

## **Failure of state socialism to achieve the goals of the revolution**

**Adel El-Emary**

**This is a chapter of my book: The Ongoing Revolution (in Arabic)**

**We will present this issue considering the Soviet Union as a model.**

**The course of the Russian Revolution gave rise to a social class system and a bureaucratic mode of production that proved to be less advanced than capitalism, and ultimately collapsed due to its internal contradictions beside Western pressures. Here we will present an analysis of this issue.**

**Before the revolution, Russia witnessed a major industrial advancement accompanied by marked backwardness of agriculture. Besides, there was an educational and scientific progress, represented in the proliferation of schools, even in the countryside, respectful universities, and valuable scientific research. While the majority of the population still lived in the countryside (82% in 1917) the number of workers in large industry did not exceed three million workers, most of whom were ordinary manual workers, with workers-peasant traditions, and they were linked to the countryside to one degree or another. That is, they did not constitute a mature or consolidated working class, even as a class "in itself"; at the socioeconomic level, but rather, a class on the way of formation.**

**It also had major civilized cities, as centers of advanced industry, where highly cultural intelligentsia was living.**

The latter inspired liberal and socialist theories, in addition to the role of its members as skilled technocrats necessary for modern industry and scientific research. So, both agriculture and industry belonged to different historical eras; intelligentsia and some industrial workers belonged to the modern time, while the rest of the population lived in the early modern period.

As a result of this situation, the ambitions and dreams of the different classes varied. In the countryside, peasants looked for bourgeois reform, while the urban industrial workers and radical intellectuals looked for socialism. Because the class of the large landowners was stronger than the bourgeoisie, the latter was unable to wage an effective struggle against the existing system, which was in a faltering transitional stage from feudalism to capitalism. Ironically, the working class was politically stronger than capitalism. It was not Russian capitalism that guided the process of capitalist transformation, but the feudal state played a fundamental role in establishing advanced industry in cooperation with foreign investors, driving the capitalist growth at a rate exceeding the rate of growth of the domestic capitalism itself. Thus the rate of growth of the working class exceeded the rate of that of domestic capitalism .

However, because agriculture was not capitalized yet, but was in a transition to capitalism, and even industry in cities was still limited for the whole of Russia's economy, the idea of the socialist transformation that workers and Marxists demand was not possible according to the Marxist theory, which asserted that this transformation necessitates an advanced capitalist economy; that is, in western Europe.

The Tsarist state was markedly centralized, and the large number of external enmities prompted it to build a strong and modern army. That required the spreading of education to form sufficient administrative and technical

cadres with a high degree of efficiency (the same as what happened in the era of Muhammad Ali in Egypt). This exhausted the economic surplus, which contributed to impeding its economic growth .

The Russian Workers' Party had split into two factions (then two parties): the Bolsheviks (left wing) and Mensheviks (a conservative wing similar to the Socialist parties in Europe); besides, other small socialist groups were present. Unskilled workers formed the rank of the Bolsheviks, while skilled and educated workers formed that of the Mensheviks. Other opposition parties have also been found, the most important of which were the Cadet Party, the bourgeois liberal party, and the Socialist Revolutionary Party, which is essentially a peasant party.

These are, in short, the social-political conditions of Russia before revolution

This uneven and combined development of Russian economics and culture was reflected in the political level; savage Russia, as called in Europe, was more mature than the latter in the sphere of class struggle. In Lenin's famous expression, Russia was the weakest link in the imperialist chain; consequently this less advanced country was closest to the socialist revolution than Europe. This was a dilemma for the Marxists that will consolidate and explode during the revolution of 1917. The class of the large landowners was disintegrating, while the bourgeoisie was not able to lead an accomplished bourgeois revolution. That situation is reminiscent of France just before its revolution from a certain point: the weakness of the bourgeoisie, while the revolution was brewing. In Russia this situation gave the fiercely rebellious peasants and workers the opportunity to overthrow the large landowners without enabling the bourgeoisie to rule. At this point the situation differed from that of France on the eve of its revolution. Russia was experiencing a very strong workers' movement,

having a well-organized political party, and the peasants also had their large and radical party (one million members in 1917), while Russian capitalism was much weaker than French capitalism.

