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UNIT I
Morality of Man

Sculpture by: Viktor Kallo
UNIT I
INTRODUCTION

Any great societal catastrophe involves a breakdown of the prevalent societal values, norms and structures of living and of course of the people themselves and their commitment to the culture of the time.

Human behavior is the heritage of western civilization. This includes the invention of philosophy by the ancient Greeks, the Judaeo-Christian tradition which gave us our moral framework and the ethical traditions of the major world religions. We evaluate all human behavior in this context including our own behavior and that of others.

Philosophy

Philosophers and religious leaders have throughout history written about ethical behavior. In doing so, they have provided guidance for leaders of society and for all citizens. Most agree that virtue is attainable by all men and women either through reason or faith.

Ancients

Socrates redirected philosophy from the study of nature to the study of man. He said that we are happy when our souls are in good condition. When we have good character, we respect tradition and the rights of others. Virtue is knowledge. We do good he argued, when we know what it is. We must know ourselves to live well.

Plato believed that the soul has rational, emotional, and sensory appetites. Reason is the best guide because it tells us what is best for us. Plato argued that the leaders of society should be philosophers, not ordinary citizens. Ideal reality as we know it will guide us to good behavior. Aristotle held that knowledge and understanding are central to the good. Justice is important, he argued, for a workable society. This does not include the Buddhist tradition and the other Asian and African traditions which have also contributed to the western system.

The Roman philosopher Epicurus argued that we are happy when we have balance in our lives between appetite and reason. Fear of death is baseless, wrongdoing others will lead to unhappiness. The virtues are necessary to peace of mind. Good is pleasure (of the mind.)

The Roman Stoics said we must develop self control and fortitude to overcome base emotions. A clear and unbiased thinker understands universal reason which is known to everyone.
Machiavelli, the first political scientist, said that men in general are untrustworthy and deceitful. Rules must make their subjects fear them in order to be ruled.

Middle Ages and Later

The King James Bible became influential after the invention of printing made it accessible to many people other than the Monks who had been copying the classics before that time. We can consider the Ten Commandments among the influential moral influences of that and this time.

Francis Bacon invented the scientific method which included observing, investigating, and recording the data of nature. This scientific enlightenment increased man's knowledge about the world around him. He said that goodness in men is the action of the will and is aided by good habits. The English philosopher Thomas Hobbes took a more pessimistic view. Conflict is natural for human society based on competition for glory, gold or power. He saw the potential for evil in an all-powerful or Leviathan state.

The German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, said that good will is the basis of our morality. Acts in themselves do not have a moral dimension. The criterion for morality is that any act is moral if it can be a universal law for all. This he called the CATEGORIAL IMPERATIVE.

Modern Europe

Bentham and Mill (hedonistic utilitarians) held that good is the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Moore (ideal utilitarians) Good is indefinable but is related to the idea of the idea. He moral is so "because of its total consequences." What is important is the results, not the intended results.

Friedrich Nietzsche believed that man is still evolving, that he will transcend the present system of morality and go "beyond good and evil." Martin Heidegger said that man's place in the universe is indeterminate and that existence is haphazard.

Montesquieu wrote that only a small country with ethnic homogeneity could achieve true democracy. He also described the concept of the balance of powers in government as the way to achieve a just government.

John Rawles defined distributive justice as justice for all in equal portions. The Intuitionists believed that virtue resides within man as a result of will, intention or predisposition. Utilitarians believed that the moral resides in acts and consequences, whatever the intent.
Frederic Bastiat wrote "The Law" in 1850 in France. It is the classic blueprint for a just society. Walter Williams wrote that it "created order in my thinking about liberty and just human conduct." Bastiat recognized that government can be the greatest single threat to liberty. You will see in this study of Soviet Russia how an out of control government sought to impose its idea of a classless society with total government ownership of production by force and deception on its citizens with disastrous results. You will see how and why at the end of the rule of the Communists signs began to appear all over Russia saying "SEVENTY TWO YEARS ON THE ROAD TO NOWHERE".

What are the roots and effects of human behavior? Why do people do the things they do? Why are some governments democratic, some dictatorial? It is important to remember that we human beings are a mix of matter and spirit, mind and body, biology and mentality. In this program we will examine the behavior of a deviant government and the dictator Joseph Stalin.

Modern genetics, biochemistry, and physiology experimentally probe the major biological mechanisms governing human behavior. These mechanisms include reward/pleasure, pleasure/pain, aggression, empathy, and fear. Research has also examined the human experience of killing whether of human beings or of animals, the Bystander effect, and ways to neutralize control the behavior. They have also looked at the things that influence our moral judgments on a biochemical level.

We know from experience that even people like Stalin are not always aggressive or violent. Their moods can vary. It is clear that there exists a complex bio-psychological balancing system in any person. We are only at the beginning of true understanding of human behavior in all its variations. Including the role of the perpetrator, collaborator, victim, and bystander.<

---
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UNIT I
Readings
THE NATURE OF MAN
"THE PRINCE"

Niccolo Machiavelli

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) ("The Prince") was an Italian statesman and writer who is regarded as the first political philosopher of modern times. Among his writings are: The Prince and The Art of War. He believed in government by the people but felt that the Italians of his day were unfit to rule themselves. He is concerned with the use and abuse of power.

This, then, gives rise to the question "whether it be better to be beloved than feared, or to be feared than beloved." It will naturally be answered that it would be desirable to be both the one and the other; but as it is difficult to be both at the same time, it is much more safe to be feared than to be loved when you have to choose between the two. For it may be said of men in general that they are ungrateful and fickle, dissemblers, avoiders of danger, and greedy of gain. So long as you shower benefits upon them, they are all yours; they offer you their blood, their substance, their lives, and their children, provided the necessity for it is far off; but when it is near at hand, then they revolt. And -the prince who relies upon their words, without having otherwise provided for his security, is ruined; for friendships that are won by rewards, and not by greatness and nobility of soul, although deserved, yet are not real, and cannot be depended upon in time of adversity.

Besides, men have less hesitation in offending one who makes himself beloved than one who makes himself feared; for love holds by a bond of obligation which, as mankind is bad, is broken on every occasion whenever it is for the interest of the obliged party to break it. But fear holds by the apprehension of punishment which never leaves men.

It being necessary then for a prince to know well how to employ the nature of the beasts, he should he able to assume both that of the fox and that of the lion; for while the latter cannot escape the traps laid for him, the former cannot defend himself against the wolves.

A prince should be a fox, to know the traps and snares; and a lion, to be able to frighten the wolves; for those who simply hold to the nature of the lion do not understand their business.

A sagacious prince then cannot and should not fulfill his pledges when their observance is contrary to his interest, and when the causes that induced him to pledge his faith no longer exist. If men were all good, then indeed this precept would be bad; but as men are naturally bad, and will not observe their faith toward you, you must, in the same way, not observe yours to them; and no prince ever yet lacked legitimate reasons with which to color his want of good faith. Innumerable modern examples could be given of this; and it could easily be shown how many treaties of peace and how many engagements, have been made null and void by the faithlessness of princes; and he who has best known how to play the fox has ever been the most successful.
THE NATURE OF MAN  
"MAN IS EVIL AND WARLIKE"

Thomas Hobbes

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) ("Man Is Evil and Warlike") was an English political philosopher whose critical and negative perceptions of man were often unpopular. In his famous work Leviathan he was so critical of his government that this work was condemned by the British House of Commons in 1666 and Behemoth was censored. He also wrote *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*.

From this equality of ability arises equality of hope in the attaining of our ends. And therefore if any two men desire the same thing, which nevertheless they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies, and in the way to their end, which is principally their own conservation, and sometimes their delectionation only, endeavor to destroy or subdue one another. And from hence it comes to pass that where an invader has no more to fear than another man's single power, if one plant, sow, build, or possess a convenient seat, others may probably be expected to come prepared with forces united to dispossess and deprive him, not only of the fruit of his labor, but also of his life or liberty. And the invader again is in the like danger of another.

And from this diffidence of one another there is no way for any man to secure himself so reasonable as anticipation—that is, by force or wiles to master the persons of all men he can, so long till he see no other power great enough to endanger him; and this is no more than his own conversation requires, and is generally allowed. Also, because there be some that take pleasure in contemplating their own power in the acts of conquest, which they pursue farther than their security requires, if others that otherwise would be glad to be at ease within modest bounds should not by invasion increase their power, they would not be able, long time, by standing only on their defense, to subsist. And by consequence, such augmentation of dominion over men being necessary to a man's conservation, it ought to be allowed him.

Again, men have no pleasure, but on the contrary, a great deal of grief, in keeping company where there is no power able to overawe them all. For every man looks that his companion should value him at the same rate he sets upon himself; and upon all signs of contempt or undervaluing naturally endeavors, as far as he dares (which among them that have no common power to keep them in quiet is far enough to make them destroy each other), to extort a greater value from his contemners by damage and from others by the example.

So that in the nature of man we find three principal causes of quarrel: first, competition; secondly, diffidence; thirdly, glory.
The first makes men invade for gain, the second for safety, and the third for reputation. The first use violence to make themselves masters of other men's persons, wives, children, and cattle; the second, to defend them; the third, for trifles, as a word, a smile, a different opinion, and any other sign of undervalue, either direct in their persons or by reflection in their kindred, their friends, their nation, their profession, or their name.

