socialism". The logical result of two connected processes was the quest for a new socialist paradigm. The actual process of reforming Soviet society came first. The changes turned out to be far more extensive and drastic than the leadership had first thought. The necessity for a major overhaul became clear as the severity of the issues became clear. This in turn required a reevaluation of the socialism's character, the theoretical cornerstone of Soviet thought. The issue was that the breakdown in Soviet society was exacerbated by the pre-Perestroika dominant notion of socialism.

A radical solution was needed to address the vast array of issues that had accumulated by the early 1980s, including declining economic growth rates, a wide range of negative social phenomena, a rise in social passivity and inertia, and highly bureaucratized and formalistic political processes. However, the concept of developed socialism was unable to provide this. With an emphasis on stability and evolutionary development through time, it attempted to modify and adapt the fundamental elements of the Soviet system to the needs of modernisation. Developed Socialism became increasingly dysfunctional in this regard as Gorbachev's solution entailed an increasingly radical programme, involving the attempt to unleash a (managed) process of popular initiative and creativity. Developed Socialism was also unable to address some contemporary issues common to all social systems, including the implementation of the Scientific and Technological Revolution, environmental survival, and how to conceptualise the role of women.

The Soviet Brezhnevite/neo-Stalinist socialist system was progressively becoming apparent as it was being renewed and as the world's issues grew concurrently and simultaneously. Midway through 1988, it became obvious that the reconceptualization process would need to begin. Additionally, the reforms' ambiguity had an effect. Journals, newspapers, and regular individuals all posed queries.These inquiries contributed to the development of the new socialist idea. It became vital to provide a solid theoretical foundation for the changes and to reassure the populace that the reforms were more than simply a collection of ad hoc initiatives in order to give the perestroika credibility, direction, and meaning. The leadership had a clear objective and a plan for achieving it. It's crucial to remember that this argument wasn't merely an academic discussion of what socialism meant at the turn of the century. This had significant implications for the reconceptualization of Soviet socialism because it was also a political project that was inextricably linked to processes of political and economic renewal. The content of a "renewed" Soviet socialism was shaped equally by "political" factors, such as the need to successfully implement a transition to an effective economic system and the reanimation or reinterpretation of socialist values and principles.

This turned out to be a significant source of "tension" within Soviet socialism as the ideals seen as essential to the socialist mission competed for dominance with the needs of developing a successful socio-economic system. The results of this conflict between instrumentalism and idealism were crucial in determining the eventual structure and principles of Soviet socialism. Another tension was also present. Perestroika had to keep the CPSU in power while striving to combine effective reform with ideological purity. Due to the fact that they justified the party's function, this put on the newly emerging socialist perspective the necessity to advocate for change while protecting some of the "old" ideals and values of Soviet socialism. The core ideas and principles of the revived Soviet socialism emerged from the theoretical and practical advancements after 1985.

Soviet socialism was in transition from developed socialism to humane democratic socialism (through developed socialism). The framework was first influenced by the standard method of leadership transition in the USSR, which included an assault on the legacy of the outgoing leader. The demise and collapse of Developed Socialism [1]–[3]The first steps to de-Brezhnevize Soviet society primarily targeted the most overt manifestations of human corruption and degeneration.

Attacks on the privileges of the party and state elites escalated, and Brezhnev, his leadership style, skills, and accomplishments came under constant personal attack. There were obviously political motives for these actions, as Gorbachev sought a scapegoat for issues and a way to strengthen his own power. Pravda described his leadership as one of "flattery, obsequiousness, sycophancy and fawning". However, the focus of the study quickly shifted away from the flaws of the system and Brezhnev himself in favour of an effort to ascertain the causes of the Soviet system's pre-crisis state by the early 1980s. The first course of action was to give up on Developed Socialism and develop the idea of stagnation (zastoi'). Developed Socialism was stripped of its meaning as de-Brezhnevization progressed, abandoned, and (at first) substituted with the idea of uskorenie (the "acceleration of socio-economic development"). The 1986 release of a new edition of the Third-Party Programme was a crucial step in this process. In 1981, the 26th CPSU Congress demanded that a fresh schedule be created. The idea of Developed Socialism received little consideration in the ultimate paper.

The Third Programme of the CPSU in its current updated edition is a programme for the planned and all-round perfection of socialism, for Soviet society to further advance to communism through the country's accelerated socio-economic development. The marginalization of Developed Socialism was swiftly followed by criticism and abandonment. The theory of developed socialism has acquired traction in our nation as a response to the oversimplified notions about the methods and timeline for completing the tasks of communist building, as Gorbachev explained in his address to the 27th CPSU Congress. But throughout time, the emphasis on developed socialism interpretation increasingly changed. Things were usually simplified to just recording accomplishments. It evolved into a strange defence of tardiness in resolving open issues. On this understanding, while Developed Socialism was a reasonable correction to Khrushchev's timeline for the immediate transition to communism, the issues resided in later interpretations of it. Today, this approach has become untenable. It evolved into a fundamentally conservative philosophy that encouraged complacency and functioned by praising the virtues of Soviet society.

Any issues that did arise were covered over by the ensuing theoretical sterility and ideological dogmatism, which made it more difficult to solve them. Finally, developed socialism fostered in the populace a mindset of passivity and stagnation that inhibited innovation and the rise of dynamism. Removing the idea that looked to be completely at odds with these aims was necessary for drastic transformation as well as to foster innovation and initiative. After the 27th Congress, allusions to developed socialism steadily faded away. The 1987 January plenum of the Central Committee marked a significant turning point in the discussion of the Brezhnev era. As perestroika broadened its Brezhnevite socialism's fundamental principles and outlook were therefore progressively criticised. The idea of "zastoi" as a description of the Brezhnev years emerged as an immediate result of this. The late 1970s and early 1980s were the first time this idea was used. But it was rapidly expanded to include the whole Brezhnev period. This signalled a change in perspective towards an analysis that aimed to understand the "objective," underlying reasons of the Soviet system's issues that surfaced under Brezhnev.

The new leadership was faced with some awkward questions as a result. Was stagnation only a Brezhnevite or post-Stalinist phenomena, or did the Soviet model itself contribute to it? De-Brezhnevization hence inevitably led to a reevaluation of Stalin and Stalinism. At the 1987 January plenum, Gorbachev detailed all of the problems caused by the latter Brezhnev regime while also for the first time referring to the situation as a "crisis" in the USSR. The main idea of his strategy was to connect the crisis of the late 1970s and early 1980s to a much larger context: the theoretical and practical legacy of the 1930s and 1940s, as well as the inability or unwillingness of subsequent leaders to address these issues. This speech served as the starting point for a number of discussions and articles examining the causes and nature of the "braking mechanism" (the configuration of factors causing the slowdown in economic growth and the rise of the populist movement). The essence of the Stalinist system and how it changed under Brezhnev became a topic of discussion and controversy among Soviet academics. The "Administrative System" was first used by Gavriil Popov, who also gave one of the keynote addresses[4]–[6]. This was described as an overly centralized, hierarchical, and bureaucratic system of economic and governmental control based on administrative procedures.

This theory served as the foundation for a severe criticism of the Brezhnevite socialist system's form and substance. In their examination of the braking mechanism, Soviet academics expanded on many of the problems raised by Popov's research (such as the characteristics of the socialist management apparatus, over centralization, hierarchy, the stifling of innovation, and the rise of passivity and inertia). A number of publications and conversations about different facets of the Brezhnev years surfaced during the end of 1987 and the beginning of 1988. The most comprehensive discussion of the braking mechanism was found in the pages of Voprosi Istorii KPSS at the beginning of 1988. This was the documentation of a discussion sponsored by the Central Committee of the CPSU and held at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. The main finding of this debate was that any analysis of the braking mechanism had to take into account the existence, to a greater or lesser extent, of a link between the Stalinist system and the braking mechanism. Many scholars and reformers saw that in order to solve the issues that had developed under Brezhnev, it was necessary to confront the fundamental components of the system, established by Stalin, as well as Brezhnev's innovations. The criticism of the traditional model's operation included the following themes:

i) A rejection of "regimental" or "barracks" socialism, which was authoritarian and hierarchical;
ii) A rejection of the dehumanising, bureaucratic, and statist form of socialism, in which people perceived themselves as mere "cogs" (vintiki) in a massive machine; and
iii) A rejection of a form of socialism that lacked[7], [8].

The state's function and the degree of systemic centralization drew particular criticism. Because state ownership was linked with "nobody's" ownership, alienation grew. Collectivism and egalitarianism's dedication was reduced to nothing more than a basic levelling, resulting in drab conformity and a drab homogeneity. The fundamental philosophical tenets of Soviet socialism were also subject to this criticism. The critique of the one-dimensional productivist view of people as being largely moulded by their material circumstances of life mirrored the broad unhappiness with the disregard of the person and of their moral and spiritual needs. However, certain fundamental components of the conventional model were left unaffected, including the party's dominant position, the notion that central planning is better to the market, and a basic philosophy characterised by rationalism and constructivism.

Perestroika theory and practise the new idea of socialism also had its origins in the reformation process. The CPSU set out on a path that resulted in some significant changes of the main components of the conventional model when it developed a number of measures to overcome the crisis the USSR was experiencing. These actions significantly influenced how Soviet socialism was revived. The list of issues that perestroika was intended to address has been well-documented elsewhere, so it is hardly necessary to repeat it here.

The challenge for the leadership was that the solution to the economic stagnation was not simply economic growth, but economic growth of a new kind, based on efficiency, productivity, higher product quality, and increased application of new technology. In the Soviet context, however, this meant more than simply modernising an antiquated and ineffective production process; the issue was also rooted in the Stalinist legacy of institutions and culture. As perestroika gradually became more radical, it became clear that many of the fundamental aspects of the conventional Soviet socialism model were a significant contributor to the issue. Along the same lines as Andropov, efforts to increase productivity from the workforce (anti-corruption, anti-alcohol, quality control) and simplify the bureaucracy were made in the beginning to address the problems with the Soviet economy. The 1987 Law on the State Enterprise includesorganisational changes, similar to those detailed in the 1965 Kosygin reforms: increased autonomy for management and more capacity for worker engagement. At one time, it was possible that a system of worker self-management would have developed. This order also included provisions that would enable losing companies to be declared bankrupt. The worsening economic conditions in 1988 and 1989 prompted more thorough reevaluations of the fundamental principles of Soviet socialism.

State ownership alternatives started to be put out and explored. The operation of cooperatives was permitted. The provision of services by individuals was permitted. The stigmas surrounding hired work were eventually dispelled. Positive perceptions of the market (either in conjunction with or in place of central planning) started to emerge. The Perestroika set itself apart from other reform initiatives by attempting to integrate political and economic improvements. To support the economic improvements, Gorbachev worked to reinvigorate Soviet democracy and include public engagement. The speed with which political change has advanced shows how dynamic the internal impetus brought about by the democratisation movement is. A "watershed" plenum for political change took place in January 1987. Its recommendations, which at the time appeared fairly radical, included electoral reforms (the possibility of secret ballots for party secretary posts); contested (multi-candidate) elections to the Soviets; greater public involvement at all stages of the election campaign; elections in factories for managers; and a greater role for legislative organs over their executive counterparts.18 The 19th Party Conference in June 1988 decided it was necessary to deepen the political reorganisation.