The aforementioned dilemma of Russia consolidated during and after its revolution. The pre-revolution situation had - according to Marxist theory - only the potential of a bourgeois revolution, which was taken for granted by Russian Marxists <sup>(1)</sup>. Thus the role of peasants in the revolution must be essential, not merely an addition to the role of the workers. Lenin translated this in the slogan of "Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry", without this slogan specifying which of them would have the superior authority <sup>(2)</sup>, which he changed later, insisting and affirming that the workers must be the leading power.

To overcome this dilemma, Trotsky proposed the theory of the Permanent Revolution: a bourgeois revolution led by the workers and supported by the peasantry, which establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat backed by the peasants. Since the workers will rule, they will- after accomplishing the tasks of the bourgeois revolution- build socialism without the need for a new revolution <sup>(3)</sup>. Thus, the revolution will be proletarian – peasant at the same time, in terms of its

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The idea of a socialist revolution in Russia was brought up by Marx in a much earlier period, before the great transformations that the Russian countryside witnessed and led to the disintegration of the village communities. Letter from Marx to Editor of the *Otecestvenniye Zapisky*: *"If Russia continues to pursue the path she has followed since 1861, she will lose the finest chance ever offered by history to a nation, in order to undergo all the fatal vicissitudes of the capitalist regime"*.

<sup>(2)</sup> The Revolutionary Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Peasantry, April, 1905 - Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, July, 1905

<sup>(3)</sup> He presented this theory in his book "Results and prospects" issued in 1906, and then devoted it to a book entitled "The Permanent Revolution" in 1928.

political content; bourgeois with socialist aspirations. This theory holds a clear problem: the proletariat in power fulfills the tasks of the bourgeois revolution then builds socialism. How can socialism be built before the forces of production develop to the maximum extent possible under the capitalist system? Can the capitalist system grow under the rule of proletariat, not capitalists? What can be inferred from this plan is that the workers carry out a socialist revolution that accomplishes the historical tasks of the bourgeoisie instead of the latter, in the context of building socialism .

We can say that the role of the proletariat in the case of Russia, according to Marxist theoretical ideas, is the additional element of a bourgeois revolution in the first place, as it was in the French Revolution. However, to lead a bourgeois revolution and take over power, not temporarily (this is always possible in history), rather, permanently, governs and establishes socialism. This means one thing: violating the theory of the relationship between the forces and relations of production, which is fundamental in Marxism. Certainly, there are Marxist explanations of this theory, trying to justify it by ideas such as the Permanent Revolution and the New Democracy (Mao).. But all we can find is dwelling on the subject, with extensive elaboration without real engagement with the issue at hand. The conclusion being that socialism can be built in a backward country, provided getting aid by developed countries<sup>(4)</sup> .

In the Russian revolution, the peasants were - by far - the most numerous, the most powerful in terms of their role in the economic system, and the most present in the army. So they imposed their program: distributing the land to the peasants (against the original Bolshevik program: confiscation of all the land), as well as the

---

<sup>(4)</sup> Trotsky proposed an example of such explanations in his book: Results and prospects, chapter 7.

**Bolshevik slogan: peace and an immediate ending of the war. The first matter led to dangerous conflicts later.**

**At last, the workers could establish their authority in the cities. The dominant classes were quickly liquidated, lost the land and factories, alongside the state instrument itself. A workers-peasant power was established, which Lenin had previously called the Democratic Dictatorship. In reality the official power was concentrated in the Petrograd Soviet; the strongest. The peasant soviets were weak and absent in small and dispersed peasant communities, to the point that on June 3, 1917 the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers and Soldiers deputies was launched in Petrograd and a central executive committee was elected without inviting the soviets of peasants' deputies. However, in December 1917 a meeting of the Soviets of peasants was held, and the overwhelming majority of delegates voted in favor of the October Revolution, declaring their union with the soviets of soldiers and workers.**