Hereby it is manifest that, during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war, and such a war as is of every man against every man.

"The Science of Evil"


Why do people do evil things? What mechanism of brain or body leads to events like the Holocaust, the Ukrainian Famine, the killing of one million Armenians in 1915, and so on? Neuroscientists examine this question by looking at brain functions with MRI's and brain scans. Psychologists examine it with such instruments as the Empathy Quotient. (1)

"Empathy is our ability to identify what someone else is thinking or feeling and to respond to their thoughts and feeling with an appropriate emotion." But, "Empathy erosion" leads to acts of evil against others because the perpetrators cannot imagine that the persons whom they victimize have been turned into objects in their view. Empathy in a person can be measured.

There is a consensus in brain science that at least ten regions of the human brain are part of the empathy circuit. The amygdale is the central part of this circuit because of its role in emotions.

(1) Baron-Cohen S., and Wheelwright S. The Empathy Quotient (EQ). An Investigation of Adults with Asperger Syndrome and high-functioning autism" Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders. 34, 163-175 92004)
THE NATURE OF MAN
"MAN IS RATIONAL"

John Locke

John Locke (1632-1704) ("Man Is Rational") was an English philosopher who believed in civil liberty, religious tolerance, the power of reason, and the value of experience. His works include: Essay Concerning Human Understanding; Two Treatises on Civil Government and Essays on the Law of Nature.

The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one, and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions.

Men living together according to reason without a common superior on earth, with authority to judge between them, are properly in the state of nature.
B. F. Skinner (b. 1904) ("Man Is a Product of His Environment") is a professor of psychology at Harvard and a researcher who has won several awards for his contributions in the area of human behavior. He is the author of Walden Two, Science and Human Behavior, Verbal Behavior, and Beyond Freedom & Dignity.

Q. Suppose that people who read your book, and take its message seriously, realize that they are controlled. Will they lose their feelings of freedom?

Skinner: I don't know. I certainly believe that my own behavior is entirely a function of three things—my genetic endowment, my past history as an individual (my family, my religious experience, my government, my schooling, the physical environment in which I have lived, and so on), and the present situation. I am absolutely sure that that is all there is in the determination of what I'm going to do at this very moment. But I don't feel discouraged or unhappy about it at all.

Q: You don't feel like a puppet?

Skinner: I don't feel the least bit like a puppet. Operant conditioning is not pulling strings to make a person dance. It is arranging a world in which a person does things that affect that world, which in turn affects him.

Q: When you come into the classroom and make children want to come to school, would you be controlling their behavior?

Skinner: That's right. A girl who teaches in a Kentucky sixth grade told me a good example. Her students were not doing their homework; they would not sit down and study; they ran around the room and talked a great deal. She decided to try some operant conditioning. Every Friday afternoon she held a lottery, and the child whose name was drawn out of a jar got a prize. Every Monday morning she would put the week's prize on the wall. One week it was a Halloween costume, another a transistor radio. Whenever a pupil brought in his homework, he could write his name on a ticket and drop it in the jar. Whenever he finished an assignment in class, he could do the same. The system changed the girl's life as a teacher completely. Her pupils did all their homework; they sat quietly and listened to her, because something she said might be just the thing they could use to get another ticket with their name in the jar.
Q: A number of your attackers charge that behavior modification is being used in China today, and they are horrified at the very thought that we might apply it that way in this country.

Skinner: Yes, it is said that the word "fascism" surfaces frequently in discussions of my book. The critics are usually good enough to say that I am not fascist, but that I give aid and comfort to fascism. But every fascist state I've heard of uses aversive control. Its citizens behave as the government dictates because they are afraid not to do so. I've spent my life looking for alternatives to punitive control and arguing in their favor. I oppose standard totalitarian techniques and I want people to feel free and enjoy what they're doing. But it may be true that I give aid and comfort to those who want to make any way of life more effective. What worries me is that in some curious way the struggle for freedom and dignity has made it impossible for us to take advantage of what we're discovering about human behavior. If that proves to be the case, there has been lethal mutation in our culture that may bring it to an end. A fascist way of life might then gain an advantage, but I'm doing what I can to prevent it.
SOURCES OF AGGRESSION

Aggression is so common that it can seem as a natural a part of human behavior as speaking or walking. Some theories have taken the view that aggression is universal in humans, an integral part of our nature. These theories have come both from psychoanalysis and biology, while social psychology has suggested that aggression is a reaction to the common human predicament of frustration.

Instinctual and Biological Theories

Many writers have viewed humanity as inherently violent and have suggested that human behavior is determined by instincts that are the result of natural selection. An instinct is an inborn behavior pattern that is common to all members of a biological species. Early explanations of human aggressive behavior relied upon this concept of instinct. Aggression was viewed as innate—and inevitable.

Freud's Theory

In Civilization and Its Discontents (1930), Sigmund Freud hypothesized that all humans possess a death instinct, an aggressive urge, that must sometimes be expressed. According to Freud, society's function is to control the expression of this death instinct, channeling the aggression into socially acceptable behaviors whenever possible. Playing football, for example, might be a socially acceptable substitute for more violent expressions of the death instinct. In developing his theory, Freud was influenced by the overwhelming violence in World War I. In trench warfare at Verdun, France, for example, over a million men were killed in a battle that decided nothing. To Freud it seemed that the death instinct had spilled out of the normal boundaries that it was out of control. However, there is no scientific evidence for the existence of a death instinct.

The Greek philosopher Aristotle believed that watching theatrical tragedies purged the viewers of their violent emotions and passions. Using this idea, Freud hypothesized that socially acceptable aggression could be used to reduce the tension produced by repression of the death instinct. (When people repress a thought, they unconsciously stop thinking about it and avoid remembering it.) He called this process by Aristotle's term, catharsis. Freud's idea of catharsis was later over generalized, and some writers suggested that anything you could do to "get it out of your system" would reduce your aggressiveness. Research, however, does not support this idea. A review of the literature in this area indicates that watching scenes of violence (such as on TV or a film), attacking inanimate objects (such as breaking a window), and verbally attacking others do not reduce aggressive behavior (Baron, 1983). In some cases these acts make people more aggressive. The idea that engaging in socially acceptable, aggressive sports — another form of catharsis — will make people generally less aggressive is also not true. Engaging in or observing aggressive sports or viewing media violence typically leads to increased rather than decreased aggression (Quayt, 1976). Aggression against others who have provoked one sometimes does lead to reduced aggression, but only for a short period, and even this effect has not been found in all studies (Baron, 1983).
Evidence supporting the idea of catharsis is outweighed by considerably more evidence showing that it either has no effect or actually leads to more aggression.

Freud's theory of a death instinct has not stood the test of time, and his theory of the beneficial effects of the direct expression of hostility is also unsupported by the research data. But his theory of the relationship between aggression and humor is still viable. Freud argued that although people repress their aggressive urges, these urges constantly strive for expression, and when they can be expressed in a socially acceptable manner, they will be. Is aggressive humor funnier than nonaggressive humor? In one study a group of people, both students and nonstudents, were asked to rank a series of cartoons from the New Yorker magazine according to their funniness. A second group ranked the cartoons according to their aggressiveness. There was a strong correlation between the two rankings. Aggressive cartoons were thought to be funnier (McCauley, Woods, Coolidge, & Kulick, 1983). Freud's theory is not the only one that predicts this outcome, though, and the data do not conclusively show that his theory is better than others on this point. As the authors of this study note, "Serious study of the non-serious is no laughing matter."

**Ethology**

The study of animal behavior patterns is called ethology. In *King Solomon's Ring* (1952), Konrad Lorenz, one of ethology's founders, described an incident involving two mourning doves confined to a small cage. While Lorenz was away one of the birds pecked the other to death, a feat that must have required several hundred pecks, since the birds were small and not strong. Lorenz realized that such attacks rarely lead to death in natural settings because the victim can flee its attacker. He reasoned that fighting between members of a species such as the mourning dove serves to scatter its members, thus allowing them to take better advantage of land and food resources. Aggression has also been credited with promoting the survival of the fittest animals, with only the quickest or strongest mating and carrying on the species.

Lorenz suggested that humans have a basic aggressive instinct and that this instinct enables the human species to survive. According to his theory, aggression has become undesirable in humans because we have developed weapons that may have catastrophic consequences. He suggested that animals born with powerful weapons, such as huge jaws or claws, are genetically programmed with inhibitory mechanisms that stop them from killing each other. When two wolves fight, for example, the loser at a critical point deliberately bares his throat, whereupon the victor stops attacking. Lorenz argued that, although we have developed powerful weapons, humans have no such inhibitory mechanism to control their use.

Like Freudian theory, the ethological position presents a sweeping theory of human aggression. But humans fight for a much wider range of reasons than do animals, and human aggression is affected by cultural factors. This does not deny that there are biological influences on human aggression. The physiological processes of aggression may be the same in humans and other mammals. But in humans these processes interact with higher mental processes, especially with people's past learning and with their appraisal of a situation (Lagerspetz, 1981). Even when a biological condition, such as the presence of androgens in the bloodstream, is shown to have specific effects on the aggressive behavior of animals such as rats, the results cannot be directly
generalized to humans because of the moderating influence of social learning and thought (Benton, 1981).