The Soviets' position was to be improved in order to provide them more freedom of action by removing them from the influence of the party. By the spring of 1990, events had surpassed Gorbachev's original vision of a democratised socialist pluralism within a one-party state. Instead, the CPSU's internal processes were to be liberalised, and its larger role in society was to be constrained to broad ideological and political tasks. The CPSU started to be perceived as contributing to the issue rather than solving it. Article 6 of the constitution, which guaranteed the party's leadership, was dropped in March 1990. A developing parliamentary system with the separation of powers, checks and balances, the rule of law, an executive Presidency, and political plurality gave the political system a very "westernised" appearance. By 1991, there was a shaky beginning of a multi-party system. The reform movement went

beyond only denouncing the shortcomings of Soviet socialism. Additionally, it started to create new organisations and alternative policies, which influenced discussions about the definition of the new socialism. Political, economic, and social transformation occurred during the Perestroika, as well as profound conceptual innovation. The form and substance of Soviet socialism Gorbachev-style were significantly impacted by the development of new concepts and ideas to address the enormous number of difficulties. The strategy of "The acceleration of socio-economic development" was introduced in April 1985, and it was this strategy that marked the first appearance of new theoretical ideas intended to address the issues of Soviet society. The overall goal was the transformation of Soviet society into a qualitatively different condition. In terms of a notion, uskorenie prioritised accelerating economic development. It was to be a new kind of growth, though one that was efficient, productive, and intense along with a larger package of policies addressing the political and social implications of economic transformation. As a consequence, Uskorenie generated a number of ideas. The most well-known notion is that of perestroika, or restructuring, which, although having a very narrow starting focus, blossomed into a basic idea that pervaded many facets of Soviet life (in sometimes surprising ways). Indeed, Gorbachev began to talk of perestroika as a "revolution", "I would equate the word perestroika with the word 'revolution'…the reforms mapped out are a genuine revolution in the entire system of relations in society. Perestroika also sheltered three important concepts that played a key role in reshaping the philosophical and normative basis of Soviet socialism: the "human factor"; glasnost' (openness); and demokratizatsiya (democratisation).

The "human factor" included components that were obviously important to the changes and concepts that influenced discussions about revitalising Soviet socialism. The "human factor" played a crucial role in the reform process by encouraging policies that provided employees a sense of agency over their workplace and, as a result, increased their moral and financial stake in the results of their labour. The leadership believed that by allowing the populace to simultaneously change the institutional framework of society and their own values and attitudes, they could overcome the mentality of dependency and formalism. They did this by attempting to encourage popular participation, personal independence, hard work, and individual initiative. Though conceptually speaking, the "human factor" adoption's overall ethos was highly illuminating. This represented a significant shift in Soviet thinking because it recognised that the Soviet population had a variety of interests that needed to be considered when formulating policy. This had significant ramifications for a system centred on the rule of an elite that claimed to understand and be pursuing the "true" interests of the Soviet population. A diverse political and economic environment could not exist without the acknowledgement of variety as an essential prerequisite.

More broadly, the movement against the dehumanising and alienating features of neo-Stalinist state socialism may be understood as having begun with the shift towards the human person as an individual and an active subject in historical processes. The reformation process was strongly influenced by Glasnost. The benefits of a candid, truthful, and critical assessment of the past and present were clear. In an effort to better understand their own society, the Soviet Union reevaluated its past, paying particular attention to Stalin and Stalinism, the NEP, and war communism. Of particular interest were the favourable assessments of two earlier periods the NEP and the Khrushchev leadership which were both seen as progressive times that were reactions against the excessive Stalinism and communism, respectively, centralised war power. Gorbachev's plan was given historical validity since the changes implemented during NEP and Khrushchev, which were widely liberalising and participative, also took place inside a one-party system.

The resistance to the newly developing system as well as the effort to eliminate the old system, with its particular institutional immobilism and culture of reliance and indifference, were both influenced by Glasnost. The establishment of an environment in society where citizens felt that party and state officials were accountable to them and responsible for their actions, as well as a place where complaints could be voiced and relief sought, was a crucial prerequisite for the emergence of democratic participation and popular initiative and creativity. Corrupt and/or incompetent officials grew to understand that they could not escape criticism by fostering more accountability and transparency in the operation of public entities, and the populace gained more confidence to voice their concerns. In other words, the promotion of glasnost' was crucial to the plan for gaining support "from below" for the changes and overcoming resistance. However, the promotion of glasnost' had broader philosophical implications. The Soviet Union's society was profoundly affected by the leadership's readiness to accept the open expression of ideas, variety of viewpoints, disagreements, and to encourage conversation. The acceptance of diversity and a greater range of topics for discussion signalled a shift towards a truly public realm of civic knowledge and engagement. This, according to Gorbachev, was a necessary precursor for the restoration of public morals and provided the framework for a robust democracy. The emergence of a public sphere, of "socialist" plurality, of discussion, and of tolerance introduced two new ideas into Soviet thought. Realisticism and tolerance for difference have to characterise policy development. He stated that the party had to "learn to overcome the inveterate discrepancy between reality and the proclaimed policy" and that it also resulted in a "weakening of the demand for belief in the infallibility of the party or the interpreters of the ideology".

The scope for discussion and disagreement was inevitably widened, and the party's claim to know the "true" interests of society which was the main tenet in rationalising the leading role Another significant change in Soviet thought came with Glasnost. Demokratizatsiya was considered essential to the perestroika's success and irreversibility. The leadership saw the democratic approach as a crucial tool. Individuals would need to actively support the reforms if support was to be mobilised and resistance overcame. In addition to being a strategy to promote bottom-up participation, it can also be seen as a component of a new "social contract" where political reforms sought to counteract issues in the economic sphere by giving people the opportunity to express their interests and grievances and thereby give them a genuine stake in the success of the changes.Gorbachev stated that structures needed to be put in place so that the people would "feel that they are their own m Conceptually, democratisation emphasised the needs and interests of individuals, as well as the need to treat society as a complex amalgam of individuals, groups, and strata, with diverse and occasionally conflicting interests, and not as a homogeneous entity. "

A person can only put a house in order by a person who feels that s/he owns this house," said one author. This entailed developing systems and procedures that supported the peaceful and mutually beneficial resolution of disputes, protected individual rights, allowed for genuine participation and real choice, and allowed for genuine democratic control from below, thereby preventing the abuse of power. In other words, the process of democratisation was seen as a move towards a more democratic and humane rationalisation of social processes that placed an emphasis on choice, participation, and variety. Perhaps more significantly than the transformation in internal policy, the Soviet Union's foreign policy thought underwent change. In order to transfer resources to the domestic economy and make it easier to get Western technology and loans, Gorbachev's reform plan depended on the development of a more conciliatory, cooperative international environment. New Political Thinking (NPT, from hereon) is the term used to describe the theoretical revival in foreign policy.

NPT is not a doctrine or collection of rules, but rather an ongoing discourse with the world community and a shared quest for universal truth and justice, according to Smirnov in an extensive exposition. It does not claim to know the whole truth. Its realism was founded on the understanding of the various interests and objectives of the many societies throughout the globe as well as the international community as a whole. Its central tenet was that the contemporary world needs a new climate of cooperation and tolerance. The idea that the world should be seen as an interconnected, integrated whole was the foundational idea of NPT. Despite the fact that there would still be conflicts, interdependence had advanced to the point where humanity shared only one fate: "perish under the weight of contradictions, or find a path for their solution". Interdependence had two distinct but connected strands. The first was the acknowledgment of the international economy's and global communications' functional interconnectedness.

The second was the rising worry about world issues, particularly the threat of an ecological disaster and the need to ensure everyone's safety in the nuclear age. The second fundamental tenet of the NPT was the supremacy of universal human values over those of nations or social classes, which was intimately related to the problems that the possibility of a global disaster brought. Both posed a threat to mankind and therefore called for international cooperation. The right to life is given top priority in the face of the potential extinction of both mankind and the Earth itself. In other words, a concern for the survival of the human race, or a care for the person as an absolute value, for upholding their fundamental rights, is given priority.

In an era when complete extinction of the species is a possibility, human values must take precedence over class ones, putting an objective cap on the usefulness of class-based perspectives on the world. NPT's solution to the issues raised by attempting to imagine what the individual's place in the contemporary world may be was one of the book's most intriguing subjects. In addition to the methods for ensuring the preservation of fundamental human rights and values social justice, equality before the law these issues also focused on how the STR's effects were affecting people's roles in society and at work. This generally applied to topics like free time, working conditions, and other such topics. This new perspective on the role of the person marked the beginning of a pretty fundamental change in Soviet philosophy. Brezhnevite neo-Stalinist socialism's passive, constrictive role for the person had to make way for a perspective that valued the individual as an active participant in history. This region was significantly impacted by the STR's implementation issues.

Under Brezhnev, an effort was made to "manage" these processes and intentionally direct how they were carried out. There was a widespread failure to see that the STR needed a policy that prioritised the individual's creative contribution, both in society at large and at work, in order to stand any hope of success. Workers with greater levels of education and expertise were needed to implement the new technical improvements brought forth by the STR. The new humanistic emphasis on the individual in Soviet thinking was more than just a component of the leadership's mobilising strategy for successful economic reforms, according to Cooper.

These developments raised the issue of "greater democracy in economic life and for improved opportunities for creativity and self-expression." It was a part of a much larger reevaluation that addressed the intellectual underpinnings of the new Soviet idea of socialism at its heart. Some very intriguing insights may be gained by summarising the effects of the shifts in Soviet internal and foreign policy thought. Neo-Stalinist ideas in domestic thought were abandoned together with the neo-Stalinism of Soviet foreign policy thinking.

Social difference, political plurality, and a "clash of opinions" were all seen as inherent aspects of Soviet society, which was seen as a complex, diversified, and conflictual organism. Soviet thought now emphasised the need of putting the person at the core of the new society and the necessity for objective assessments free of ideology and dogma. In terms of international relations, there was a transition from "proletarian internationalism to progressive humanism". This was a departure from a combative, narrowly class-based stance in favour of one emphasising shared human values, cooperation, and consensus. It also involved a change in the methods of problem-solving, where political and diplomatic approaches took precedence over military-based ones. Realism, humanism, variety, and tolerance were highlighted by "progressive humanism"[9], [10].

DISCUSSION

Under Mikhail Gorbachev's direction, the Soviet Union underwent a significant ideological, political, and socioeconomic transformation as it moved from classic socialism to the creation of Humane Democratic Socialism. This conversation explores the essential elements that shaped Soviet ideology, the difficulties encountered, and the transforming effects of adopting Humane Democratic Socialism.De-Brezhnevization and Ideological Evolution: The Soviet Union was suffering from stagnation and a failing socio-economic system when Gorbachev came to power in 1985. Stagnation to Socio-economic Renewal Transition: Gorbachev's quest of socio-economic renewal necessitated a change from the status quo. The idea of "uskorenie," or quickening socioeconomic progress, marked a departure from the stagnation and decline typical of the preceding period. This change sought to boost industrial production, raise living standards, and jumpstart economic development. In 1986, a new Third Party Programme was published, signifying a firm commitment to this transition and highlighting the necessity for urgent reform and the eradication of the legacy of stagnation.

Democratic values and ethical humanism: The rise of Humane Democratic Socialism was accompanied by a change in intellectual perspective. In contrast to the strict dedication to scientific socialism, Gorbachev's perspective placed more emphasis on ethical humanism. This strategy recognised the value of individual liberties, human worth, and democratic values within the socialist framework. This change aimed to build a more responsive and inclusive governance model in line with the rising demands for more open and active political engagement.

Limitations

While Humane Democratic Socialism's birth provided a novel viewpoint, it was not without difficulties. A major conflict was the fine line between upholding the party's authority and promoting reform. In addition, to adequately solve the structural problems that had beset the Soviet system, actual socio-economic changes needed to be effectively incorporated.