**As an extension of the dilemma of the Russian revolution, the post-revolution situation of the workers was weak enough to fail to efficiently manage the country. After allocating lands to the peasants, the latter became economically stronger than the proletariat, as their industries were not able to balance with the huge agriculture. Moreover, in the Civil War and the wars of intervention, Russia witnessed massive devastation, especially in the cities. Many workers were killed and most of the rest fled to the countryside to seek food and guaranteed work in land. The few that remained in the cities showed failure to manage the economy, due to lack of experience. The proletariat lacked the ability to manage what was supposed to be its economy. While all that changed in the countryside was the right to own land for the benefit of the peasants. This new situation led to a higher standard of their living and their control of most of the national production, including food, and could now**

**control the working class economically in reality. Thus the stronger peasant component imposed itself on the revolution as a whole, even in the major cities.**

**Those changes had several consequences: First, the Labor base of the Labor party became limited, while the party's cadres found themselves in power, not only responsible for managing their own economy, but had also to work to rebuild the working class that had corroded in the civil war and war of intervention. Secondly: The Bolshevik Party while holding the state power found itself in a state of war with the developed world (14 countries participated in the conquest of Russia), without having a coherent social support at home. Thirdly: the Bolsheviks (according to their theory of the social revolution in the weak link of the imperialist chain) looked for a proletarian revolution in Europe to help them, but their calculations were mistaken, as the workers' revolutions in Europe failed. Fourthly: What made matters worse was the necessity of the Bolsheviks in 1921 to grant a new concession to the peasants, by following the liberal "New Economic Policy", which led to the growth of the "kulaks"; the rich peasants, who Stalin later resorted to confiscating their lands by force and killed millions of them<sup>(5)</sup>.**

**In these circumstances, the social structure of the Soviet Union began to being formed.**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**The social transformations achieved by the revolution led to an increase in the standard of living of the peasants,**

---

<sup>(5)</sup> This policy liberated domestic trade, encouraged foreign capital to work in the Soviet Union, and established the right to private property that was previously abolished by the Bolshevik government. It also abolished the policy of forcibly seizing crops and replaced it with a tax on agricultural production. It also abolished forced labor. This policy resulted in private sector recovery; artisan workshops, trade and agriculture, and has led to a significant improvement in the conditions of the economy as a whole.

**the absence of rent, and the lack of agricultural surplus. The peasants consumed almost all their production, so that they could no longer save at their will. Moreover, the industry deteriorated drastically; its production became not sufficient enough to rebuild the country or provide the army supplies, rather, it was not enough to exchange for food for city dwellers, resulting in famine.**

**The revolutionary proletariat was unable to control the countryside. The presence of the Bolshevik Party was very weak among the peasants and in their soviets, which prompted the Bolshevik government to give the worker five votes to one vote for each peasant in the soviet elections, to maintain the official status of workers and to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat.**

**This was a strange historical precedent, expressing the dilemma of the revolution that had bourgeois potential with socialist aspirations. Likewise, the workers themselves were unable to impose their authority, even within the cities, because they were simply lacking the efficiency, thus the workers' rulership really did not last more than a few weeks or months in the large cities. Actually, destruction of the old system was relatively easy, but the process of building a new system was the Russian dilemma while it was being consolidated (incomplete sentence). Here, everything began to change, especially after the failure of the dream of extending the revolution to the entire imperialist chain. However, the revolution was victorious in the wars of intervention and civil war, the Bolsheviks could crush the right and left opposition completely. At last the party's political authority became omnipotent in the cities.**

**Because of this dilemma, everything began to change. The revolution gradually declined during the period from 17-1928. Each step was taken under pressure from the economic and military conditions that the Bolsheviks and their allies exploited in their favor. The Bolshevik party**



completely dominated, thanks to the balance between the workers and peasants. Rather, it played on this balance even since before the rise of Stalin, which means that the objective conditions were a favorable climate for the forces of "evil" in the heart of new political power and the new deep state. The party of the proletariat – supposedly - has become based on a small proletariat; rather, it had to recreate the proletariat in order to operate the industry. In order to strengthen its corroded base, it appealed to the help of the old administrators and the Tsar's officers; the deep Caesarian state, with the utmost use of violence to transform the peasants into workers and compel them to work. This step was the first sign of the failure of the socialist revolution and the beginning of the counter-revolution.