Identical aggressive behavior in humans can have different causes. Ignoring the effects of culture and social learning upon humans leads to what has been called the "myth of the beast," the idea that we are just like our less complex relations in the animal world.

Frustration and Aggression

A common-sense explanation of Jack McGarrity’s fighting in the football game is that he was frustrated. His team was losing, he was upset, his father was yelling at him, and he was being hit. It was just too much. When the pile-up brought him face-to-face with a boy on the other team, he started a fight.

The idea that frustration leads to aggression was introduced in 1939 by a group of psychologists at Yale University (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939). They defined frustration as the blocking of goal-directed activity. People want or expect their actions to lead to a certain goal or reward, and something or someone gets in the way. The theorists proposed the frustration-aggression hypothesis initially suggesting that frustration is the only cause of aggression. Whether or not one inhibited aggression following frustration depended upon the amount of punishment one expected as a consequence of the aggression: "...all frustrating situations do not produce overt aggression. Few arrested motorists jeer at policemen; guests at formal dinners do not complain when the meat is tough; German Jews do not strike Nazi storm troopers." (p. 32). According to Dollard and his colleagues, if people could get away with it, aggression would follow frustration.

If people cannot directly attack the source of their frustration, they will show displaced aggression, directed toward some person or thing other than the source of frustration.

Though frustrated people may indeed behave aggressively, they may also react in other ways. They may become resigned or depressed, or may vow to overcome the source of their frustration. Intense frustration often does lead to aggression, but low or moderate frustration does not (Harris, 1974). Given a frustrating situation, whether aggression is specifically encouraged or discouraged has important consequences.

Frustration is more likely to lead to aggression if the inhibitions against aggression are weak (Geen & Berkowitz, 1967) or if the person thinks that aggression is appropriate in the situation (Burstein & Worchel, 1962). Football players usually do not fight during games, where fighting is specifically discouraged and the participants are likely to be ejected from the game. By contrast, fighting between players during hockey games is a common occurrence. It is more or less expected, and the punishment for fighting is less severe — one is merely benched for a short period.

Frustration can lead to aggression, then, but does not necessarily do so. One of the factors that influences whether people will become aggressive following frustration is their past learning history.
Learning to be Aggressive

Mr. McGarrity reinforced his son's aggressive behavior at the football game. The rougher Jack played, the louder his father cheered. He punished Jack by yelling at him when the team was losing. He also modeled aggression by arguing with other parents and shouting insults at the referees and the other players. Jack probably had many opportunities to see his father behaving aggressively. He may have been rewarded many times for aggression and punished for nonaggressive behavior. He came to the understanding that when the going got rough, he could "solve" the problem by fighting.
THE MILGRAM "SHOCK" EXPERIMENT
Stanley Milgram

The Holocaust forces us to ask how people could obey orders that ended in the murder of millions of people. The issue of mass obedience has produced heated debate. Stanley Milgram's controversial laboratory research described below was designed to compare German and American levels of obedience. Milgram found a human capacity to obey destructive orders that had little to do with any instinct for aggression. He used Hannah Arendt's phrase, "the banality of evil," to describe the results of the experiment. In the experiment, ordinary persons imparted electric shocks to the victims not from any aggressive tendencies but out of a sense of obligation. Thus, ordinary people, by simply doing their jobs, chose to participate in a destructive process.

The Nazi [murder] of European Jews is the most extreme instance of...immoral acts carried out by thousands of people in the name of obedience. Yet in lesser degree this type of thing is constantly recurring: ordinary citizens are ordered to destroy other people, and they do so because they consider it their duty to obey orders...In order to take a close look at the act of obeying. I set up a simple experiment at Yale University. Eventually, the experiment was to involve more than a thousand participants and would be repeated at several universities...Two people come to a psychology laboratory to take part in a study of memory and learning. One of them is designated as a "teacher" and the other a "learner." The experimenter explains that the study is concerned with the effects of punishment on learning. The learner is conducted into a room, seated in a chair, his arms strapped to prevent excessive movement, and an electrode attached to his wrist. He is told that he is to learn a list of word pairs; whenever he makes an error, he will receive electric shocks of increasing intensity.

The real focus of the experiment is the teacher. After watching the learner being strapped into place, he is taken into the main experimental room and seated before an impressive shock generator. Its main feature is a horizontal line of thirty switches, ranging from 15 volts to 450 volts, in 15 volts increments. There are also verbal designations which range from SLIGHT SHOCK to DANGER—SEVERE SHOCK. The teacher is told that he is to administer the learning test to the man in the other room. When the learner responds correctly, the teacher moves on to the next item; when the other man gives an incorrect answer, the teacher is to give him an electrical shock. He is to start at the lowest shock level (15 volts) and to increase the level each time the man makes an error, going through 30 volts, 45 volts, and so on.

The "teacher" is a genuinely naive subject who has come to the laboratory to participate in an experiment. The learner, or victim, is an actor who actually receives no shock at all. The point of the experiment is to see how far a person will proceed in a...situation in which he is ordered to inflict increasing pain on a protesting victim. At what point will the subject refuse to obey the experimenter?
Conflict arises when the man receiving the shock begins to indicate that he is experiencing discomfort. At 75 volts, the "learner" grunts. At 120 volts he complains verbally; at 150 he demands to be released from the experiment. His protests continue as the shocks escalate, growing increasingly vehement and emotional. At 285 volts his response can only be described as an agonized scream...

For the subject, the situation is not a game; conflict is intense and obvious. On one hand, the...suffering of the learner presses him to quit. On the other, the experimenter, a legitimate authority to whom the subject feels some commitment, enjoins him to continue. Each time the subject hesitates to administer shock, the experimenter orders him to continue... There are, of course, enormous differences between carrying out the orders of a commanding officer during times of war and carrying out the orders of an experimenter. Yet...one may ask in a general way: How does a man behave when he is told by a legitimate authority to act against a third individual?...

A reader's initial reaction to the experiment may be to wonder why anyone in his right mind would administer even the first shocks. Would he not simply refuse and walk out of the laboratory? But the fact is that no one ever does. Since the subject has come to the laboratory to aid the experimenter, he is quite willing to start off with the procedure...Despite the fact that many subjects experience stress, despite the fact that many protest to the experimenter, a substantial proportion continue to the last shock on the generator.

Many subjects will obey the experimenter no matter how vehement the pleading of the person being shocked, no matter how painful the shocks seem to be, and no matter how much the victim pleads to be let out....

A commonly offered explanation is that those who shocked the victim at the most severe level were monsters, the sadistic fringe of society. But if one considers that almost two-thirds of the participants fall into the category of "obedient" subjects, and that they represented ordinary people...the argument becomes very shaky. Indeed, it is highly reminiscent of the issue that arose in connection with Hannah Arendt's 1963 book, Eichmann in Jerusalem. Arendt contended that the prosecution's effort to depict Eichmann as a sadistic monster was fundamentally wrong, that he came closer to being an uninspired bureaucrat who simply sat at his desk and did his job...it was felt that the monstrous deeds carried out by Eichmann required a brutal, twisted, and sadistic personality...After witnessing hundreds of ordinary people submit to the authority in our own experiments, I must conclude that Arendt's conception of the banality of evil comes closer to the truth than one might dare imagine. The ordinary person who shocked the victim did so out of a sense of obligation—...—and not from any peculiarly aggressive tendencies.

This is, perhaps, the most fundamental lesson of our study: ordinary people, simply doing their jobs, and without any particular hostility on their part, can become agents in a terrible destructive process. Moreover, even when the destructive effects of their work become...clear, and they are asked to carry out actions incompatible with fundamental standards of morality, relatively few people have the resources needed to resist authority.
UNIT I
Activities
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Investigate some classic approaches explaining human behavior. Discuss:

1. Is a human being intrinsically good or bad?
2. Do we need to be controlled by authority?
3. Why do we accept authority?
4. Under what circumstances is authority necessary?
5. What insights can be gained from studying these philosophers and scientists?
6. How do the thoughts of people writing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries apply to our present condition?
REVIEWING PHILOSOPHY

To familiarize students with predominant philosophers' views on morality, with their attempts to understand and explain the roots and meaning of morality.

Discussion:

Suggested questions:

- If you are Mother Theresa-like person, what philosopher will you cite as your mentor? Why?
- What arguments justify aggressive behavior with intent to subdue other people or nations?
- What is the commonness of the Philosopher’s views?

Have each student choose one philosopher (or type of philosophy) to study more in depth. Each student should write an essay utilizing this outline.

a. Life of the individual
b. Main ideas
c. Relevance to my life

Utilize any of the following websites:

- Philosophers Index - http://www.ovid.com/site/catalog/DataBase/155.jsp
- Major Topics in Philosophy - http://erraticimpact.com/
- Philosophy Ideas Database - http://philosophyideas.com/

Or — Google the name of one of the philosophers discussed in Part A of Unit I above.