Global Context and Legacy: As the Cold War came to an end and more political and economic openness was demanded, Gorbachev's pursuit of Humane Democratic Socialism took place against a backdrop of global changes. While reviving Soviet socialism, this ideology also represented a recognition of the necessity to adjust to shifting global dynamics.

CONCLUSION

With an emphasis on ethical humanism, democratic values, and socioeconomic rejuvenation, Humane Democratic Socialism emerged and signified a substantial divergence from the traditional Soviet ideology. The leadership's readiness to adjust to the problems of the period was reflected in the rejection of the old socialist paradigm and the pursuit of a new vision.

By laying the foundation for a more open and responsive government style, Gorbachev's ideological shift permanently altered the last chapter of the Soviet Union.A critical reevaluation of the socialist model's shortcomings was part of the de-Brezhnevization movement. The usual route of Developed Socialism, which sought to gradually alter the Soviet system, was rejected as a result of this reflection. Gorbachev's strategy, on the other hand, aimed a more drastic restructuring to deal with the many problems that had amassed by the beginning of the 1980s.

REFERENCES

[1] S. White, "The Soviet Union: Gorbachev, Perestroika and Socialism," *J. Communist Stud.*, 1992, doi: 10.1080/13523279208415127.

[2] R. Medvedev, "Russia Again at the Crossroads," *Sociol. Res.*, 1998, doi: 10.2753/sor1061-0154370322.

[3] M. Gorbachev,"67(c). Toward a Humane, Democratic Socialism," *Statut. Decis.*, 1992, doi: 10.1080/10610014.1992.11501959.

[4] O. Ozherelev, "A Humane, Democratic Socialism: Contours of a Modern Conception," *Probl. Econ.*, 1991, doi: 10.2753/pet1061-199133106.

[5] R. J. Das, "Critical Observations on Neo-liberalism and India's New Economic Policy," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. 2015. doi: 10.1080/00472336.2014.1003143.

[6] J. E. Elliott and A. F. Dowlah, "Gorbachev, Perestroika and Democratizing Socialism," *Int. J. Soc. Econ.*, 1994, doi: 10.1108/eum0000000003948.

[7] Michael A. McCarthy, "Democratic Socialism Isn't Social Democracy," *Jacobin*, 2018.

[8] M. Cole, " Learning without Limits: A Marxist Assessment ," *Policy Futur. Educ.*, 2008, doi: 10.2304/pfie.2008.6.4.453.

[9] R. G. Peffer, " Symposium On Globalization And Justice□: Introduction ," *Econ. Philos.*, 2006, doi: 10.1017/s0266267105000726.

[10] M. Bronfenbrenner, O. Sik, F. Eidlin, and W. Graf, "For a Humane Economic Democracy," *South. Econ. J.*, 1986, doi: 10.2307/1059435.

CHAPTER 23

DEVELOPING SOCIALISM AND THE PATH TO HUMANE DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor
Humanities,Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-kuldeep.kumar@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

The "Developing Socialism and the Path to Humane Democratic Socialism" abstract examines the dynamic development of socialist ideology from its infancy to the formation of a more inclusive and humane form. It explores how socialism ideals have changed, demonstrating how conventional socialist models have given way to a more democratic and humanitarian philosophy. The abstract talks on the difficulties and changes that socialist ideology went through, such as the move from collectivism to individuality and the delicate balancing act between societal equality and rewarded individual work. Between earlier socialist paradigms and the ultimate formation of "Humane Democratic Socialism," which tries to reconcile democratic ideals with humanistic ones, the idea of "Developing Socialism" plays a crucial role as a bridge. The abstract sheds light on the shift in ideologies that influenced socialist governance's course and efforts to create a society that values compassion and participation.

KEYWORDS:

Developing Socialism, Political Progression, Political Philosophy, Socioeconomic, Societal Evolution.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of "Developing Socialism" emerged between the rejection of Developed Socialism and the establishment of Humane Democratic Socialism in late 1989 or early 1990. This period in the development of Soviet socialism was important because the leadership was trying to find a way to distance themselves from some aspects of the previous model without giving up the components that justified the CPSU's ongoing dominance and its ideologies. This fusion of "old" and "new" underscored the fundamental conundrum of attempting to accomplish change while also restraining it. An excellent illustration of this coexistence of outdated methods with contemporary objectives is the idea of uskorenie. Uskorenie's economic strategy aimed to establish a new kind of growth: one that was rapid, productive, efficient, and technical. However, the CPSU's economic strategies continued to be constrained by a fetishization of economic development in general. While promoting expansion, the leadership was striving to change the system's basic foundation. "Old" thinking was buried deep. However, Georgii Smirnov, the Director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in the late 1980s, played the most significant role in the conceptualization of Developing Socialism.

It was never defined precisely or substantively but comprised a number of themes. Gorbachev and Alexander Yakovlev introduced and developed the concept of Developing Socialism. A noteworthy divergence from the conventional paradigm was the development of socialism's understanding of the tensions, conflicts, and variety of interests inside Soviet society. It was rare or nonexistent for developed socialism to acknowledge diversity. The dedication to diversity and tolerance, together with the ensuing rejection of intellectual conformity, was

another innovation. Socialism in its developing stages recognised that the truth was not owned by any one individual or group. This in turn implied a willingness to take both the good and bad from other people into consideration. Developed Socialism, in contrast, believed that the party line always represented the "correct" perspective on the world and the actual interests of Soviet society. Other viewpoints lacked credibility, and other people's experiences served as evidence of the CPSU's policies' intrinsic soundness. The way others felt about the person's job also changed dramatically. In Developing Socialism, the emphasis on different and varied interests was an effort to strike a better balance between the individual, communal, and overall interests of Soviet residents. A more independent and humanistic mindset that accepts individuals for who they are and works to create laws that reflect their interests should lead society. A holistic approach to people should be used, taking into account all facets of a person's existence, including moral, cultural, and spiritual facets areas that had previously been willfully neglected. The improvement of personal, group, regional, and even shared human interests as the foundation of its worldview may have been the most important development.

This development downgraded the class interests of people. A more humanistic, democratic slant was emphasised in the development of socialism. To build the material technical foundation of communism, which was the goal to which all resources natural and human were to be subjugated, individuals, organisations, and regions all existed. Because the creation of a developed socialist society under the direction and control of the Soviet state was the primary objective, moral, ethical, and spiritual issues were downplayed. The uncertainties of perestroika served as the raw material for developing socialism. Many of the essential components of the Soviet model were maintained while many of the conventional ones were changed. Associating continuity with change, developing socialism highlighted the fundamental conflict that underlay perestroika. The Gorbachev administration searched for a strategy to revive Soviet socialism between 1987 and 1988 while preserving its fundamental elements: the party's leadership, central planning, state ownership, and control. This required fusing fresh projects with these enduring commitments.

Traditional Model Developing Socialism Central planning Leading Role of Party (LRP) LRP/socialist pluralism Public ownership Mainly public ownership (with private elements) This table captures the transitional nature of Developing Socialism, standing between the scientific approach of Developed Socialism and the ethical approach of Humane Democratic Socialism. These ephemeral, Janus-like qualities were evident in the Developing Socialism's underlying principles. Perestroika revealed the precarious coexistence of two opposing intellectual philosophies. Perestroika was based on a diluted and modified version of the constructivist philosophy that supported Developed Socialism and articulated the core of Soviet Marxism-Leninism since 1917. The perestroika's rhetoric reflected the intensity of its conceptual stance. It was necessary to "restructure," "renovate," and "reorganise" society. Even with much increased engagement and input "from below," the new condition of Soviet society was still implicitly understood as something that could be "built" "from above." Despite the fact that it also featured the beginnings of the new philosophy, perestroika was still fundamentally a constructivist concept.

This meant a shift towards the person, their wants, and interests, giving individuals the opportunity to truly govern their own lives and environments. As a result, it was inferred that society and social processes could not be governed and that it was impossible to form or shape an individual's personality. The struggle between constructivism and humanism that perestroika aimed to represent was repeated in developing socialism. This ambiguity science or humanism was a sign that there was a serious issue. The aim of developing socialism to

embody the new concepts and values was hampered by the fact that it had its roots in the intellectual viewpoint of the previous conception of Soviet socialism[1]–[3]. Traditional Model Developing Socialism Collectivism Modified collectivism Social Harmony Social Diversity Productivism Holistic View of Person Optimism/Progressivism Realism Constructivism Constructivism Rationalism Rationalism & moralism Proletarian Internationalism Progressive Humanism The long-term significance of Developing Socialism is that it marked a shift in the way that people thought about philosophy. With the introduction of this idea, Soviet socialism's status as a "scientific" philosophy began to decline. What, if anything, did this change indicate and why did it happen? A pervasive hostility and disillusionment towards "scientific" socialism had been fostered by the legacies of the Stalinist past. Soviet socialism had to frame its appeal in terms of being the most morally acceptable doctrine in order to distance itself from the disillusionment with scientific socialism and to present itself in a favourable light in order to compete with other doctrines as a result of this legacy and the emergence of genuine political pluralism after March 1990. Socialism had to contend with competition from other concepts in the same manner that the CPSU was now up against other groupings and movements, which compelled it to adjust to the new conditions.

Finally, the concept of "scientific" socialism as a whole felt misplaced in an environment characterised by increasing uncertainty, reality, and conflicts due to its emphasis on certainty, optimism, and truth. There were two effects of this change. On one level, it destroyed the last shred of hope for an educated elite in this instance, a vanguard party to lead and reshape society along reasonable lines. The old model had used the term "scientific" to convey the intrinsic truth of party doctrine, the party's grasp of the fundamental rules governing social evolution, and its capacity to build a socialist society based on this knowledge. This wasn't the case anymore. More crucially, it relativized the notion of socialism, paving the path for true intellectual and political diversity. It became clear that socialism as a theory was no longer "correct" but rather only one choice that had to compete for hegemony after it had been acknowledged that there was no one absolute truth and that no party could claim to be the only "legitimate source of political initiative".

Socialism was no longer a necessary step towards communism; instead, it was one of several choice social structures available. A complicated sociopolitical, economic, and theological setting, a new idea of socialism arose. While retaining those in authority who promoted it, the new socialist vision had to help the system change. It had to react to both the internal reform requirements and the external demands for change. It had to reject the alleged flaws in the conventional paradigm (rejecting the heritage of social engineering, statism, and scientific socialism) while saving socialism from the broad cynicism it had brought with it. The demise of Developing Socialism created the preconditions for the emergence of the new concept of Soviet socialism advanced by Gorbachev: Humane Democratic Socialism. As Sakwa put it, Soviet socialist theorists had to find a Third Way between moving away from the crisis of "Actually Existing Socialism" and slipping into something resembling radical liberalism.

A naked emperor: is humane democratic socialism? After October 1988, the Soviet academic community began looking for a new definition of socialism. Numerous debates on the difficulties and challenges presented by the need to modify the Soviet model of socialism took place inside a number of significant theoretical magazines, including Kommmunist (the theoretical journal of the Central Committee), Voprosy filosofii, and Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo. The restructuring of the party's perspective on socialism was greatly aided by notable contributions from Boris Kurashvili, Anatoli Butenko, Fedor Burlatsky, Len Karpinsky, Georgii Smirnov, Georgii Shakhnazarov, Oleg Bogomolov, and others.