The emergence of "villains" inside and at the head of the new state power had old seeds: the party that looked to itself as the bearer of the consciousness of the proletariat, having truth, and the pioneer of socialism. It now regards its absolute power the most necessary guarantee for the stability of the revolutionary regime that would build socialism. Therefore, the Bolshevik party, using the social and political contradictions, struck here and there, supporting its absolute power, and gradually centralized it in the hands of a single leader. To achieve this goal, it practiced all forms of "evil", from killing opponents, stripping all rights of workers and peasants, and using methods and men of czarism, claiming that it had made great sacrifices for the sake of the capstone doctrines.

This is how the state was re-established in Russia with iron and fire against the will of the population. This was supported by the ignorance of the workers, the greed and the narrow mind of the peasants, and of course the aspirations of the new leaders of the party. In fact, the Russians never ruled themselves either during or after the revolution. The workers' soviets were concentrated in

major cities, and the peasants' soviets were also in the larger villages and towns, most of which were formed after the October Revolution by the government. The power was effectively transferred from the Tsar's hands to the Kerensky government, to the Bolsheviks, initially supported by workers, soldiers and peasants. Then it ended up in the hands of a few Bolshevik party leaders.

Despite all the circumstances, we can not find any objective justification for the new rulers to: suppress the peasants by armed gangs formed of workers, abolish the trade union authority, suppress the workers-peasant left, the monopoly of political power, the brutal liquidation of the other revolutionary parties, then selecting the authoritarian Stalin as a leader. Last of all, the plots performed to liquidate the most revolutionary elements of the Bolshevik party itself. However, the greed of the few for power, the narrow mind of the Russian people as a whole, and their liability to submit in exchange for a piece of land, constituted the deep foundation of Stalinism.

The idea of organizing a revolution, while relying on the support of another possible revolution is an absolutely utopian one. The Russian Marxists were unanimous that socialism could not be established in Russia without direct assistance from proletarian revolutions in Western Europe. It is totally impractical to start a revolution on the basis that others will complete it. So that this process of support must continue for several decades in order to advance the relatively backward Russian economy, a period that is sufficient for the bureaucratization of soviet power and the separation of the workers' party from workers.

Just as this aid can only be conceived as an addition, it does not immediately create a proletariat capable of self-administration, which also means strengthening the authority of the state and the ruling party. Likewise, this support cannot be free of charge; so who will provide free

support to a country with a population of 130 million people for ideological or moral motives? This perception is based on a Marxist firm belief in the unity of the interests of the "world proletariat", which no practical politician can imagine. We add that the peasant component here is neglected, that is the supposed support would be provided mainly to the Russian peasants, because they are the majority of the Russians. So, why would European workers provide support to Russian peasants in huge quantities for a long time? For the sake of Russian workers?! If this is possible, capitalism can also give up its private property in favor of an egalitarian - autonomous society, by mere discussion and persuasion. Finally, it was never possible to ascertain the success of the revolution in Europe, and then it was necessary to precisely conceptualize the situation of revolutionary Russia in this case. Kautsky commented on this perception, saying about Lenin: *"although he lived for decades as an emigrant in Western Europe, still never achieved a full understanding of its political and social peculiarities. His politics, which was completely adapted to the peculiarities within Russia, was with regard to foreign countries based on the expectation of a world revolution, which to anyone who knew Western Europe must have appeared from the start as an illusion"*<sup>(6)</sup>. The more utopian is Trotsky's additional perception: that the Russian revolution would transfer the revolution to Europe<sup>(7)</sup>.