My Choice

My essay (use additional pages)
HUMAN NATURE: OPINION SURVEY

What do you think about the nature of human beings? Are we born good or evil—or with a "blank page"? Based on your reading and on your own thinking, complete the survey below.

Respond to each of the following statements with:

(AS) Agree Strongly  (D) Disagree
(A) Agree  (DS) Disagree Strongly

1. Life is a constant struggle. Those not powerful enough to rise to the top deserve whatever they get.

2. Most people are more likely to do evil rather than good.

3. Most people are weak and lazy.

4. Most people cannot handle freedom.

5. Most people would prefer miracles rather than depend on the fruits of their own hard labor.

6. Most people need something to worship.

7. We should not hold high expectations about the capacity of people for compassion and kindness to each other.

8. Most people would prefer not to make difficult decisions involving good and evil and the way in which society operates.

9. Most people are likely to conform rather than to maintain their individuality.

10. Most people cannot be trusted.

11. Most people are indifferent and uninvolved about issues that involve social responsibility.

12. Most people would want to avoid truth because it can cause pain.

13. Since conscience can cause personal suffering, most people do not act from conscience.

14. War is the natural outgrowth of human nature.

15. Most people need an authority to tell them what to do.

Given your responses, summarize your own feelings about human nature and behavior.

HAVE YOU EVER...?

Answer yes or no to each of the following questions.

Answer truthfully. It is for your eyes only!

Have you ever:

1. Overheard a joke that made fun of a person of a different ethnic background, race, religion, or sexual orientation?

2. Been the target of name calling because of your ethnic group, race, religion, gender or sexual orientation?

3. Made fun of someone different than you?

4. Left someone out of an activity because they are different than you?

5. Not been invited to attend an activity or social function because many of the people there are different from you?

6. Engaged in stereotyping (lumping together all people of a particular race, religion, or sexual orientation? (Ex. White men can't jump.)

7. Been threatened by someone different from you because of your difference?

8. Committed an act of violence against someone because that person is different from you?

Copied from 2003 Anti-Defamation League
MILGRAM
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Describe the Milgram "shock" experiment.
2. Did the participants feel uneasy about what they were doing? Erich Fromm in his book, Anatomy of Destructiveness, has suggested that we should emphasize the difficulty people had in obeying Milgram's orders.
3. What do you think would have been your reaction if you had been the teacher? How does the issue of "responsibility" play a role in the subject's decision to shock the learner?
4. Is the capacity for obedience an innate part of human nature? Can humans be taught to disobey orders that lead to the infliction of pain on others? How could this be done?
5. Are there times when it is important or necessary to obey without question or hesitation? Give examples.
6. What is meant by the "banality of evil"?
Suggested Questions for Discussion or Assessment:

1. Give examples of psychological experience other to cause or solve problem.
2. Can feelings of enjoyment and reinforcement be achieved by abusive behavior? Give examples.
3. Because pain is the major instrument for breaking human will, do you think that training for pain tolerance should be promoted?
4. Do you think that constant avoidance of pain makes people weaker?
5. What kind of people can and cannot be torturers?
6. Why is aggression relevant to the mass murder?
7. Why are people attracted to aggressive sports, like ultimate fight and boxing?
8. Are you attracted (or not) to these sports and why?
9. What is your opinion about gladiatorial games in ancient Rome?
10. Do you think that aggressive sports discharge destructive impulses?
11. Do you think that a mass murder/aggression might be perceived as attractive by many who might be recruited as willing perpetrators?
12. Do you see 300 Spartans who killed 20,000 Persian invaders as trained mass murderers or as heroes? Explain.
13. Consider a case when a mobster-murderer, who is in fact already an outlaw, is condemned (for whatever reason) to elimination by a mob’s council. Would you consider the executioner of thus condemned mobster a murderer, a vigilante, or just a violator of a due process?
14. Do you understand the difference between Killing and Murder? Please, explain and give examples.
15. If the law is the law of Nazi Germany, is a lawful killing a murder?
16. Was Hitler more loyal to his followers than Stalin?
17. Is the human animal intrinsically good or bad?
18. Do we need to be controlled by authority?
19. What insights can be gained from studying philosophers and scientists?
COMPARING

This unit has focused on philosophical and scientific theories of human behavior. It has included an overview of philosophy and religion with selected readings. The following statements are based on the thinkers referenced above.

Indicate which are referenced as follows:

1=Freud  2=Lorenz  3=Milgram  4=Jung  5=Darwin  6=Hannah Arendt
7=Socrates 8=Uncertain 9=Kant 10=G. Moore 11=Nietzsche 12=Machiavelli
13=Hobbes 14=Locke 15=Skinner

Man is by nature aggressive.  __________
Most people obey authority automatically.  __________
In some places, immoral acts have been carried out by large crowds.  __________
The banality of evil means ordinary people can do bad things.  __________
Philosophy is the study of man.  __________
Reason in our best guide to behavior.  __________
We are happy when we have a balance between reason and appetite.  __________
A clear thinker understands universal reason.  __________
Most world religions agree on the golden rule.  __________
An act is good if it can be a universal rule for all.  __________
Humans must progress “beyond good and evil.”  __________
The leviathan state is potentially evil.  __________
Man is naturally good.  __________
A leader is able to inspire both love and fear.  __________
A leader must be opportunistic.  __________
Conflict is necessary in civil society.  __________
We are all aware of power.  __________
The state of nature has a law which is reason.  __________
Men naturally live together in a state of reason.  __________
Human behavior is altered by stimuli and responses.  __________
UNIT II
Totalitarianism, Genocide and Communism
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UNIT II
INTRODUCTION

This unit examines forms of government in general so that students may be prepared to review the government that was set up in Russia after the 1917 revolution which led to a government led by the party of Lenin, the Bolsheviks. Students will compare various forms of government from democratic to dictatorial. They will also learn about the totalitarian form which came to prominence in the twentieth century.

Students by studying forms of government are better able to understand totalitarianism which produced the Soviet system and to arrive at a greater understanding of the nature of good government as exemplified in the western democracies and especially our American democracy and as a vehicle of freedom and opportunity for all Americans.
UNIT II
Readings
TOTALITARIANISM & COMMUNISM

The Soviet Union under Stalin was a totalitarian form of government. Totalitarians were a twentieth century creation. It is a system which recognizes no limits to its authority. Citizens are property of the state and basically have no rights. The government regulates every aspect of a person's life. These regimes stay in power by persuading the people through control of all media that the state can solve all problems because it has the knowledge and the resources to do so. Hitler was a totalitarian dictator who needed Dr. Joseph Goebbels to continually "educate" the German people about the achievements of the government under Der Fuehrer. The propaganda mechanism includes restrictions on and regulation of speech, of meetings and gatherings, of family life and structure, and widespread use of terror. All of these things were in evidence during Stalin's rule and did not relax until his death in 1953. Even then it was not much better until the era in Russia of perestroika and glasnost under Mikhail Gorbachev.

The totalitarian regime controls every aspect of life including the economy, work, education, the arts, science, private life and morals, marriage, child rearing, and so on. There is also usually a cult of personality in which the ruler or ruling group of a few individuals (e.g. the Politburo in Russia) makes all the decisions.

Historians debate the reasons for the collapse of the Soviet System. Many believe that the downfall began because of the policies of President Reagan.

It began on June 7, 1982 at a private Vatican meeting between President Reagan and Pope John Paul II. The two men were alone for 50 minutes and the subject of their discussion was Poland and the Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. The two men shared the belief that atheistic Communism lived a lie that, when fully understood, must ultimately fail. Both also shared the remarkable experience of almost dying at the hand of an assassin — and miraculously surviving the ordeal.

Others argue that the system of Soviet communism had been declining for years and that the Brezhnev era clearly indicated signs of weakness in the social structure of the nation. There are significant amounts of absenteeism from work, of alcoholism and of crime beginning at that point in time.

Stalin controlled the media of print and film. During the time of the Revolution in Russia, Soviet cinema reached a very high aesthetic point. The films of Eisenstein, Pudovkin and were renowned throughout the world. Stalin was something of an intellectual who was interested in literature and film.
TOTALITARIANISM & GENOCIDE

Here is a clear explanation of the eight stages of genocide which are indicative of the relation of this topic to the government form known as totalitarianism.

Genocide is a process that develops in eight stages that are predictable but not inexorable. At each stage, preventive measures can stop it. The later stages must be preceded by the earlier stages, though earlier stages continue to operate throughout the process.