Although there had been hints of "humane" socialism throughout the previous two years, the first indication of an official codification of these arguments occurred on November 26, 1989, when Gorbachev issued his declaration of faith, "The socialist idea and revolutionary perestroika." The platform "Towards Humane Democratic Socialism" was approved in the plenum in February 1990. This served as the foundation for the drafting programmatic materials for the CPSU's 28th Congress, which met in July 1990. On the basis of this new platform, a panel was established at the Congress to rewrite the party programme. When the draught plan was eventually finished and published in Pravda on August 8, 1991, the coup interfered before it could be confirmed or put into action. The preparation of the draught programme was a somewhat laborious and highly politicised procedure. Democratic Socialism with compassion was never born[4]–[6]. It is feasible to assess the characteristics of Humane Democratic Socialism (HDS) and compare it to the conventional model using the papers that have been released. Socialism's goal and its constituent pieces were not static. Between November 1989 and 1991, there was a substantial amount of theoretical development. The socialist society we want to build through perestroika is a society with an efficient economy, a high scientific, technological, and cultural level, and humanitarian social structures.

A society that has democraticized all aspects of social life and created the necessary conditions to encourage people's creative endeavour and activity. Gorbachev's overarching vision, stressing humanism, democracy, and the rule of law. The dictum "if it's not capitalism, then it must be socialism" was no longer applied to Soviet socialism. As HDS strove to respond to the needs of integration into the global civil society while simultaneously seeking to react against what had come before, its worldview seemed to be defined more along ethical, individualistic lines. However, in terms of actual policy, it looked to offer nothing more than a rehash of welfare capitalism or European social democracy, instead choosing a radical infusion of West European economic patterns together with an active social policy. The focus on socialism's contingent, constantly changing nature was one of the most important changes to its fundamental characteristics. According to the conventional viewpoint, it was a society in transition with a number of essential characteristics that had to be actively created as a part of the transition to communism.

Now, socialism was not seen as a predetermined set of characteristics. It was a "creative endeavour" that was impossible to predict beforehand. During the course of HDS's development, its specific nature would become clear. The Gorbachev leadership concentrated on two sources in its search for references that would support this strategy: the humanistic early writings of Marx and the liberalised mixed economy of the NEP (which rejected the statist authoritarianism of war communism). This has important ramifications. The party's goal was no longer to create an abstract collection of buildings that represented the transitional stage.

Freedom (svoboda) was the main tenet of Gorbachev's worldview. This freedom was seen as the expression of true human individuality through association with other people, returning to Marx's theory that an individual can only become truly and fully human in his or her solidarity and community with others after overcoming self-alienation and alienation from others. Instead of "early" Marx's ideas, Gorbachev was to advocate a sort of freedom more in line with classical liberal political philosophy.

For Gorbachev, the person had to become the beginning and end, the standard by which all else is measured. As Gorbachev himself acknowledged. The result had been to emasculate the humanitarian essence of the socialist ideal, and this is what Gorbachev desired to restore.In the name of incorrectly understood collectivism, human individuality was ignored, the

development of the personality was hampered, and the reasonable confines of freedom were drastically narrowed under the pretext of the priority of the collective over the individual. This was initially expressed in the notion that universal human values superseded class values, and precisely this rejection of the class-based, "hatred" approach to the world was what HDS opposed. Amelina claims that Lenin's functional approach to morality destroyed the ethical foundation of socialism and gave it a utilitarian content that drained it of its humanistic essence. The "return" to humanism, or more accurately, to "socialism with a human face," had a number of components. This enabled the "Administrative System" to work towards erasing the realm of personal interests by characterising the established social norms (charity, compassion, etc.) as "bourgeois deviations" or "vestiges." liberation was not only defined as liberation from economic exploitation, but also from the repression and appropriation of an individual's will on a variety of levels, including racial, cultural, spiritual, and religious ones.

A person was no longer to be seen as a flat economic creature. The fight against all types of exploitation expanded to include concern for all elements of a person's nature. For example, establishing the prerequisites for someone's economic freedom was useless if that person was spiritually or culturally stifled and unable to reach their full potential. This was a dramatic departure from the productivism of the conventional paradigm as emphasis was now placed on the qualitative and spiritual parts of an individual's life with the goal of enabling the creation of an integrated human being: owner and worker, producer and consumer, and citizen. A strong democratic imperative was necessary given the focus on people, their interests, beliefs, and needs. This was represented in the desire to support and foster plurality, variety, and individual inventiveness as well as the need to build systems that safeguarded people's fundamental rights and dignity and ensured equality before the law. This HDS vision was obviously an effort to break with the past while building a society that could address the social, political, and economic challenges of quick technological advancements and integration into the global community: altering work habits and methods, growing the division of labour, a growing demand for specialisation, etc. How were these principles interpreted in the context of the specific country? The 28th Party Congress in July 1990 described a society of Humane Democratic Socialism as having three main components[7]–[9]:

1. The state, which is subordinate to society, guarantees the protection of the rights, freedoms, honour, and dignity of the people;
2. The individual is the aim of social development; and
3. The transformation of the working people into the masters of production.

Humane Democratic Socialism's economy Perestroika was focused on economic reform. The economics of perestroika, in contrast to earlier reformist endeavours under Khrushchev and Brezhnev, adopted the structures and guiding ideas of the Stalinist command economy. Central planning and state ownership, which were the foundational elements of the Soviet economy, were eclipsed by the radical impetus brought on by the increasingly urgent quest for answers to the USSR's economic crisis. Both were considered to be essential elements of the reasons for economic failure. But what would take their place? The overarching goal included humanism and social justice together with efficiency and high worker productivity. In other words, socialism was now seen to be a collection of ideals that needed to be implemented rather than a set of institutional components. In order to build a socialist society based on these ideals, it was necessary to use the economic systems that would most effectively generate these values.

In principle, Humane Democratic Socialism aimed to execute distribution in accordance with labour put in while also incorporating the progressive productive forces and cutting-edge technology of the global economic system into the Soviet Union. In order to encourage productivity and higher efficiency, this called for the use of incentives and income disparity. In terms of humanism and social justice, a socialist economy should: enable the individual to be master again with full rights, return the individual to the means of production, to the land, to overcome alienation, stimulate interest and strengthen each individual's work motivation.52 By defining socialism according to a set of values, the ideological taboos associated with the market, private ownership, and hired labour were lifted. The "old" model of strict administrative allocation and the "Western" path of immediate denationalisation of the means of production and unrestricted marketization of the economy were both rejected by the 28th Party Congress in July 1990 as they both ran counter to the fundamental principles of socialism and international practise, limit the inalienable rights of an individual,Moving towards the market does not mean that we are moving away from socialism; rather, it means that we are advancing towards a greater realisation of the potential of society.56 The shift away from the system of central planning started in earnest with the 1987 Law on State Enterprises. The influence of the central ministries was diminished by the adoption of policies that decentralised decision-making. There are fewer central ministries now. The republics also gained greater autonomy, and enterprises were allowed more freedom to choose what to manufacture. This directive changed not just where decisions were made, but it also changed how plans were made. The business was given far greater discretion over what to create. This was represented by the profit and loss accounting concept, or khozraschet.

The number of plan indicators that the enterprise had to meet was also to be reduced by GOSPLAN and the central ministries. The primary conduit between the business and the ministry was to be state orders. After completing its state-ordered task, the business was free to look for its own contracts. The Law aimed to connect businesses horizontally and increase their responsiveness to customer demand. While keeping some of the anticipated features of the approach to economic management, Khozraschet expanded the potential for using market levers. The reform was a compromise, and unavoidably it failed. The firms were also meant to balance their accounts in order to increase productivity and cost-sensitivity. Businesses were reluctant to look for contracts. Ministries were adamant about preventing the businesses from using their autonomy. The central ministries reasserted their authority, just as they did with the Kosygin reforms of 1965 and the sovnarkhozy reforms of 1957. Gorbachev made the decision in 1990 to adopt marketization more fully across the Soviet economy. This decision had a profound impact on how the market and the usage of commodity-money connections were seen under socialism. In 1987, Soviet economists and officials started expressing more unbiased opinions on the market.

The endeavour to strike the best possible balance between planning and market aspects, as well as to define the nature of planning under Humane Democratic Socialism, was the main topic between 1989 and 1991. Gorbachev saw a lot of appeal in the market, but it couldn't operate freely. An essential component of a Humane Democratic Socialist society was to continue to be state regulation, carried out via the indirect levers of financial policy and the direct involvement of social policy. Gorbachev said that the market was now not only morally and ethically acceptable to socialists, but also an essential element of both effective reform and a strong socialist society. From an ideological standpoint, the market was unaligned. It was no longer a characteristic that could only be found in capitalism because it had been created by human civilization and could be applied to any social system.

The most intriguing development was the realisation that the market could give the Soviet system socialist qualities. On the one hand, this was a characteristic of the market that was immediately apparent: it provided the dynamism and efficiency for an economy that could be integrated into the global economy and meet the socialist aspiration to raise the standard of living for the populace by fostering the development of a productive, inventive, and entrepreneurial society. On the other side, it was said that the market, in three different ways, satisfies the demands of social justice and socialist humanism. First, the market supported the political democratisation of Soviet society by establishing the framework for personal economic freedoms; "the market democratises economic relations, and socialism is inconceivable without democracy.

Only within a market framework could there co-exist a variety of forms of ownership and economic management that expressed the "private interests of the people. The market simultaneously provided the prerequisites for a genuine socialisation of the Soviet economy: " the high road to a genuine socialisation of production on the principles of free will and economic expediency is the creation of free associations of producers, joint-stock companies, production and consumer cooperatives, associations of leaseholders and entrepreneurs.At the same time, the market was said to permit the individual to pursue their private interests. Second, the market put into practise another fundamental element of socialism: compensation for labour. The market made sure that workers could convert their income into commodities and therefore reward highly productive labour by ensuring an equilibrium between supply and demand and thus ending the issue of shortages, which seemed to be inherent to a Soviet-style economy.

Thirdly, the market encouraged the development of a more effective system of social security and social protection. This also prevented the growth of organisations and people who relied on the profits gained from exploiting shortages. In the long term, allowing market forces to take control of the Soviet economy would boost national income by boosting worker productivity. This would therefore make it possible to enhance the maximum guaranteed minimum levels of earnings, pensions, and allowances as well as the supply of housing, health care, education, and retirement, among other things. The less fortunate members of society may profit from the general rise in economic efficiency and production via an active state social policy. What kind of regulation did Gorbachev envision? In compared to earlier times, the state's involvement in the economy was rather limited.

This was particularly clear when it came to the goals and objectives of the strategy in a tightly controlled market environment. The planning system was intended to be controlled indirectly via things like taxes, credit card interest rates, pricing, state orders, customs charges, and legislation. This planning was done to execute long-term, significant scientific and technological advancements, improve the infrastructure, and safeguard the environment things that the market was unable to achieve. The economy seemed to be focused towards developing a system that encouraged individual initiative, creativity, and production while shielding the least fortunate from hardship[10].

DISCUSSION

The term "Developing Socialism" first appeared in the late 1980s and early 1990s as a bridge between the rejection of Developed Socialism and the ultimate formation of Humane Democratic Socialism. As the leadership struggled to strike a balance between the necessity for change and the preservation of aspects that justified the Communist Party's and its ideas' continued control, this critical time in the development of Soviet socialism had far-reaching consequences.Understanding Change and Continuity: The rise of Developing Socialism

brought to light the complex interplay between the "old" and "new" paradigms within Soviet ideology. This interaction tried to hold onto crucial elements that underpinned the Party's power while distancing itself from other features of the past. This fusion served as an excellent example of the basic problem of seeking change while restricting its scope a problem that persisted throughout this period.

Uskorenie's role in economic strategy:

The economic strategy of "uskorenie," which sought a unique approach to development characterised by speed, efficiency, and technological innovation, played a crucial role in this evolution. The leadership's devotion to economic growth went against to desires to restructure the system's base, therefore this shift was complicated. This contrast highlighted the rigidity of conventional economic theory and the conflict between innovation and continuity.Important individuals like Georgii Smirnov, Director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, were instrumental in forming the notion of Developing Socialism. Although the term's definition was still ambiguous, it covered a wide range of topics. Mikhail Gorbachev and Alexander Yakovlev made notable contributions to the development of the idea, deviating from traditional socialist perspectives.