Many factors prompted the revolutionary authorities to resort to oppression to stabilize the system: the inability of the Russian proletariat - its lack of educated and trained cadres to run the country - the party became entrusted with its rehabilitation, and indeed with its restructuring, as a necessity to preserve the new system -

---

<sup>(6)</sup>Epitaph of Lenin

<sup>(7)</sup>Results and Prospects, chapter 9

**the scarcity of economic surplus - the inability of the industry to provide goods to peasants in exchange for food. The authorities resorted to seizing crops from the peasants by force; the police force. In the beginning, the Bolshevik party formed gangs of city workers to plunder the agricultural surplus at gunpoint. Later, this process was organized in a better and more efficient way. The oppression extended up to exclude the masses of workers from any exercise of authority.**

**Oppression definitely required specialized apparatus, after shrinking of the number of workers and the industry's need for them. These apparatus should require expenses and their members must look for a share of the economic surplus. Therefore, the task of rebuilding the degenerated state appeared (Lenin described the Soviet power in March 1923 as: "*Our state apparatus is so deplorable, not to say wretched*"<sup>(8)</sup>).**

**That state found that it is necessary to extract the surplus by itself and to concentrate it in its hands. By this we became in front of the new Soviet state: the leaders of the party that Stalin had opened to non-workers, technocrats whom Lenin had to return them back in 1919 to their positions and gave them payments generously <sup>(9)</sup>, old and new senior statesmen, senior officers requited from the old Tsar's army and new ones, a mixture of Bolsheviks and Caesarean elements. That clique began working to build the new system. Its excellent position was codified by special ceremonies. The theory was "developed" from Marxism-Leninism to Stalinism to suit the new system; it became the official philosophy of the state. The new plan of the new Bolsheviks became: Socialism in One Country and after that they said: "the state of the whole people"! Rather than making Russia a mere base of the international revolution as Lenin and**

---

<sup>(8)</sup>Better Fewer, But Better, March 2, 1923

<sup>(9)</sup>Six Theses On The Immediate Tasks Of The Soviet Government.

**Trotsky wanted, the world communist movement became a reserve and a fifth column for the Soviet Union.**

**Initially Lenin and Trotsky liquidated all parties except the Bolshevik Party, then the same principle went along; the left wing members of the same party, or those opposing the leadership were physically liquidated, and even all the thinkers, leaders and prominent militants of Russian socialism, including Trotsky himself. At the end, the party structure reformed to match the regime of one party rule.**

### **Bureaucratic mode of production:**

**The mode of production is - in broad terms, according to the perfectly reasonable Marxist definition - the social form of the social surplus.**

**In the Soviet Union, the social surplus was being generated under the supervision of the organized state bureaucracy (its core was the party elite), while the workers and peasants were squeezed out of any political or non-political authority. The party has been integrated into the state apparatus, including the army and security. Thus a bureaucratic ruling class had been formed. That class established all system policies and supervised their implementation. It set the objectives of the investment process and the mechanisms of its implementation. At the end it determined the mechanisms of distributing the surplus, its fate, and the proportions of distribution among the different groups that constituted the new ruling class. The member of this class, was merely a position and nothing more, representing power only in terms of her professional status, and her entire activity is directed toward the interests of the system as a whole, not her own interest. If that member had come out of it for one reason or another, she became nothing, especially during the rise of the system, before the emergence of secret private properties of the bureaucrats. As for the surplus, it was being distributed through mechanisms**

determined by the ruling elite to its members in different forms: “wages”, bonuses, percentages of “profits”, “state awards”, incentives, special services, excellent special products, and other not codified forms that emerged later. These mechanisms were linked to the nature of the bureaucracy itself, where specific responsibilities are defined for each individual plus giving him specific power; a margin of movement that enables her to practice unregulated forms of looting, as a margin, related to any bureaucracy in general - even in the private sector – for the purpose of providing the administration with some flexibility.