See this website:
http://drp.lifestreamcenter.net/Lessons/genocide/8 stages. html# CLASSIFIC A TION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight Definitive Parts of Genocide</th>
<th>Examples of Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFICATION:</td>
<td>Separate one group from another making a clear difference between one and the others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cultures have categories to distinguish people into &quot;us and them&quot; by ethnicity, race, religion, or nationality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOLIZATION:</td>
<td>Placing labels on a group to set them apart from the others shows symbolization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We give names or other symbols to the classifications. Classification and symbolization are universally human and do not necessarily result in genocide unless they lead to the next stage, dehumanization. When combined with hatred, symbols may be forced upon unwilling members of pariah groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEHUMANIZATION:</td>
<td>When one group is treated less than human and there are clearly no human rights at all dehumanization is shown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One group denies the humanity of the other group. Members of it are equated with animals, vermin, insects or diseases. Dehumanization overcomes the normal human revulsion against murder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION:</td>
<td>When a group of people take the liberty of others away usually by force with plans to harm them there is an organization of hate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genocide is always organized, usually by the state, though sometimes informally or by terrorist groups. Special army units or militias are often trained and armed. Plans are made for genocidal killings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLARIZATION:</td>
<td>When people use hate, violence, torture and any other means to keep the people separated there is polarization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremists drive the groups apart. Hate groups broadcast polarizing propaganda. Extremist terrorism targets moderates, intimidating and silencing the center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION:</td>
<td>When humans become victims and that group keeps being victimized over and over, preparation is shown. There is no mistake over the treatment of the victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims are identified and separated out because of their ethnic or religious identity. Death lists are drawn up. Members of victim groups are forced to wear identifying symbols. They are often segregated into ghettos, forced into concentration camps, or confined to a famine-struck region and starved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE HISTORY OF GENOCIDE

Although the term genocide was coined in the twentieth century, it describes a phenomenon that is as old as recorded history. Baillot (1912, 151-152) tells us that genocides were common in predynastic Egypt; the Assyrians (Chalk and Jonassohn 1990, 58-61) claim to have practiced it, if we are to accept their own reports; and several cases are to be found in the Old Testament (Chalk and Jonassohn 1990, 61-63).

The Old Testament contains several quite specific descriptions that are of interest to us. The Amalekites are reported to have been annihilated several times, which might raise questions about the historical accuracy of the reports or about the completeness with which the annihilations were carried out. Our interest is not so much in these details as in the style in which they were reported. That style allows us to conclude that the physical destruction of the entire people of defeated opponents was not unusual at that time, nor that it evoked any humanitarian outrage. The victims seemed to have accepted their fate as the usual lot of the losers at the same time as they were lamenting their losses.

The origins of genocide are shrouded in the unrecorded past. In antiquity, because it is always reported in connection with wars, we can make an educated guess about its roots. City-states and empires were very small by modern standards; many of them were located in the so-called golden triangle, the modern Middle East. The geopolitical dimensions of this area seemed to have been designed to produce almost continuous warfare. The valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates are very fertile with few natural boundaries. The region lies across the trade routes between Asia, Europe, and Africa. Similar criteria apply to the Nile Valley. Thus, opportunities for competition and conflicts leading to wars seemed to be ever present. However, these wars initially did not settle anything; the defeated party went home, recruited and trained another army, produced more and sometimes better weapons, and then returned to fight another war in order to recoup losses and wreak revenge. It did not take much imagination for someone to decide that the only way to preserve a victory was to annihilate the vanquished enemy entirely, not only the combat forces.

The states in the fertile crescent were extraordinarily labor intensive because their fertile valleys required elaborate irrigation systems; because the large number of gods they worshipped all required temples; and because few rulers were content with the palaces of their predecessors and therefore spent huge resources on new palaces, or burial sites in Egypt, to glorify their reign. Thus, the new realization that the captives of a conquered enemy were much more useful as slaves than as corpses became widespread in the area.
Genocides continued to be performed by states and empires in order to eliminate a real or perceived threat, in order to terrorize a real or imaginary enemy, or in order to acquire economic resources that others owned but which could not be carried off as loot or booty. These three motives were usually present at the same time, although one of them tended to predominate in any particular situation. Of course, the farther we go back into the past, the more difficult it becomes to obtain evidence of the motives of the perpetrators.

In antiquity it is particularly difficult to account for the fates of peoples. From inscriptions, clay tablets, and parchments we know a great many names of peoples about whom hardly anything else is known. Even when we know something of their history, some of them have disappeared without our knowing what happened to them. The classic illustration is the story of the Hittites who are well known to us from scripture and Egyptian records (Chalk and Jonassohn 1990,60-61). We know that they conquered their neighbors and built an empire that competed with Assyria and Egypt. Then they disappeared from history without a trace. In fact, it is only in modern times that the remains of their capital were discovered; it had been burned to the ground and cursed to prevent it from being resettled. Their writing was deciphered, and the peace treaty that they negotiated with Ramses II was decoded. However, we still have no idea what happened to the Hittite people. Were they dispersed to other areas? Did they assimilate into the culture of their conquerors? Or were they slaughtered? Only the development of an archeology of genocide holds any promise of solving that riddle.

The history of empires, right into the modern period, is punctuated by periodic persecutions, sometimes escalating into genocides, which were performed either to build up an empire or to maintain it. One of the important characteristics of these types of genocides is that the victim groups were always located outside the perpetrator society, physically and socially. The campaigns of Athens against Melos, of Rome against Carthage, of Genghis Kahn against several peoples (Chalk and Jonassohn 1990,), and of the Crusaders against populations of Antioch and Jerusalem (Runciman 1962), may serve as examples.

Some believe that genocide has become the ultimate human rights problem of the modern world. The term genocide was first used by Raphael Lemkin in 1944 during World War II, in which more civilians had died than soldiers. Lemkin, a professor of law in Poland who escaped the Nazis, used the term to describe a "...coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves." Raphael Lemkin (1900-1959) devoted his life to a single goal: the outlawing of a crime so extraordinary that language had not yet recognized its existence. In 1944, Lemkin made one step towards his goal when he created the word "genocide" which meant, in his words, "the destruction of a nation or an ethnic group." While he had lived long enough to see his word popularized and the Genocide Conventions adopted by most of the world, recent history serves as a reminder that laws and treaties are not enough to prevent genocide. On December 9, 1948, the United Nations adopted the Genocide Convention, which defined genocide as follows:
...genocide means any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

While the limitation of Lemkin's definition is its broad nature, that of the United Nations has been criticized as being both broad and narrow (Totten, Parsons, Charny, 1997, p. xxiv). Because neither of these definitions has satisfied many who have sought to apply them to very serious acts against groups of people, we are now confronted with many definitions of genocide, a phenomenon that can be puzzling to young people who are seeking their own set of criteria to help them evaluate the numerous violations of human rights around the world today.

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

1) Killing members of the group;
2) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
3) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
4) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
5) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.
DEFINITIONS OF GENOCIDE

Genocide is the mass killing of substantial numbers of human beings, when not in the course of military action against the military forces of an avowed enemy, under conditions of the essential defenselessness and helplessness of the victims.

Genocidal Massacre - Mass killing as defined above in the generic definition of genocide but in which the mass murder is on a smaller scale, i.e., smaller numbers of human beings killed.

Intentional Genocide - Genocide on the basis of an explicit intention to destroy a specific targeted victim group, (ethnic/religious/racial/national/political/biological or other), in whole or in substantial part.

To establish first, second, or third degree of genocide, evaluate extent of:

- Premeditation
- Totality or single-mindedness of purpose
- Resoluteness to execute policy
- Efforts to overcome resistance
- Devotion to bar escape of victims
- Persecutory cruelty

Specific Intentional Genocide - refers to intentional genocide against a specific victim group.

Multiple Intentional Genocide - refers to intentional genocide against more than one specific victim group at the same time or in closely related or contiguous actions.

Omnicide - refers to simultaneous intentional genocide against numerous races, nations, religions, etc.

Genocide in the Course of Colonization or Consolidation of Power - Genocide that is undertaken or even allowed in the course of or incidental to the purposes of achieving a goal of colonization or development of a territory belonging to an indigenous people, or any other consolidation of political or economic power through mass killing of those perceived to be standing in the way.

Genocide in the Course of Aggressive ("Unjust") War - Genocide that is undertaken or even allowed in the course of military action by a known aggressive power, e.g. Germany and Japan in World War II, for the purpose of or incidental to a goal of aggressive war, such as massive destruction of civilian centers in order to vanquish an enemy in war.
**War Crimes Against Humanity** - Crimes committed in course of military actions against military targets, or in treatment of war prisoners, or in occupation policies against civilian populations which involve overuse or force or cruel and inhuman treatment and which result in unnecessary mass suffering or death.

**Genocide as a Result of Ecological Destruction and Abuse** - Genocide that takes place as a result of criminal destruction or abuse of the environment, or negligent failure to protect against known ecological and environmental hazards, such as accidents involving radiation and waste from nuclear installations, uncontrolled smog, or poisonous air owing to industrial pollution, pollution of water supplies, etc.

**“Cultural Genocide”** - Intentional destruction of the culture of another people, not necessarily including destruction of actual lives included in original UN definition of genocide but may include separation of families, prevention of learning and the passing on mores of a people.

**Ethnocide** - Intentional destruction of an ethnic group not always including destruction of actual lives, but may include disbursement of the people and elimination of their culture.

**Linguicide** - Forbidding the use of or other intentional destruction of the language of another people - a specific dimension of ethnocide.

**ALTERNATIVE DEFINITIONS OF GENOCIDE**

**UN:** Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

**Charmy:** The wanton murder of a group of human beings on the basis of any identity whatsoever that they share — national, ethnic, racial, religious, political, geographical, ideological. Legal warfare is not included in this definition.