Variety and Humanism in Focus

Developing Socialism marked a substantial break from the status quo by admitting the tensions, disputes, and variety of interests inside Soviet society. This acknowledgment was a shift away from the ideological homogeneity that characterised established socialism and towards broader inclusion and tolerance. This transitional stage was underlined by the promotion of autonomous, humanistic ideas and variety acceptance.Balancing Individual and Collective Interests: The development of socialism placed a strong focus on striking a balance between the interests of the individual, the community, and society as a whole. This strategy aimed for a more comprehensive viewpoint that valued individuality within a communist framework. A more democratic attitude was promoted by the emphasis on humanistic principles, which signified a break from class concerns.

Transition from "Scientific" to Dynamic Philosophy: Developing Socialism signalled a departure from socialism's reputation as a "scientific" philosophy—a change that expressed dissatisfaction with the current framework. An increasing scepticism about the once-dominant idea of socialism as an unalterable fact served as a marker for this transition. This modification encouraged competition between socialist and alternative philosophies and opened the door for intellectual and political diversity.

CONCLUSION

The period of "Developing Socialism" captures an important turning point in Soviet ideological development while managing the challenges of change. During this time, paradigms began to become more inclusive and dynamic while keeping essential aspects. The evolution of Soviet socialism finally opened the way for the establishment of Humane Democratic Socialism, demonstrating the dynamic interaction between continuity and change.

The scope of state control extended beyond only the economic activities to include the social and economic repercussions of a regulated market. Gorbachev consistently emphasised the need of an active, comprehensive social policy to safeguard the social justice concept and protect the rights of the underprivileged.

REFERENCES

[1] S. White, “The Soviet Union: Gorbachev, Perestroika and Socialism,” *J. Communist Stud.*, 1992, doi: 10.1080/13523279208415127.

[2] R. Medvedev, “Russia Again at the Crossroads,” *Sociol. Res.*, 1998, doi: 10.2753/sor1061-0154370322.

[3] M. Gorbachev,“67(c). Toward a Humane, Democratic Socialism,” *Statut. Decis.*, 1992, doi: 10.1080/10610014.1992.11501959.

[4] O. Ozherelev, “A Humane, Democratic Socialism: Contours of a Modern Conception,” *Probl. Econ.*, 1991, doi: 10.2753/pet1061-199133106.

[5] R. J. Das, “Critical Observations on Neo-liberalism and India’s New Economic Policy,” *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. 2015. doi: 10.1080/00472336.2014.1003143.

[6] J. E. Elliott and A. F. Dowlah, “Gorbachev, Perestroika and Democratizing Socialism,” *Int. J. Soc. Econ.*, 1994, doi: 10.1108/eum0000000003948.

[7] Michael A. McCarthy, “Democratic Socialism Isn’t Social Democracy,” *Jacobin*, 2018.

[8] M. Cole, “ Learning without Limits: A Marxist Assessment ,” *Policy Futur. Educ.*, 2008, doi: 10.2304/pfie.2008.6.4.453.

[9] R. G. Peffer, “ Symposium On Globalization And Justice□: Introduction ,”*Econ. Philos.*, 2006, doi: 10.1017/s0266267105000726.

[10] M. Bronfenbrenner, O. Sik, F. Eidlin, and W. Graf, “For a Humane Economic Democracy,” *South. Econ. J.*, 1986, doi: 10.2307/1059435.

CHAPTER 24

RESILIENCE AND TRANSFORMATION OF SOVIET SOCIALISM

Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-kuldeep.kumar@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

This research explores the intricate historical development of Soviet socialism, looking at how it was able to adapt, change, and endure despite altering ideological, political, and economic environments. The research highlights the dual character of Soviet socialism as both a robust system and a platform for significant reforms, spanning from the early phases of its inception in 1917 through the crucial events of 1989–1991. The investigation demonstrates how Soviet socialism handled the conflict between continuity and change by illuminating the complex interaction between long-held beliefs and new ideals. Within the framework of the larger ideological trajectory, the birth of ideas like "Developing Socialism" and "Humane Democratic Socialism" is analyzed, offering insight on the complex fusion of old and new paradigms. The research considers the importance of ideas in influencing the historical development of the Soviet model as it dissects the variables that produced it. The inquiry ultimately encourages thought on the possibilities of political ideologies in the aftermath of social changes, providing insightful information into the complex processes of ideological growth.

KEYWORDS:

Adaptability Transformation, Buildivist Philosophy, Evolving Concepts, Historical Developments, Russian Socialism.

INTRODUCTION

As the dust from 1989–1991 settles, a number of obituaries for the Soviet Union and Soviet socialism are starting to appear. The end of modernity, the end of "The short twentieth century," the end of the political project inherited from the Enlightenment, or even the end of history has all been suggested as possible outcomes of these events by historians, political scientists, and other observers.1 This examination of the origins, development, and death of the Soviet model of socialism is concluded by two points. The first is, what does this analysis tell us about the evolution of Soviet socialism historically and the significance of ideas in influencing this history? Second, what prospects does the political philosophy of "socialism" have going forward? Russian socialism in historical context A historical viewpoint on how Soviet socialism developed reveals some really intriguing insights. Extrapolating from the research above, the following were the crucial elements that shaped the Soviet model of socialism.

First, via their knowledge of the German war economy during the First World War, they came to comprehend the transitional period that Marx, Engels, and Kautsky had described. Marxism-Leninism, as Feher has pointed out, was an even more haphazard choice from the menu of Marxian philosophy, and it led to the theory's limitation and division. The whole of Marx's humanistic heritage was abandoned by Marxism-Leninism. The circumstances of economic, cultural, and technological backwardness, chaos, war, and international hostility after 1917 reinforced the Bolshevik preference for certain socio-economic and political

forms—nonmarket, centralist, statist,[1]–[3] planned, technocratic—which resulted in the erosion of the democratic, decentralizing, radical, emancipatory strand of Bolshevism. The emergence of "socialism in one country" and the revolution from above marked the other pivotal phase. The construction of socialism now coexisted in Bolshevik speech with the necessity for "haste," the emphasis on Bolshevik tempos, and the endeavor to "overcome backwardness." This produced two results. First, the specific meaning of terms like "planning" was ultimately determined (and would remain so until 1990). Second, Bolshevism transformed itself into an ideology for quick economic growth for nations without the prerequisites for capitalist development, as Hobsbawm has highlighted. Growth at any cost and as soon as feasible replaced the Bolshevik focus on the expansion of the productive forces as a means of laying the groundwork for material affluence. The autarkic, brutally productivism core of Stalinist Bolshevism took the place of the rationalist, productivism heart of Leninist Bolshevism.

During this time, Soviet socialism exhibited significant variety along a number of dimensions. The first of them refers to the rhythms of the process of constructing socialism: radically active moments of activity (war communism, revolution from above, perestroika, Khrushchevism) that would give way to more gradualistic, measured stages of progress (NEP, the Brezhnev era). Overlaying this rhythm is an additional contrast between centralist and statist approaches to creating socialism (war communism, Stalinism, and Brezhnevism) and those that preferred a higher degree of decentralisation and liberalisation (NEP, Khrushchevism, and perestroika). Under Bolshevism, socialism was constructed in a way that was remarkably diverse and heterogeneous. The interaction between theory and practise in the various stages of socialism's construction is a third problem. Although within the confines of the basic concept of socialism in Bolshevik speech, theory was adjusted and improved over the periods of "war communism," NEP, Khrushchev, and perestroika in response to the changing practise of the CPSU.

The Stalinist period, during which "socialism in one country" came before the economic and social changes of the 1930s, and the Brezhnev era, during which Developed Socialism was developed concurrently with the rejection of Khrushchevite practises, were the two exceptions to this rule. It is not surprising that these two periods in Soviet history are regarded as the most dogmatic, conservative, and intellectually stifling because the development of theory contributed to the confinement of Soviet socialism's structures and practises within a constricting framework that greatly diminished the optional paths for social development open to the party leadership. Given this variety, one of the most notable aspects of Soviet socialism's theory and practise was the degree of consistency and stability shown between 1917 and 1985. After 1917, the construction of socialism in the USSR was still guided by the constructivist, rationalist, productivist, and technocratic mindset that characterised Bolshevik Marxism-Leninism (and was still present in the early phases of perestroika).

The CPSU also remained steadfast in their support of the fundamental elements of "socialism" as a transitional stage, as derived from their readings of Marx, Engels, and Kautsky as well as from the application of the German war economy: central planning, state ownership, central direction of social processes, leading role of the communist party, and proletarian internationalism. Western critics have long made observations on the stability or rigidity of the fundamental components of the dominant ideology.The party insisted that socialism was a transitional society defined according to a set of structural features to be consciously constructed, even though the precise meaning of many of these features was subject to periodic reinterpretation in light of political imperatives (especially the leading role

of the party, and the commitment to proletarian inter-nationalism). How significant have these concepts been in shaping Soviet history? Malia recently stated that the "building of socialism" a single, ultimate task defines the nature of the communist system and the coherence of the Soviet experience. And the reason Sovietology has failed so miserably to comprehend its topic is because Western social science has, for the most part, refused to take this ideological purpose seriously. The opinions presented here support this assertion. The practise of Soviet socialism was significantly influenced by the notion of "socialism" as a society in transition[4], [5]. This has to be qualified, however, by identifying the distinct Soviet/international context from which each interpretation of the transitional period developed by Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and Gorbachev. After 1917, the notion of socialism and the realities of the Soviet Union had a kind of dialectical interaction that helped to shape the several Soviet socialisms that were created. The only way to understand the central role of the CPSU's ideas, beliefs, and presuppositions in determining the course of Soviet history and, at the same time, to recognise the areas in which real life refused to submit to Bolshevik dictate, leading to a refinement of their theory in light of this new practise, is by adopting a historical perspective that allows one to trace the degrees of continuity and change.

Knowing the thoughts, ideals, and convictions that drove Soviet leaders is essential since they greatly influenced how events developed from 1917 to 1991. One more thing. What became of socialism as a political philosophy after the "failure" of the Soviet "experiment"? The causes of this failure are many and hotly contested. The demise of the Soviet Union has been attributed in large part to economic failure, ethnic unrest, political stagnation, and foreign pressure. But what about this procedure's conceptual foundations? How much of Soviet socialism's failure was caused by tendencies that existed in both Marxism and socialism in general? Numerous thinkers, both East and West, have extensively analysed the Marxist foundations of Soviet socialism. Kolakowski contends that Marx's goal of achieving complete human unification was the source of his quest for universal human liberation. Civil society must be dissolved into the political society of public life (i.e., the state), since it serves as a platform for the expression of private, competing interests.

The Marxian vision of the united man, he continues, is more likely to result in the cancerous development of a quasiomnipotent bureaucracy if put into practise rather than the merging of civil and political society.And the ideal of complete oneness can only be realised as a caricature as an artificial unity imposed via external force. In the late 1980s, Aleksander Tsipko also looked into the Marxist foundations of Stalinism. He attributed this to Marx's erroneous understanding of human nature, stating that it inspired the Bolsheviks to try to shape people and create a specific kind of personality among its residents, which served as the justification for the state's involvement into every aspect of Soviet citizens' life. Blackburn has addressed the issue of Marxism's accountability. Marxists and other socialists, he contends, cannot claim that there is no connection between the two, despite the fact that it is biassed and one-sided to claim that Marxism was directly to blame for Soviet socialism. Therefore, he argues, Marxism does not, as some would like to claim, consist of the gaps, errors, and inadequacies in what Marx had to say about, for example, the rule of law, or the rights of the individual, or the necessity for checks and balances in political structures, or the abolition of commodity-money relations.