Everyone in the bureaucratic system received "wages", but there was a qualitative difference between the "wages" of workers and the "wages" of senior statesmen. The workers received a ration in exchange for their labor power, while the big bureaucrats received a share of the surplus, not corresponding to professional work, but a socio-political position. The most important sector of the bureaucracy; its heart, consisted of highest military ranks, security guys, the secret service, leading intellectuals of the ruling class, politicians, and technocrats in their administrative rather than technical capacity, just as the rest of the upper bureaucracy. That was ruling class. All this is not completely intended or planned; Stalin himself lived as an austere, but running the system required the purchase of loyalties.

Bureaucracy is a social stratum, a position, more than a real class; it is a legal personality, an institution. It is more important and stronger than its members as long as the system remains coherent. It does not consist of specific individuals; rather, it begins its existence as an institution; a social position, an apparatus that includes individuals, whom it may get rid of some and recruit others.

**The full control of the bureaucratic stratum or class - if we want to call it - over the society requires the prohibition and proscription of the individual property of the means of production. Individual ownership means that the bureaucracy is deprived of part of its power as an owner class, and of some amount of the surplus (because it depends on direct robbery). Therefore it tends to confiscate it to the fullest extent, and becomes less and less able to do so as it goes into disintegration as an institution.**

**In this system, the ruling class, or stratum was the state itself. Thanks to this concentration, the surplus was being produced and distributed according to economic plans, by distributing investments, determining wages and gifts, and developing the labor power in a way that serves the long-term interests of the system. It is inevitable that the state would provide services such as education, health services..etc., to an appropriate extent for that goal. The system was extracting the social surplus through a general plan that included the distribution of labor, the determination of working hours, workers' rights, etc. Thus the surplus was being generally extracted from the working classes, as a single block, being organized by administrative methods in the production process. The state employed the worker in a specific place, specifies his rights, and it might need to consider his inclinations, if the authorities were reasonable enough, in order to achieve the highest possible performance. As for peasants, the state was "buying" from them a percentage of their crops at prices that it determined, and obligated them to purchase certain "public" services. In the early periods, peasant's farms were compelled to provide a certain number of them annually to the state to become workers in the cities. In addition, the peasants were being subjugated to generalized servitude, which resembles that of the Asiatic mode of production, in the form of public works. Moreover, the state imposed certain taxes on the**

products, not related to their cost; with the purpose of guaranteeing a predetermined income. This is not to mention the concentration camps, set up by order of Lenin<sup>(10)</sup>, reached its peak during Stalin's rule, and incarcerated millions; estimated to be 8-15 million people in 1942<sup>(11)</sup>.

This system, therefore, consisted of two classes: the upper bureaucracy and the forced laborers. All work was carried out under coercion. In addition, the striking laborer became subject to execution at the late 1920s<sup>(12)</sup>. Workers were not distributed among the various production sectors by bureaucratic decisions only, but also by indirect mechanisms, such as the types and quantities of taxes (for example, during the Khrushchev era, the livestock farmers were obliged to sell their products to the state at the price that it set, which meant their conversion from private producers into laborers for the state).

The fact that the bureaucracy is the only owner of the means of production compelled the workers to work for it. Moreover, the worker did not have the right to move from one job to another except after the approval of the state, because his employment contract was being done with the state not with the work place. The citizen had no right to work in other countries, except with a mandate from the state that shared his salary in this case. In all cases, he was not receiving a wage, but rather a ration (like soldier's portion of the daily food), which he had no right to bargain about it; rather he had to receive. In fact, the worker had no role in the determination of his income, was not allowed to bargain, as there was no labor market at all, but the state determined everything for him, according to its own calculations.

---

<sup>(10)</sup>Richard Pipes, *Lenin's Gulag*.

<sup>(11)</sup>Tony Cliff, *State Capitalism in Russia (1955/1974)*.