**Horowitz:** A structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus. Different from assassination which is the sporadic and random act of people seeking power who eliminate major figures in a government in an effort to gain power illegally.

**Chalk and Jonassohn:** A form of one-sided mass killing in which a state or other authority intends to destroy a group, as that group and membership in it are defined by the perpetrators.
**Fein:** A series of purposeful actions by a perpetrator(s) to destroy collectivity through mass or selective murders of group members and suppressing the biological and social reproduction of the collectivity. This can be accomplished through the imposed proscription or restriction of reproduction of group members, increasing infant mortality, and breaking the linkage between reproduction and socialization of children in the family or group of origin. The perpetrator may represent the state of the victim, another state, or another collectivity.

**New Jersey Commission on Holocaust:** Any tragic events that results in the murder of a specified group of people or the destruction of them as a people as seen in the case of the Native American (reservation and white schools) and slavery loss of names, families, values, etc.
UNIT II
Activities
GENOCIDE

Essential Issue: What are the definitions of genocide and what is the history of the word?

Objectives:

1) The students will know the basic definition of genocide while learning many alternative definitions.
2) The students will know how and when the word "genocide" came into use and who coined the term.

Background: With few exceptions, most teachers who address the issue of genocide focus on the Holocaust. In many ways, this is understandable. First, the Holocaust is one of the most (if not the most) documented events in the history of humanity. Second, and this is obviously related to the first point, a plethora of books, essays, first-person accounts, films, curricula, teacher guides, and other adjunct materials are available for use by teachers. Third, numerous documentaries, feature films, and television miniseries on the Holocaust have captured the interest of educators and students alike, thus creating a strong "constituency" for focusing on the tragedy of the Holocaust. Fourth, the Holocaust was perpetrated by a Western nation against its own citizens and people of neighboring countries, providing a focal point that is of great interest to other Westerners. Fifth, many survivors of the Holocaust live in the United States, and teachers and students with access to them have been extremely moved by their stories. Sixth, the recent establishment of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has generated a tremendous interest in the subject.

Some teachers and students may be interested in founding a student-led Amnesty International Adoption group. In such groups, students work on the behalf of prisoners of conscience across the globe. Although the main focus of such groups is a wide range of human rights violations and not only genocide, such work provides students with powerful insights into problems faced by nations and individuals across the globe, some of which lead to genocidal acts.

Finally, when studying any genocide, it is imperative never to forget that behind the massive and frequently numbing statistics of the dead are individuals—men, women, and children; mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, grandmothers and grandfathers, nieces and nephews, aunts and uncles. As this writer has written elsewhere, to comprehend the enormity of genocide, any study must move "from a welter of statistics, remote places and events, to one that is immersed in the 'personal' and 'particular.'"

Most other genocides perpetrated in this century appear to have been consigned to a black hole of forgetfulness in the schools.
Why? Many genocides do not have any constituency, let alone a strong constituency, calling attention to them. Very few materials addressing such genocides have been designed for use in secondary schools. Many high school teachers—not being specialists in particular periods of history, geographical areas, or the field of genocide studies—are, understandably, not aware of such events with the possible exception of those perpetrated during their lifetimes. Moreover, the issues inherent in each genocidal event are complex, and it is not easy to ascertain the antecedents that led up to and culminated in the genocides.

**Key Terms:** (should be known at conclusion of instruction)

- Genocide
- Atrocity
- Editorial cartoon

**Materials:** Reading included with lesson plan. *(Reading #1)*

**Procedures:** Teacher will first have student read definitions and discuss questions listed at end of reading in a guided learning environment.

**Extension Activities:** Discuss the topic at home and prepare a paper regarding the responses of family and friends. Prepare a map where current genocides according to the student's definition are occurring today.

**Assessment:** The teacher should present a past or current atrocity and ask the students to first write their response to the question – Does this atrocity fit your definition? What is the justification for their answer? *(Assessment #1)* The teacher should allow for a debate between the pro and con sides of the issue.

The students will develop their own working definition of the word and be able to use it when reviewing past and current atrocities.

Were there any common concepts in each definition?

Have student react to editorial cartoon. *(Assessment #2)*
TOWER OF HATE

Student Objective:

1. To explore the extent of reputed cases of genocide around the world now and in the past.

Materials:

1. Tower of Hate — handout for each student.
2. Definition of Genocide copy for each student

In the Classroom — Levels of Hate:

1. Remind students that previously they discussed a situation that started out as "whispering and laughing" and became more intense, escalating to threats of violence. A visual way of describing this type of progression is called a Pyramid of Hate.

2. Distribute the Hate handout or draw a similar diagram on the board. Briefly review each level starting with Level 1, the bottom level. Ask students to provide one or two examples for each level.

3. Based on the case study, ask students the following questions:
   a) Where would you place "whispering and laughing" on the chart? (answer level 1)
   b) Why do you think that what seemed harmless initially progressed into violence? (Answers might include: nobody stopped it, the perpetrators gained confidence that they could continue without interference or consequences, the victim did not seek help, etc.)
   c) Even if it seemed harmless to the perpetrators and bystanders, do you think it felt harmless to the victim? How do you think he felt?
   d) At what level of the pyramid do you think it would be easiest for someone to intervene? What would be some possible ways to intervene?

4. Ask students if they can think of examples of genocide to which groups were subjected based on their race, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, etc. (e.g. Armenians, Native Americans, Aboriginals of Australia, enslaved Africans, Rwandans, Muslim Bosnians, and Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe, Sudanese) Chart their responses.

5. Present the United Nation's definition of "genocide" by using the Genocide handout. Discuss the significance of the year, 1948? Which countries were/are represented in the United Nations?
TOWER OF HATE

GENOCIDE
The deliberate, systematic extermination of an entire people

ACTS OF EXTREME VIOLENCE TO GROUPS

ACTS OF VIOLENCE
Assault Terrorism
Desecration Vandalism Threats

DISCRIMINATION
Harassment Employment Discrimination
Social Exclusion Housing Discrimination
Educational Discrimination

PREJUDICE AND BIGOTRY
Scapegoating Slurs/Name Calling
Ridicule Social Avoidance De-Humanization

SUBTLE BIAS
Stereotyping Jokes Rumors
Discussing feelings with like-minded others Accepting negative information/Screening out positive information Insensitive remarks
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PERFORMANCE TASKS

INSTRUCTIONS: Label each of the scenarios described in this handout as a genocidal act (G) or as a non-genocidal act (NG). Explain your reasoning.

_____ 1. The government declares that subversive groups have been undermining national security by using terrorist tactics against social institutions (military, educational, economic). A national emergency is declared and subversives are arrested, imprisoned and eventually many "disappear."

_____ 2. Government policy of converting forests and surrounding areas into pastureland has produced conflict between indigenous peoples and new settlers. New settlers take action to expand their control over forestlands, and in the process eliminate not only the food sources but the economic livelihoods of the indigenous cultures. Indigenous peoples who resist are relocated, and some die in the process. Most significantly, survival of the indigenous culture is threatened.

_____ 3. In a society where ethnic tensions have long been a problem, a minority religious and ethnic group has long suffered at the hands of the majority ethnic group. Recent attempts by the majority group to solidify control of the national government through use of discriminatory legislation have led to violent uprisings by the minority ethnic group, which also has a distinct religious tradition. Military forces controlled by the majority ethnic group have retaliated and massacred elements of the minority group in isolated towns and villages.

_____ 4. A revolutionary government has recently come to power and has begun to take reprisals against its opponents in this nation. Those opponents of the current regime who were in positions of high status or influence prior to the revolution are prime targets of the reprisals, and many have been deported, relocated into labor camps, or imprisoned. A policy of "re-education" of the young has been implemented by the revolutionary government, and all who oppose it are either exiled or killed by the revolutionary army.

_____ 5. The government of this country has determined that the most effective means for solidifying its control over the population is to identify a cultural group that has long been a target of prejudice and discrimination, and blame it for recent internal social and economic problems. Despite the support of a vocal minority of intellectuals and some outside pressure from sympathetic governments, the targeted group has received little aid in its protests against this policy. Forced relocation and denial of basic civil rights have already been imposed upon this group by the government, and some group members have fled the country warning of harsher measures to come.
CYBER BULLYING - A MODERN STORY

In one school a group of students began whispering and laughing about a boy who looked different. They did not like the way he looked, the way he dressed, or the way he talked. They made comments as he walked by in the hall. Then a comment appeared on a facebook page of one of the group. Then there were more messages on smart phones with phone pictures and more slurs about the boy’s background, what part of town he lived. They said he was an orphan, or was without parents or a home. Eventually this boy was attacked by a gang after school one day and left on the ground cut and bleeding. In this age of instant communications, bullying is even more dangerous.

Please answer these questions in your group and report back to the class:

- When is it ok to ridicule those who may look different?
- When is bullying a good group activity?
- How would you react if you were ridiculed for any reason?
- Would you report bullying to the school authorities?
- Can you remember an incident of bullying which you have observed or which you may have experienced? Would you be willing to describe this to the group? To the class?
- If not, why not?
- Does your school have, or should it have a code of conduct which includes the probation of bullying?