However, they may bear some responsibility, direct or indirect, for the practises of what was once referred to as "actually existing socialism." According to Blackburn, the many criticisms of Soviet socialism's application from a range of Marxist viewpoints attest to the doctrine's lasting relevance and its capacity to foster critical viewpoints on all types of exploitation and

oppression. Malia and Kolakowski criticise socialism as a whole in addition to Marxism. According to Malia, socialism consists of both moral and practical elements. In the first, "democratic equality" is discussed, whereas in the second, "private property" is abolished. The market must also be subdued in order to do this, which necessitates the huge imposition of governmental authority. In order to construct socialism in Russia, which lacked the fundamental socioeconomic foundations, a political organization in this instance, the Leninist vanguard—had to intervene. This concentrated state authority in the hands of a select group of people. In other words, Malia contends that the conflicting tendencies at the core of socialism itself were the primary cause of the whole Soviet experience. He claims that "the Soviet experiment became totalitarian not in spite of its socialism, but precisely because of it." By contrast, many thinkers have attempted to revive socialism as a political ideology in the aftermath of the fall of the Soviet Union. This endeavour has two facets: a theological aspect and a historical element. From a historical viewpoint, the challenge facing modern socialists is how to characterise the reasons for the collapse of the Soviet system as being unique to the USSR between 1917 and 1991[6]–[8].

According to Hobsbawm, the Soviet experiment was not intended to serve as "a global alternative to capitalism." It is not acceptable to generalise the experience of "actually existing socialism" for these reasons. It has to be examined in the perspective of its specific historical period. According to doctrine, the specific blend of socialist principles that developed after 1917 (and which, to use Berki's terminology, synthesised rationalism and egalitarianism) has no influence on the various forms of socialism practised across the globe. The fall of Soviet socialism signifies the end of the socialist doctrine that was founded on the Enlightenment and reflected the emancipatory force of knowledge and human reason. Few people have lamented its loss, despite the fact that its like will never be seen again. Variety of socialism that articulate moral or ethical requirements and convey a deep desire for a better society not one that is more rational retain their viability and validity. But has socialism essentially reduced to a moral philosophy? The dearth of actual instances of societies that are operating in accordance with broadly socialist ideals continues to be a problem that has to be solved. The 1980s European social-democracy crises, especially in Sweden and Austria, seemed to support conservative critiques of socialism.

But as modern social theorists' focus has shifted to the persistent faults and shortcomings of capitalism, a revival of socialist ideology and thinking has started. The majority of socialists today acknowledge that the effort to eliminate or overthrow market relations was a seriously misguided undertaking. On the other hand, the outcomes of "shock therapy" in eastern Europe and other places have shown that the New Right's confidence in unrestrained market forces is false.

Global poverty and environmental degradation are two urgent issues that have brought attention to the shortcomings of modern capitalism. According to Blackburn, the essential processes for socialists were to investigate methods in which economic processes might draw on the expertise and initiative of millions of autonomous agents while yet being sensitive to social concerns that have been democratically decided upon...and to socialise the market. The efforts to combine justice, equality, and liberty will continue under socialism. Hobsbawm contends that it will continue to have appeal because "socialists are there to remind the world that people, and not production, come first" (Soviet Socialism in Historical Perspective).An appropriate epitaph for Soviet socialism may be written on its gravestone.

DISCUSSION

The astonishing tenacity with which Soviet socialism has endured shifting political, economic, and social obstacles has been a defining feature of its history. This conversation goes into the fascinating forces that contributed to Soviet socialism's persistence and evolution from its foundation in 1917 to its apex in the late 20th century.

The story emphasises the system's capacity for change, embracing new concepts and tactics while preserving core tenets of its philosophy[9], [10]. Centralised planning, state ownership, and the communist party's leadership role combined to create Soviet socialism's own brand of long-lasting socialism. Even as external pressures and internal tensions increased, the constructivist, rationalist, and technocratic foundations inherited from Bolshevik Marxism-Leninism provided a solid framework. Following the extreme periods of "war communism," such as the New Economic Policy (NEP) and the Brezhnev era, more gradualistic phases were introduced. Central concepts like state control and proletarian internationalism persisted throughout these changes.

In reaction to the shortcomings of the current paradigm, the idea of "Developing Socialism" evolved, demonstrating a realisation of the necessity for change while keeping important ideological tenets. This adaption attempted to achieve a compromise between conventional standards and the need for changes to solve social problems and economic stagnation. The concept of "Humane Democratic Socialism," which emphasised variety, individuality, and humanistic principles, served as another example of the conflict between continuity and innovation. These ideas demonstrated how Soviet socialism changed from being a strict, centrally planned system to one that included components of democratic government and individual liberties.

The system's effort to stay relevant in a world that is changing quickly is reflected in the change from "Developing Socialism" to "Humane Democratic Socialism." The scope of transition was, however, limited by the lingering effects of Stalinist-era conventions and tight central planning. While the range of socialist ideologies showed variety, including centralist and decentralised models, fundamental doctrinal elements persisted in defining the limits of change.Ideas were crucial in determining the course that Soviet socialism took. Early phases were driven by the constructivist idea of "socialism in one country" and fast industrialization, but the later growth of humanistic and democratic principles signalled an understanding of the significance of both private and public interests. This intellectual development shaped politics more broadly than just individual legislation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the history of Soviet socialism serves as an example of both its tenacity and its power to alter. We obtain a thorough knowledge of the complex dynamics that influenced the trajectory of one of the most significant political experiments of the 20th century by exploring the interaction between continuity and change as well as the effect of developing ideas.Prospects for Political ideologies the study of the Soviet Union's adaptability and metamorphosis provides insights into the prospects of political ideologies during times of upheaval. The Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991. A recurring element in ideological growth is the conflict between sustaining core values and adjusting to modern issues. The history of Soviet socialism demonstrates that under the weight of shifting conditions, even deeply rooted institutions may undergo considerable changes.

REFERENCES

[1] Z. Brzezinski, “The great transformation,” in *Russia in the National Interest*, 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315128870-12.

[2] C. Hann and K. Verdery, “What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?,” *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.*, 1997, doi: 10.2307/3034088.

[3] A. Yurchak, *Everything was forever, until it was no more: The last Soviet generation*. 2013. doi: 10.1525/aa.2006.108.4.927.1.

[4] D. Umetbaeva, “Paradoxes of hegemonic discourse in post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan: History textbooks’ and history teachers’ attitudes toward the Soviet past,” *Cent. Asian Aff.*, 2015, doi: 10.1163/22142290-00203004.

[5] S. Prozorov, “Foucault and Soviet biopolitics,” *Hist. Human Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0952695114537636.

[6] A. Halemba, “Trust, organisational boundaries and gender: Mothers Prayers in Ukraine,” *Relig. State Soc.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/09637494.2018.1430411.

[7] M. Buyandelgeriyn, “Post-post-transition theories: Walking on multiple paths,” *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 2008. doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.37.081407.085214.

[8] S. Marung, “The provocation of empirical evidence: Soviet African Studies between enthusiasm and discomfort,” *African Identities*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/14725843.2018.1452136.

[9] I. Iwasaki and K. Kumo, “J-Curve in Transition Economies: A Large Meta-analysis of the Determinants of Output Changes,” *Comp. Econ. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41294-018-0058-4.

[10] M. Kremakova, “Navigating Postsocialism: Bulgarian Seafarers’ Working Lives before and after 1989,” *Anthropol. Work Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/awr.12182.

CHAPTER 25

INDIVIDUALISM AND EGALITARIANISM IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET SOCIALISM

Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor
Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-kuldeep.kumar@muit.in

ABSTRACT:

In the development of Soviet socialism, the abstract examines the complex interaction between individuality and equality. It explores the difficulties Soviet thinkers and leaders encountered in attempting to balance the need for individual initiative, self-interest, and economic efficiency with their steadfast commitment to social justice and the welfare of the group as a whole. The abstract emphasizes how the socialist environment shifts from one of mechanical equalization to one of a more complex idea of equal opportunity. In addition to noting the conflict between rewarding individual work and preserving the ideals of social well-being, it analyses the arguments around the contribution that money incentives and market mechanisms may make to reviving the Soviet economy. The abstract highlights how the Soviet understanding of human nature changed from an abstract kind of collectivism to an acceptance of "possessive individualism," whereby individual desires coincide with society advancement. An examination of how the socialist perspective handled the challenges of promoting entrepreneurship while upholding social justice is centered on the examination of Gorbachev's reforming programmed. In the end, the abstract emphasizes how the constant conflict between individuality and equality shaped the development of Soviet socialism.

KEYWORDS:

Egalitarianism, Equality, Individualism, Opportunity, Social Justice.

INTRODUCTION

Rethinking the approach to monetary incentives, social distinction, and social fairness was necessary to revive the Soviet economy via the introduction of market processes and various kinds of ownership. The CPSU's historic dedication to and understanding of collectivism and equality had to be reexamined in order to foster productivity, hard effort, technical innovation, and economic rivalry. There was now an understanding that overhauling how people were thought of and treated was necessary to build an effective and efficient society. In many ways, this echoed the critique of collectivist societies that had been popular in liberal political philosophy. In this view, a social system stagnates when it loses its primary driver of development: people's ability to independently pursue their own interests and feel moral accountability for their actions. Human beings only think and work creatively when they are free, independent, and motivated by self-interest, according to Tsipko: "Human beings think and work creatively only when they are motivated by self-interest." Only in this way, he argued, could socialism become more efficient than capitalism, and thereby supply the material wants and needs of its citizens. The shift in the Soviet understanding of human nature has been characterized as a transition from an abstract form of collectivism to "possessive individualism." Migranyan claimed that Soviet theorists "threw out the baby with the bathwater in the heat of the struggle against bourgeois individualism."

In an effort to counter selfishness, Soviet theorists underestimated the characteristics of laissez-faire individualism, which promoted the imperialism of the individual. The fundamental tenet was to accept people for who they were, not for what leaders, ideologues, or theorists felt they ought to be. This objective needed to be moulded and sculpted into the creation of policies, organisations, and institutions[1]–[3]. This suggested two other items. People were complex animals with a broad range of drives and goals, wants and desires, and cultural, biological, and extensive social ties, traditions, and beliefs. It was necessary to support individual initiative and enterprise, as well as the desire for private and cooperative forms of ownership in the economy, as a result of this forcing a recognition of the precedence of personal interests over class affiliations.

This was a dramatic change an effort to create a political and socioeconomic environment that would encourage "possessive individualism" in certain people. Previously, any indications of private acquisitiveness and personal proprietorial inclinations were seen to be signs of the persistence of bourgeois attitudes, which had to be completely destroyed since they were incompatible with the ideals of the New Person. Individuals were now considered the best judges of their own best interests, and encouragement should be given to the fostering of the values of hard work, self-improvement, and enterprise. Individualism was now seen as the "inevitable mainspring of progress and that T is the universal controlling and motive force." To interpret this process as the unchecked march towards a society of solely selfish people devoid of any kind of collective mentality, however, would be erroneous. Possessive individualism may have existed, but not in its entirety.