<sup>(12)</sup>*Ibid.*



**Under this system, the working class can not be considered proletariat, in the Marxist sense of the word for many causes. It did not pay surplus value to the state. The mode of bureaucratic exploitation prompted the state to employ the entire population; otherwise they will starve to death. Besides, the working class is not separated from the possession of the means of production; it cannot choose to work, and at the same time the state used non economic means to force it to work; including very dreadful ways. The state also controlled the movements of the workers, their fields of study and specialization... etc. The worker was just a "someone", working for the bureaucracy as the farmer in ancient Egypt used to work for the king, with some difference, as we will see.**

**In conclusion, the surplus was extracted from the workers as a whole in favor of the bureaucratic stratum as a legal personality; an institution. This method of looting was not related to the market mechanisms, but rather there was no market at all. The state imposed both wages and prices according to its goals, regardless of the cost. It was not concerned with the profit rate of each enterprise, not even the general profit rate in the first place, but rather it was concerned mainly with the stability of the system as a whole. The state in such system was more important than anything else: politics was first. Economic policy was an element in a policy aimed at securing the social system against both internal and external pressures, whatever the economic cost and losses. This was evident in what is called the inefficiency of the Soviet economy; economic projects were created in the service of the state policy, not for profit - making.**

**On the basis of this concept, we argue that the surplus in the bureaucratic society is the Generalized Labor Rent. The logic of the economic plan determines from the start the division of labor and the distribution of workers over the means of production. It also determines the quantity**

and quality of workers "consumption", the level of bureaucracy's income, and the rate and areas of capital accumulation. The plan determined everything, and the income of the members of the dominant class was determined according to their roles in developing and implementing the policies of the system as a whole. As for the exchange, it did not take place in a free market, but rather in a central market, which was under the control of the state and subject to the general plan, without regarding the cost, production price, or exchange value.

This surplus is not a surplus value, because it is not produced through buying and selling labor power, but is extracted through uneconomic ways; by coercion. However, it is not purely feudal surplus; rather, it is an intermediate form, having characters of both.

We call this the Modern Bureaucratic Mode of Production, which differs from the old bureaucratic systems - such as ancient Egypt - because the surplus in our case is extracted as a Generalized Labor Rent from the working class as a whole, not from its members as individuals, or from its divisions (for example, villages communities). Here the rate of exploitation of the individual workers varied, and there were even privileged workers who high wages, and workers who were receiving wages in establishments that were loss -making. But there was a generalized labor rent going to the state.

This system arose as a result of the Russian revolution with its dilemmas as we dealt with, and the conditions of Russia and its own social composition. This was not a historical inevitability in any way. Rather, the establishment of that system was the result of the balance of powers in Russia. It would have been certainly that things go differently if the Bolshevik revolution had failed for subjective reasons; even that might be better for Russia.

**The Soviet power had to extract the surplus from the peasants by coercion, because it was the only surplus that was available at the beginning. Meanwhile, the backward industry alongside the foreign blockade pushed the state to prioritize heavy industry at the expense of the consumer goods industry. This option led to achieving a high accumulation rate and a low rate of consumption. Besides; the wages were very low, with brutally suppressing the workers and forcing them to work, and prohibiting the work outside state sector, otherwise labor camps, especially most of the population were peasants, with a shortage of labor needed for rapid industrialization.**

**We consider this system a pre-capitalist socio – economic formation, not in the Marxist sense, but in the sense that it is less technologically advanced, based on backward forces of production, and its development had blocked after little decades. It is also less modernized than capitalism; the state imposed Marxism over the people as a religion, not allowed to be criticized or refused, so one is not able to think freely without the guidance of another (this is the definition Enlightenment presented by Kant). This is backing out secularism.**

**Despite achieving a great development of productive forces in the beginning, the formation of modern bureaucratic society implies a strong tendency for stagnation. It does not have a strong internal impulse to develop the means of production as quickly as it actually did (note that the high rate of China's growth began actually after starting transition to capitalism). Rather, western pressures and blockade were the biggest motivation for rapid growth. Moreover, the continuation of the bureaucratic system requires its success to maintain its isolation from the influence of the global market. So the extremely fast industrialization at the beginning, especially for machinery and equipment, arm**

industry in particular, was very concerned by the bureaucracy.