Individual response here:
FORMS OF GOVERNMENT

Use the internet to define the following terms or find the requested information:

1. What is a kratocracy?
2. What is corporatism?
3. In what country can you find the Islamic Courts Union?
4. What is a Confederation? Has the US ever had one?
5. Define "enlightened absolutism".
6. Name some wars going on now around the world other than Iraq and Afghanistan.
7. How is socialism different from communism?
8. What is a polyarchy?
9. Name and define 5 kinds of democracy? What kind do we have in the US?
10. What is "sovereignty"?

From the Wikipedia site, "list of forms of government" select 10 entries from the list "Basic Forms of Government", read the entry and write a brief description in the following form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM OF GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION/ASSESSMENT

1. Have students create a list of tile various political systems and their characteristics. Use the internet. See previous page.

2. Distribute the handout Comparison Chart. Review the terms "consent of the governed" and "rule of law." Have students complete only the United States column of the chart on their own. Review their answers.

3. Divide students into groups. Explain that each group will research one foreign country's political system. Distribute the handout Types of Government Project. Tell groups that their final product will be an oral presentation in which they will teach about their nation's government. The oral presentation must be accompanied by a visual: a map, picture of the leader, flag, or symbol.

4. Review the grading criteria. Assign countries so students will learn about a variety of political systems. For example:

   China/Cuba - oligarchy       Jordan/Saudi Arabia - monarchy
   Libya/Iraq - dictatorship   Britain/Canada – parliamentary

5. During the oral presentations, have all students complete the Comparison Chart. Add columns depending on the number of countries assigned. Conduct a debriefing after each presentation to ensure that students have accurate information.

6. Assign one student from each country to a new group. Have the students complete the handout Advantages and Disadvantages. Discuss their conclusions.

Assessment of Indicator:

Have students answer this Brief Constructed Response item:

"Democracy is the worst form of government on earth except for all the rest."

Winston Churchill

- Explain the meaning of the quote.
- Do you agree or disagree with the author of the quote? Explain why.
- Give details and examples to support your answer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristocracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictatorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the internet or your textbook to review these systems. Enter the term "forms of government" into Google or other search engine for more information.

Page 4 (next) lists some websites which will be helpful in this task
PERFORMANCE TASK

Class should form small groups of 3 or 4 students. One member should be selected as the group leader and facilitator. One member will be responsible for reporting the progress of the group to the class.

TASK:

You are members of the government of a small new country. Your job will be to select a format for the government. Your group will determine:

- who will make the rules
- who will control the economy
- how much power will the government have
- what will be the rights and responsibilities of citizens
- will there a representative law making body like the U.S. Congress

Your group will need to prepare a brief written report on the decisions you have reached. You must then try to sell your plan to the class which will vote on the issue after you have completed your report.

Use this format for your group report:

Rulers will be__________________________________________

Economy to be controlled by_________________________________

The government will be_____________________________________

Citizens will______________________________________________

Laws will be made by_______________________________________
UNIT III
The Revolution & Communism

Sculpture by: Cubistic Marx & Engels
UNIT III
INTRODUCTION

The Russian Revolution was a spontaneous response in 1917 to events and forces which had been building up for many years. When it finally broke, there was not a single individual or group who was the motivating force.

Two Communist factions, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks were the best organized forces. After a civil war, the Bolsheviks were the winners and formed the new government.

The leading mode of thought at this time was Communism which was based on the life and writings of Karl Marx (Marxism). This is a political philosophy which projects as the ultimate good for society a classless and stateless society.

Communism also requires common ownership of the means of production — the machinery, the factories, the raw materials of manufacturing. It also projects free access to consumables, to the everyday needs for living of all citizens; also, the end of private property and real estate privately owned. Also, it projects the end of wage labor. (Marx believed that the value of all made objects proceeded from the labor of the workers who produce them. This is called the "labor theory of value."

Marxist theory holds that communism is a stage of historical development in a society which emerges inevitably when productive forces has lead to an overabundance of material goods which allows for a distribution of these based on need and on social relations based on freely-associated individuals. This should not be confused with socialism which is seen as an earlier stage.

The leading communists during the revolutionary period in Russia disagreed on many aspects of communism. They argued about whether communism would result as a natural development, or whether it required a revolution. Leon Trotsky postulated a need for a permanent revolution because of the changing natural of the class struggle.

Through the twentieth century there were many variants of communism e.g.: Leninism, Trotskyism, Maoism, Titoism, Stalinism, Castroism, and others. These tend to be specific to a place or to a charismatic leader, a Fidel Castro, or a Tito, or a Mao, and many others.
UNIT III
Readings
RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION

Russian history began with the founding of Moscow in 1147. By 1300, Moscow was the seat of the Grand Duchy of Muscovy, a state of some 18,500 square miles. Ruled by a series of ambitious grand dukes. Muscovy began expanding its borders in all directions, conquering a variety of ethnically different people in the process. By 1500, Muscovy, whose people were called Muscovites, included an area of some 772,000 square miles.

Muscovy continued to conquer and subjugate other peoples in much the same way that the ancient Romans had done. By 1700, Muscovy was an empire that encompassed an area of 5,600,000 square miles. Muscovy's rulers began to call themselves "czars", the Russian word for Caesar or emperor. Czar Peter I changed the name of the empire from Muscovy to "Russia" to convince the world that his empire was heir to the ancient Rus' empire which once included large sections of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Muscovy and a small part of Poland.

Russia's rulers never hesitated in their efforts to expand their empire. They fought all of their neighbors in an effort to conquer more land. By 1900, the Russian empire extended from the Black Sea in the south to the Baltic Sea in the north, and from the Vistula River in the west to the Pacific Ocean in the east. It was the world's largest empire totaling some 8,571,400 square miles in size. Russian aggression during the last five centuries devoured forty-six distinct peoples speaking sixty-one different languages.

The czarist government conducted its first modern census in 1897. Of the 126 million inhabitants living in the Russian empire at the time, only 51 million (41%) were ethnic Russians. The non-Russian majority was considered to be foreigners and were often denied any means of self-expression in their native languages. The government was officially designated an autocracy, meaning that absolute authority resided in the person of the czar whose authority was not limited by a constitution. Without a constitution, or set of fundamental laws independent of the ruler's will, individuals had no legal rights other than those which the ruler saw fit to grant. People living in the Russian empire could not criticize the government; they had to pay high taxes; those who were inducted into the military had to serve for twenty years. With education generally reserved for the privileged few, most people could neither read or write. Only in 1905, when a popular revolt shook the regime to its foundation, did the czar "grant" his subjects a limited form of representation. When it became evident that most of those elected to the newly created legislative assembly (Duma) were not always voting according to government wishes, the czar restricted voting privileges to the affluent class whose loyalty to royal policies was assured.
In an effort to assimilate the Ukrainian population, the czarist government initiated a "Russification" campaign. This was no easy task because the Ukrainian people wanted to retain their religious and national identities. To accomplish its objective, the government often discriminated against a separate Ukrainian identity by calling Ukrainians "Little Russians," forbidding the publication of Ukrainian books and periodicals, and jailing Ukrainian leaders who advocated greater freedom and autonomy for their people.

By 1917 the peoples of Russia had had enough of czarist despotism. They staged a revolution and the authoritarian rule of Czar Nicholas II was replaced by a democratically constituted government headed by Alexander Kerensky. Soon after the Russian revolution began, the conquered peoples of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Ukraine declared their independence. The Russian empire was beginning to crumble.

A representative Russian government based on democratic principles was short-lived, however. Within a year, a small, well-organized group of communists headed by Vladimir I. Lenin overthrew Kerensky's government and re-established authoritarian rule over Russia. Following in the footsteps of their czarist predecessors, Lenin's Red Army invaded and recaptured Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia and Ukraine. Promising to grant full national rights to each of the conquered nations (including the right to secede) Moscow established the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), forcibly incorporating the re-conquered peoples into a Russian orbit. Although all of the Soviet republics were supposedly equal, it was the Russian republic that dominated Soviet affairs from the beginning.

During the 1920's, Lenin and his followers attempted to pacify their minorities by granting them certain national and civil rights. When the various national groups started to push for more rights, however, the Communist government changed its approach and began to centralize its control. According to Hannah Arendt, the USSR was a totalitarian state by the time Stalin had consolidated his power in 1929.

During the 1930's, Stalin initiated a reign of terror in the Soviet Union that was unlike any the world had ever seen. All opposition to Soviet rule was ruthlessly suppressed. Millions of Soviet citizens were sent to Siberia for the slightest offense, often without trial. Millions were shot or simply disappeared. No one was safe from Stalin's unpredictable will. University professors, teachers, army generals, farmers, journalists, even Stalin's closest revolutionary associates, were executed simply because Stalin or his secret police decided they were "enemies of the state.

In 1939, Stalin signed an agreement with Germany's Adolf Hitler, another totalitarian dictator, and the two of them invaded Poland. Stalin annexed the eastern third of Poland, populated mainly by Ukrainians and Byelorussians, after
a bogus "plebiscite" in which the results were predetermined. A year later, the Soviet Union invaded and annexed Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Moldova claiming that their people wanted to become part of the USSR. By 1960, the Soviet empire included an area of 8,650,060 square miles. In addition, the Soviet Union controlled most of Eastern Europe including Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, and Poland.