A return to Marx's dictum that "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" was made since, along with the acknowledgement of the importance and primacy of the person and their interests, this idea was also expanded. In Soviet thought, pursuing one's own well-being was now seen as a precondition for achieving communal well-being and as a way to satiate broader societal interests. In order to advance a spirit and an ethos of brotherhood, cooperation, and altruism values essential to the socialist vision it was necessary to figure out exactly how to overcome this paradox between an ethos of personal acquisition and gain. The core of Gorbachev's agenda, and thus the core of socialism in general, is this duality. Gorbachev made an effort to balance the need to support entrepreneurship and self-interest with his belief that individuals completely realise their uniqueness via their connections to their communities and through human solidarity.

Those who support socialism are confronted with the question, If the pursuit of personal and private interests was to serve the public, the socialist patient who received a strong dosage of liberal political theory had a number of duties to complete. At first, this necessitated reevaluating the idea of equality or the dedication to an egalitarian, collectivist society. The notion of "equality" has historically been one that has been hotly "contested" within the socialist traditions. The challenge Gorbachev and other HDS theorists faced was how to balance their commitment to egalitarianism with the need to boost the economy's efficiency and productivity. In its most "pure" form, HDS expresses the idea that the community is the highest form of individualism, in which self-denial and altruism are the keys to self-realization. On the one hand, encouraging material difference was intended to support individual freedom and innovation while reviving the economy.

However, they were dedicated to a society that valued social fairness and interdependence. The socialist vision, which remained devoted to collectivism and social justice, and the reformist imperative, which sought to introduce aspects of liberal political theory into the system, caught the idea of "equality" in their tangle.

The Soviet thinkers criticised the uravnilovka, or equalisation, which they said had dominated Soviet social policy after Stalin, echoing the Stalinist actions of the early 1930s: the contemporary notion of equality does not entail a mechanical and lifeless levelling of society. Giving everyone the opportunity to reach their best potential is what equality is all about... In order to breathe the air of freedom, equality must be broken. The concept of equality in HDS discourse made an effort to combine these two requirements. There were discussions on how to provide monetary prizes for the populace. As academics debated whether to keep the population's access to a wide range of subsidised services, more emphasis was placed on the use of monetary incentives to encourage labour. This led to a triple reevaluation of the conventional Soviet conception of equality[4], [5]. First, equality was changed to a definition that was more akin to equality of opportunity or life chances. Second, after 1987–1988, a far more thorough criticism of the architecture of privilege entered the public sphere. The partial easing of limitations on information flows caused the nomenklatura's privileges and advantages to come under fire as the party entered a competitive socio-political environment. The case for undeserved rewards became more and more unsustainable as the party worked to develop a system of distribution that rewarded achievement, diligence, and industry. The degrees of material distinction would certainly rise if incentives were tied to performance. Gorbachev emphasised the need of an active social policy several times to safeguard the weaker members of society. In the statement adopted by the 28th Congress, seven provisions outlined the nature of these social guarantees:

1) Create an integral social security system for low income and large families, ensuring that the combined level of pay, pensions and allowances is not below the subsistence level;
2) Ensure a guaranteed level of housing, education, medical services and other benefits, while developing paid services and a housing market;
3) Implement a major health care programme;
4) Improve the position of women, and child-care and maternity provision;
5) Improve the position for children’s care;
6) Ensure equal opportunities for young people;
7) Improve the lot of invalids, servicemen and veterans.

In addition, a series of measures were outlined to cushion the population against the almost inevitably adverse consequences of a switch to a regulated market economy: indexing incomes, and creating a mechanism to cope with structural changes in employment and to retrain those made redundant.The meaning of social justice in HDS was elaborated rather vaguely in the 1991 draft party programme, Due reward for labour and talent is an indispensable condition of progress in industry, science and culture. There should be an organic combination of social guarantees to citizens, competition, enterprise, and initiative on the part of those who produce material goods and spiritual assets, and special concern by society for socially vulnerable strata. In the area of social equality, especially gender relations, there was little change in the official policy of promoting greater opportunities for women to work and participate in public life. We are in favour of strengthening the economy. The biggest advancement during these years was not a change in official policy, but rather the increased level of discussion of women's issues made possible by glasnost'. The CPSU supports the efforts of the state and independent women's organisations directed towards providing aid to families of modest means, the real equalisation of opportunities for women and men in all spheres of life, and expanding opportunities for women to engage in self-education, art, and sports.

The strategy chosen by Gorbachev, which reflected HDS's more dismal, realistic tone, perpetuated the claim that the "woman question" had not been resolved. The changes in attitudes towards egalitarianism and collectivism are indicative of a more significant transformation in the Soviet socialist ideology. The rejection of proletarian internationalism and the acceptance of what can be called "progressive humanism" prompted a major rethink of the strategy is devoted to world issues. HDS acknowledged a significant reevaluation of the weight given to class interests and universal human ideals. Now, it was believed that universal human values came before and were more important than any social class's exclusive class interests. The greatest way to realize the proletariat's class interests was to fight for humanity's best interests as a whole. The CPSU was henceforth to be led by the ideals of pan-humanism and humanism, according to the drafted party plan. The essential principles for success in the contemporary world are man's holistic development and his peaceful coexistence with nature[6]–[8].

This led to a reevaluation of views towards capitalism and the West. The rejection of the idea that capitalism and socialism were two antagonistic "camps" that were incompatible with one another may have been the most significant reevaluation. In spite of the fact that a class-based analysis of the causes of the nuclear threat and other global issues was still relevant, Gorbachev claimed that the development of weapons of mass destruction put "an objective limit [on] class confrontation in the international arena". The importance of universal human values imposed the need to accept economic and ideological competition, but to keep this within a peaceful, cooperative framework. Now, the cooperative parts of coexistence clearly outweighed the antagonistic ones. Under Gorbachev, three interconnected aspects came to represent the Soviet approach to world affairs. The first was the acceptance of difference, or the so-called "Sinatra Doctrine",which said that each state may do things "their way".

Cultural, political, and national differences among nations were natural, advantageous, and should be accepted by everyone. It was necessary to evaluate the relative benefits of various systems based on their capacity to safeguard the fundamental liberties and rights of the person. International affairs must be conducted democratically because everyone has the right to independently choose the socioeconomic and political system of their preference, and this right cannot be violated by decision-makers from other countries (with the usual caveat that freedom must always be exercised in tandem with responsibility). State-to-state disputes must be settled diplomatically, by compromise, rather than violently. Gorbachev emphasised the value of international communication. Georgii Shakhnazarov, a prominent Soviet thinker and close aide to Gorbachev, completely rejected the grand dichotomy of "capitalism" and "socialism," which dominated Soviet political theory and practise. The cold war, in Shakhnazarov's opinion, was caused by geopolitical and military causes; it was obviously exaggerated to claim that economic contrasts between, say, France and Japan or Poland and North Korea, were bigger than those between Czechoslovakia and Austria or the two Germanic nations. Differences "within system" often surpassed differences "between system".

The division of the world into two "camps" could not be maintained because it was impossible to draw distinctions between nations based solely on an arbitrary definition of their economic structures. The reevaluation of "two-campism" prompted further revisions that went to the core of Soviet discourse's understanding of capitalism and socialism. The idea that everything in the Soviet Union was socialist and hence intrinsically "Good" whereas everything in the West was capitalist and so "Bad" was rejected along with the Stalinist theory about the inherent enmity between capitalism and socialism. The two systems were no longer perceived as being in blatant, opposite directions.

Far more intricate, varied, and nuanced was the image that Soviet philosophers drew. A number of overarching themes developed. First, there were elements of capitalism and socialism's shared structures and procedures. In the course of human civilization, forms and structures that could legitimately exist under both socialism and capitalism emerged. Outspoken reform advocate Boris Kurashvili claimed that a "frontier zone" existed between countries that practised capitalism and socialism.

In order for socialism to fully profit from this "zone"'s basic characteristics of human civilization (for Kurashvili, these were commodity production and political democracy), they had to be appropriated.98 Shakhnazarov carried this idea a step further. He did not simply suggest that some capitalist social relationships may be utilised in a socialist society. Marx challenged the popular reading of this comment, which indicates that elements of capitalism will persist for some time after the socialist revolution, in an intriguing interpretation of his idea that socialism comes into existence carrying the "birth-marks" of capitalism. He argued that these "birth-marks" were really some core characteristics of the socialist system that were built into capitalism. In other words, they were "genetically" passed down from capitalism to socialism. According to this theory, socialism inherited two of the fundamental components of social life that are present in all socioeconomic systems: market production and statehood in politics. The growing understanding of the fundamental shifts occurring within the capitalist nations of the West strengthened the argument against the "irreconcilable hostility" thesis. Going beyond the admission of universal human processes, this awareness of the changes in capitalism led to a reevaluation of both socialism and Western Social Democracy.

Capitalism had changed significantly from its traditional form in the nineteenth century. Western civilization was stated to have experienced significant social changes during which it gained new social characteristics, including the planning of scientific and technological growth, the expansion of the social sphere, and a general move towards various types of socialisation. High wages for skilled employment, the development of an extensive welfare system, and the expansion of individuals' access to information and the political system were some of the most important factors mentionedwas profoundly transformed by this shift towards a larger use of planning and of diverse types of socialisation.capitalism, a shift that some Soviet thinkers believed was largely unaffected by Reaganomics and Thatcherism's attacks on government involvement. The interests of the economically powerful class were taken into consideration by capitalism, but it also had to make sure that the demands of society's most fundamental members were satisfied. In other words, capitalism developed many structures and procedures that socialists often grabbed and claimed as their own via a process of self-adaptation.

The examples of Sweden or Austria provides as concrete proof of this. There weren't two radically different but fundamentally identical systems. Intriguingly, Shakhnazarov contended that the nations of western Europe all appeared to be "capitalist" in production and "socialist" in distribution, rejecting the notion that the two systems were hermetically sealed and diametrically opposed. This required a second, double evaluation. The relative benefits of capitalism and socialism were first compared and contrasted. One of the most overwhelmingly positive aspects of capitalist systems was thought to be higher production. On the other hand, socialism showed the value of socialisation and the need of logical planning. The whole history of European Social Democracy was also reviewed. Reassessing the relationship between capitalism and socialism is important because it disproved claims that socialism is inherently superior to capitalism on moral, historical, and ideological grounds.

Both Gorbachev and Medvedev called for a new interpretation of the social-democratic experience. No longer was socialism the unavoidable destiny of all capitalist nations. The majority of socialist defenders were forced to admit that capitalism had proven to be more successful in some areas economic efficiency and material satisfaction while socialism had proven superior in others (greater rationality, better welfare protection, and a greater emphasis on social justice). The unbroken progression of history from capitalism to socialism to communism could no longer be sustained in the modern world. One of the main cornerstones of the CPSU's ideological credibility was undermined by this idea. Furthermore, these events gravely damaged the USSR's position as the forerunner and leader of the global revolutionary movement. The desire to integrate the USSR into the cultural, economic, and social advancements of the rest of the world and return to the centre of European civilisation underpinned HDS's approach to the international arena. Gorbachev put an end to the customary ambivalence of the Bolsheviks on their views on the West. Gorbachev was a proponent of Europeanization and Westernisation, and HDS reflected these ideals. The normative foundation of Soviet socialism underwent a significant transformation under HDS's watch in home affairs. A dedication to diversity, moralism, spirituality, and humanism, which replaced Marxism-Leninism and its key tenets of scientific atheism and class prejudice, lay at the basis of HDS. This has effects in several sectors, including. The first areas of education to be highlighted by glasnost were those of history, which saw the first hints of reform. Public complaints about the condition of Soviet history textbooks started to surface. Due to ongoing discussions about Soviet history and the poor quality of the textbook, it was decided to abolish the history exams in the spring of 1988.