**The disintegration and disintegration of the bureaucratic system:**

Despite the development of rapid means of production in the Soviet Union, the bureaucracy failed to catch up with capitalism. The latter possesses a vast global market, a special internal mechanism for growth and stimulating development, and it was much more advanced than Russia. A costly conflict took place between the two parties. The capitalist countries sought vigorously to restore this part of the world that had almost left the global market. This prompted the Soviet bureaucracy to work to strengthen itself, which explains its focusing of the entire Soviet economy around the manufacture of weapons (while this did not happen in the socialist countries which the Soviet army was protecting, or benefited from the Cold War). This heavy cost of the army and armament placed enormous pressure over the Soviet resources, accelerating the collapse of the system.

In addition, the domination of the bureaucracy always leads immediately to great corruption, despite all laws and the instruments of oversight and control. As we aforementioned, this bureaucracy gives its members a margin for private movement in their implementation of the system policy, like any bureaucracy in general. With the growth of sources of the surplus, the private interests of the members of that class grow, over time. Hence, peripheries of the system ultimately achieve triumph over the institution as a whole, and this is what actually occurred for the bureaucratic systems. As the external pressures continued, the peripheries of the system; the new rich bureaucrats, met with capitalism abroad; hence, the capitalist transformation started. This process was gradually reinforced by the breakdown of the Iron Curtain, under the effect of the communication

**revolution and the public access to the conditions of the opposite world; the capitalist.. Then the bourgeois revolution came in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, while China had preceded a decade or more.**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**The summary of this analysis is that what actually took place in the socialist countries was a path which followed the situation of those countries at the time of their transformation to socialism. It was never the result of some errors or problems, neither in practice, nor - certainly - of foreign conspiracies as some Marxists claimed. The fact that the socialist revolution did not take place in the developed countries, as predicted by Marxism, was not a coincidence, but rather a challenge to the theory about the socialist revolution, and with it, all the predictions of Marx and Engels.**

**The idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat constitutes a fatal weakness in the Marxist socialist theory; it led to an ambiguous talk about the proletarian state; sometimes a state, a state - commune - and a state that vanishes because it is not needed. How can we imagine that "special bodies of armed men, prisons, etc." - in the words of Lenin - confiscates the means of production and then chooses for vanishing of its volition? How can such a state be a non -state at the same time, as described also by Lenin, except on paper? Then how can we imagine - assuming all good intentions - that the state of armed workers will not be an oppressive state, while peasants - in the case of Russia – account for 85% of the population?**

**This theory had been adhered to in the socialist revolutions following that of Russia: the party rulership on behalf of the working class, even in countries almost have no workers; so who represents this party?! How can**

**we imagine that this party state will be dissolved autonomously?**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**Because of failure of the socialist state, there was almost a consensus in the ranks of the socialists on the necessity of finding another socialist alternative in which the state is subjugated to the people, but there is no practical "recipe" yet for implementation. Practically speaking, we do not think that there can be a state that is subject to the people. Actually the good state is the dead state.**

**We end this section by referring to what is being said by the Marxists that the aforementioned socialism is not really socialism, but rather another system, which they called a bureaucratic workers' distorted state, state capitalism..etc. What we want to call attention to is that we also considered it (what does it refer to?) a stratified and bureaucratic system; but this is the Socialism as it had been implemented. It does nothing to say that another socialist ideal was not established, that history should achieve, just to deny the charges of socialism. Our goal was to analyze the actual reality, not the name: an autopsy.**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**‘Despite all the disasters, socialism had achieved great steps in the path of development and welfare for people who were markedly underdeveloped, and some of them were primitive in the full sense of the word. For example, we cannot imagine how the peoples of the Tatars and Central Asia could witness this modernization without socialism, as there were no other promising political currents. However, it is not easy to imagine what would happen to Russia and China without the socialist revolution. Would the bourgeoisie have achieved greater**

**freedom, welfare, and development for those peoples?  
Maybe'**