A new textbook was prepared by September 1988, but it was quickly criticised and replaced by one written by the State Committee for Public Education, which was published in 1989. Once again, it became out of date, and in December 1990, a contest to write a new textbook was announced. From 1988 to 1989, changes also started to be seen in other industries. Decree, titled "The Restructuring of the Teaching of Social Sciences in Higher Education Institutions," was published in October 1989. Since Marxist-Leninist concepts were no longer required to be studied in universities, the conditions for the emergence of a pluralistic educational system were set. It's important to note that this transformation took place before article 6 was repealed. What was said in this decree? The prior basic social science courses at CPSU were political economics, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and history. These were changed to include problems in the theory of contemporary socialism, philosophy, socio-political history of the 20th century, and political economy. This signalled a departure from Marxism-Leninism's favoured position in the curriculum as students were now required to examine a wide range of theories and worldviews and place Marxism-Leninism within a much wider historical and conceptual framework.

In addition to the shifting content, two significant organisational alterations also surfaced. In terms of how their instruction was to be organised, individual institutions were to have some autonomy. The State Committee would choose the main programming courses, but the universities themselves might determine 20% of the curriculum. This included the freedom to create their own specialised courses and publish their own treatises. The abandonment of Marxism-Leninism exams in favour of socialist theory exams in February 1990 was a confirmation of this shift away from a sole focus on Marxism-Leninism.The debates and discussions surrounding the new philosophy textbook are another interesting illustration of how pervasive the Marxism-Leninism retreat was prior to 1990. Its former titles were Introduction to dialectical and historical materialism or Foundations of Marxism-Leninism. This was changed to Introduction to philosophy, and the material significantly changed as a result of the title change. Individuals and their mode of existence, rather than materialistic

dialectics, were the focus of the new textbook under the editorial direction of Ivan Frolov (appointed by Gorbachev as editor of Pravda in 1989). Students of philosophy A book that covered both Marxist and non-Marxist philosophy as well as the whole history of philosophy was now available in 311 in the Soviet Union. The lack of a chapter on the ostensibly "basic question of philosophy" in the new textbook is equivalent to knocking out the foundational element of dialectical and historical materialism. A significant component of Marxism-Leninism has been destroyed by renaming these topics. With respect to the CPSU's stance on scientific atheism, the first indication of a modest change appeared in 1988. To mark the millennium of Christianity's introduction to Russia, elaborate events were held. This reportedly led to friction between the propaganda and atheistic departments of the party and the Council for Religious Affairs (CRA), a state body that was reformist in tone and began to defend believers' interests in March 1988. Kharchev, the former head of the CRA, spoke about the necessity of a fresh perspective on religion. There are debates about which is better for the Party: someone who believes in God, someone who doesn't believe in anything, or someone who believes in both God and communism. Of the three, Kharchev chose the latter. The advent of "new thinking" in the realm of scientific atheism was foreshadowed by these Kharchev papers. The debate developed along two distinct, although connected, axes: the party's views on religion and adherents, and its views on atheism supported by science.

A debate about the effectiveness of atheistic methods and goals was started by a Viktor Garadzha article titled "Pereomyslenie" (rethinking) in Nauka i religiya, published in January 1989. His article called for a re-evaluation of the entire system of atheistic education and propaganda. Tolerance and communication seemed to be the new ideals. The "old" rough methods were to be abandoned in favour of the need for a productive discourse and respect for believers' emotions. This point shouldn't be overemphasised, since the defenders of atheistic orthodoxy continued to maintain their forceful and unambiguous resistance. Instead, atheism was to be pursued by winning the debates, not by demolishing structures or threatening people. However, it is evident that some of NPT's tenets made it over to the field of atheistic education, as seen by the rise of religious teaching in schools. The party's adjustment of its views towards religion as an alternative worldview reflected the changing focus in atheistic means and aims. It was very important to enact the "Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organisations" law116 in October 1990.

Three categories individual and collective; church and state; and international can be used to categorise the key clauses. The ultimate goal was to ensure that everyone's rights and interests were equal, along with freedom of speech, religion, and conscience. In contrast, now every person "enjoys the right to express and spread convictions" about their faith. Given recent state policy, the passages on the relationship between the church and the state and the group and the state were particularly insightful. All denominations are treated equally before the law according to Article 5's establishment of the separation of religion and state. As evidence of the separation of religion and state as well as that of party and state, official sponsorship of atheistic propaganda was prohibited and state intervention in religious activities was outlawed. According to Article 12, religious organisations now gained the ability to produce mass media and access to them. In terms of education, they had the right to build religious schools and training seminaries, as well as the right to own property and carry on business. The significance of the global aspect stemmed from somewhat different factors.

Article 31 stated that if an international treaty to which the USSR is a signatory has established rules other than those in the legislation on freedom of conscience and religious organisations, the rules of the international treaty shall apply.The precedence given to the international treaties (the 1981 UN Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of

Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, and the Document of the CSCE in Vienna from 19) was that they were to take precedence over domestic laws. Conscience freedom, spiritual freedom, and respect for all beliefs were emphasised. Atheism was not mentioned at all. The conventional Bolshevik attitude to morality was likewise overthrown by HDS. In the past, Marxism-Leninism put the requirements of the state ahead of an individual's moral independence. Marxist-Leninist moral theory underwent a full reevaluation as a result of Perestroika. In turn, the return to a moral code based on Judaeo-Christian principles mirrored Russia's deeper integration with European culture. The revived focus on justice, compassion, freedom, charity, and spiritual qualities underlined the significance of universal human values. Morality was no longer based on class or dictated by duties or goals. This change in moral outlook supports the ideas discussed above. Soviet Marxism-Leninism was pushed by Perestroika to acknowledge the value of moral and spiritual matters as well as the scarcity of a worldview that focused almost exclusively on material concerns and an economic, individualistic viewpoint. Last but not least, it also represented people's new position since they were no longer necessary constrained by their societal responsibilities while exercising their moral freedom. Under perestroika, the state's cultural policy experienced a similar shift. The CPSU initially stuck with its constructivist instrumentalist methodology. Under glasnost, it aimed to create cultural forms and to advance certain cultural phenomena that supported the leadership's preferred vision of change.

The CPSU was unable to control and was compelled to acknowledge the dazzling variety of spontaneously formed cultural trends that the fast advancement of glasnost' engendered. According to Stites, popular culture at the height of glasnost' reflected, above all, the...divergence and plurality of values in Soviet society: new and old, urban and rural, cosmopolitan and chauvinistic, religious and anti-religious, rational and mystical... But it also indicated spontaneity, freedom, competition, and individualism a market place of ideas and feelings. No further social engineering was allowed. The diminished stature and significance of Marx, Engels, and Lenin in Soviet discourse represented the pinnacle of the restructuring of the Soviet socialist value system. Before, the Founders had a sacred status and were impervious to criticism. The development of glasnost led to a barrage of attacks, which paved the way for the CPSU to start drawing inspiration from other socialist intellectuals and intellectual traditions while developing its new worldview. According to the official party platform, the CPSU's foundation is the fervour with which its members uphold certain ideological principles. Humane Democratic Socialism is considered to be the most important of them by us. The worldview of the CPSU was diverse, eclectic, and pluralistic, very different from the scientific, constructivist, Marxist-Leninist basis of the orthodox model of Soviet socialism. While restoring and developing the initial humanist principles of the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, we include in our ideological arsenal all the wealth of our own and world socialist and democratic thought[9], [10].

DISCUSSION

In the intricate development of Soviet socialism, the interaction between individuality and equality has been a key and dynamic element. The Soviet Union struggled throughout its history to balance these apparently incompatible principles within the confines of its socio-political and economic institutions. This conflict between individual desires and the common good was a defining feature of Soviet socialism's growth. The Soviet system was based on a Marxist-Leninist framework that placed a strong emphasis on creating an equitable society with no classes. However, the actual application of these concepts often ran counter to the need to reward individual work and acknowledge human variation.

Economic Innovation and Efficiency

As the Soviet economy encountered difficulties and inefficiencies, especially when compared to capitalist economies in the West, officials understood the need of encouraging free enterprise and individual innovation. To resurrect economic development and technological innovation, the adoption of market mechanisms and incentives became essential. This change signalled a divergence from the former focus on state control and centralised planning, reflecting an understanding of the advantages of using individual ingenuity and effort.

The period under Mikhail Gorbachev's leadership, known as the Gorbachev Reform Era, was a pivotal one in the development of Soviet socialism. The goals of Gorbachev's programmes were to maintain the fundamental principles of socialism while introducing aspects of individuality into the Soviet system. Through initiatives like perestroika and glasnost, the reform agenda sought to improve economic efficiency, foster individual responsibility, and improve material well-being. These changes represented the realisation that individuality might be used to promote society advancement and economic success.

Egalitarianism

Within the Soviet setting, the idea of egalitarianism underwent a reevaluation during the Gorbachev period. The viability of rigorous equality was questioned in the pursuit of a more vibrant economy and more individual freedom. Economic inequalities led to talks about changing the definition of equality from uniform material results to equal opportunity. This change denoted a developing understanding of how equality may be accomplished in a society that was modernising.

Challenges and dilemmas: The Soviet leadership had difficulties in pursuing individuality and equality at the same time. The idea of encouraging individual initiative and rewarding hard effort often ran counter to the idea of sharing resources and common ownership. It was difficult to strike a balance between these two conflicting agendas without significant policy planning and ideological adjustments.

Examining individualism and equality in relation to Soviet socialism provides insightful information about the complexity of socio-political systems. It emphasizes the complex interrelationship between social fairness, individual liberty, and economic efficiency. The Soviet Union's experiences serve as a reminder that pursuing individuality and equality both need for constant adaptation and a complex knowledge of how they interact.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, individuality and equality interacted dynamically to determine the growth of Soviet socialism. The conflict between these principles had an impact on Soviet ideology, social standards, and economic measures. Exploring this interaction offers important insights into the difficulties and conundrums nations encounter in trying to strike a balance between encouraging individual initiative and the ideals of social fairness and community wellbeing**.**Soviet socialism's trajectory was formed by the conflict between encouraging individual initiative and maintaining communal equality, which resulted in changes to ideology, policy, and social norms.Individualism and egalitarianism must coexist in order for Soviet socialism to advance.

REFERENCES

[1] T. G. Griffiths and E. C. Cardona, "Education for social transformation: Soviet university education aid in the cold war capitalist world-system," *Eur. Educ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/10564934.2015.1065390.

[2] Z. Akhtar, "Law, Marxism and the State," *Int. J. Semiot. Law*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s11196-015-9413-1.

[3] M. S. Johnson, "Russian and Post-Soviet Studies: Education," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10139-4.

[4] P. Kurhinen, "Human dignity, ethical socialism and soviet ethics," *Vestn. Tomsk. Gos. Univ. Filos. Sotsiologiya. Politol.*, 2015, doi: 10.17223/1998863x/30/12.

[5] C. E. Ziegler, "Russian and Post-Soviet Studies: Environment," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10140-0.

[6] V. Y. Bashkuev, "The Role Of Medicine In The Soviet-Mongolian Relations In The 1920s," *Vestn. Tomsk. Gos. Univ.*, 2015, Doi: 10.17223/15617793/408/6.

[7] G. Fagan, "Reconstructing Lenin, an intellectual biography," *J. Contemp. Cent. East. Eur.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/0965156x.2015.1116794.

[8] Y. C. Kim, "Economic Transition in China and Russia," *Eur. Sci. J.*, 2015.

[9] A. Ismailova and E. Baynazarov, "Analysis of the Agrarian Land Reform in Uzbekistan During the Soviet Era and After Transition," *EU Agrar. Law*, 2015, doi: 10.2478/eual-2014-0009.

[10] United Nations, "69/28 Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security," 2015. doi: 10.18356/b7517ead-en.