Bray, pp. 82 - 96; Also see Basil Dmytryshyn, USSR: A Concise History (New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1965), pp. 38 - 86; V. I. Kozlov, National'nosti SSR: Ethnodemograficheskii Obzor (Moscow: Finansy i Statistika, 1982) p. 38.


COMMUNISM

Communism was the ruling ideology of the Bolsheviks who took over the rule of Russia in 1917. They believed very strongly in the theories of Karl Marx which said that society would evolve from a society in which one class, the rich, exploited the rest of the population, those who had to work, by hiring them to work and to produce the resources needed by all food, clothing, home, entertainment, et al. Marx held that the system of capitalism, or individual enterprise would eventually evolve into a classless society in which the needs of everyone would be met in a system in which workers would control their own lives.

The leaders of the factions of communism in post-revolutionary Russia — Bolsheviks — believed in the following:

- a classless society in which all are equal
- a proletarian ruling group
- state ownership of everything
- no private property
- workers empowered as ruler
- government controls the economy, society and families
- religion is eliminated as deception of the people
- Marx wrote: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

This is the core of their beliefs. There was many points of difference among the leaders of the movement — Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Bukharin, Kamenev and others. Students should use the following resources to examine these differences. Their understanding of communism will be strengthened when they come to understand that communism was not a single, monolithic system.

Communism is a political-economic system which grew out of the writing and thinking of Karl Marx. It has taken many forms from Leninism to Stalinism to libertarian communism, Council Communism, Luxemburgism, Castroism, anarchist communism, and religious communism as well as Christian communism. In Marxist theory, it is a specific stage of historical development that emerges from an oversupply of resources which then leads to distribution of resources to all based on need and to a system of social relations of freely associating individuals — an ideal society. Marx believed that socialism was a stage on the road to communism.

Lenin, the principal actor in the early stages of the Russian Revolution believed on the other hand that a vanguard party was needed to lead the revolution of workers or proletarians through the transition from capitalism to communism. During this phase workers would hold all power of government. Many contemporary communists such as non-Marxist libertarian communists, anarchic communist's et al. believe that no such party is needed but that society can proceed directly from capitalism to communism.

There is a wide variation among communist theorists about the way in which a society would be constructed especially as regards industry, food distribution. Banking, public safety, hospitals, and so on. All insist that these functions should be worker-owned and controlled, and that no experts will be needed because of their faith in the ability of workers to do so.
Marx believed in what he called the "materialist conception of history." This view looks at changes in human society as a result of the ways in which people collectively produce the necessities of life. All non-economic features of life including social classes, political structures, and ideologies are seen as the result of economic activity. As Marx wrote 1859:

Neither legal relations nor political forms could be comprehended ....on the bases of general developments of the human mind, but on the contrary they originate in the material conditions of life or civil society........In the social production of their existence, men enter into definite relations which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their materials forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which arises a legal and political superstructure to which correspond definite forms of consciousness.

Leninists believed in the need for a vanguard party to lead the proletarian revolution and to hold political power with the participation of the workers in a transitional phase between capitalism and socialism. This party would guide the development of the society through the transitional phases toward the government of the proletariat. A later development was the Council Communists who rejected the idea of a vanguard party and a transitional stage. They argued for the development of communism to follow upon the abolition of communism. There is wide variation in their ideas about the development of institutions which would replace existing economic entities such as education, food distribution, health care, as they might exist in a capitalist system. Some believed in the development of councils, decentralized and worker owned. They believed that the workers and the poor would be capable of managing this structure on their own without overseers. This faith in the workers is a core belief of communism.

Another issue which communists argued was whether there should a world revolution of communism (Trotsky), and "socialism in one country" (Stalin).

In the modern world, there are many varieties of parties who are called communist and who are the ruling parties in some places but who are not committed to particular philosophy. Students need to understand some of the core ideas of communism and that most of them have been abandoned. Russia and China for example operate in a system of state capitalism with communist elements.

> The "dictatorship of the proletariat" or workers' state is a term employed by Marxists that refers to a temporary state between the capitalist society and the classless, stateless and moneyless communist society. During this transition period, "the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." The term does not refer to a concentration of power by a dictator, but to a situation where the proletariat (the working class) would hold power and replace the current political, economic and social system controlled by the bourgeoisie (the property class). Many marxists refer to this transitional stage as socialism.

Marx: "...When the workers replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by their revolutionary dictatorship ... to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie ... the workers invest the state with a revolutionary and transitional form ..."

Engels: "...And the victorious party" (in a revolution) "must maintain its rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune (1871) have lasted
more than a day if it had not used the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie? Cannot we, on the contrary, blame it for having made too little use of that authority?..."

Engels: "As, therefore, the state is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, to hold down one's adversaries by force, it is sheer nonsense to talk of a 'free people's state'; so long as the proletariat still needs the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist..."

Vladimir Lenin developed the Marxist theory further, which after his death became known as Leninism and became the official ideology of many Communist states.

The role of the revolutionary party, in his case the Bolsheviks, was to serve as a "vanguard of the proletariat," which would start the revolution when the time was right and lead it to victory. Like Marx and Engels, Lenin did not believe that a liberal democracy could represent the interests of the proletariat because it was merely a "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie."

Lenin believed that, even after a successful proletarian revolution overthrows capitalism in one country, the bourgeoisie still remains stronger than the proletariat, because:

For a long time after the revolution the exploiters inevitably continue to retain a number of great practical advantages: they still have money (since it is impossible to abolish money all at once); some movable property — often fairly considerable; they still have various connections, habits of organization and management; knowledge of all the "secrets" (customs, methods, means and possibilities) of management; superior education; close connections with the higher technical personnel (who live and think like the bourgeoisie); incomparably greater experience in the art of war (this is very important), and so on and so forth.<

UNIT III
Activities
RESEARCH

1. From the list or your own, select a person (not Stalin) involved between 1917 - 53

2. Write a brief history of your person including his/her ideas.

Lenin
Trotsky
Bukharin
Kamenev
Beria
Khrushchev
VARIOUS FORMS OF COMMUNISM

The varieties of communism:

1. Research these terms and write brief definitions of each:
   a. Marxism
   b. Materialism
   c. Communism
   d. Leninism
   e. Stalinism
   f. Trotskyism
   g. Council communism
   h. Left communism
   i. Christian communism
   j. Maoism
   k. Castroism
   l. Religious communism

2. After analyzing the terms above, what are the essential components of all varieties of communism?

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Destruction of the Church and State was the Bolshevik goal. If it was the “End”, what was supposed to happen after that?
2. Do you agree or disagree with the logic of the “Greater Good” justification? Why?
3. Is it justifiable to kill one person to save a few others?
4. Do you think that the goal justifies the means, and the communists just saved a rotten, unjust system of a semi-feudal Russia?
5. Narodnaya Volya had one goal on mind: killing the tsar (and thus triggering the revolution). Killing stopped progressive reforms, “revolution” didn’t even start and Narodnaya Volya eventually ceased the existence. Why the results of the Alexander II’s murder were quite opposite the one expected?
6. Why Stalin, Hitler and mobs used similar methods to defeat their opponents?

Additional Study:

1. Declaring the “dictatorship of the proletariat” or workers’ state, did Marx and Lenin realize that at the moment a worker becomes a minister he or she is not a worker anymore but a government bureaucrat and, therefore, the state becomes a bureaucrats’ state? Or the exception was made for Lenin, Stalin and alike who have never even been workers? Can we accept their idea that they know better what workers want or need?
UNIT IV
Stalin’s Evil Reign

With a Camera Around the Camps by: Sergey Meinikoff
UNIT IV
INTRODUCTION

Joseph Vissarionivich Dzhugashvili was born in Gori of humble origins. He attended a religious seminary as a young man but was more interested in Marxism. His association with Lenin in the Bolshevik party before and during the 1917 Revolution led to his becoming the first General Secretary of the Communist Party from 1922 to 1934, then Secretary but head of the party and of the State until his death in 1953.

His gift for bureaucratic maneuvering led to his growing power within the government. He wavered between the "left" of the party which favored continuing the NEP economic program of limited capitalism and the "right" which favored forcing the agricultural sector to conform to the demands for greater industrialization.

This unit discusses three aspects of Stalin's repression and brutalization of his people to bring out his economic and political goals: (1) the man-made genocidal famine in the Ukraine which resulted in the death by starvation of millions of farmer in some of the richest farmland in the nation: (2) the so-called "Great Terror" which was his use of the military, the Secret Police and show trials to eliminate hundreds of his rivals and all those officials who opposed his policies; and, (3) the use of the network of prison camps or gulags throughout Russia and Siberia to dispose of all those citizens, officials or kulaks (farmers) who opposed him or did not cooperate with the Five Year Plans to "modernize" Russia.

Stalin's Life and Rise to Power:

Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili, (Stalin) born on 18 December 1878 was the first General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. His tenure ran from 1922 to 1934, then Secretary but head of the party and of the State until his death in 1953.

There are many books, articles and websites on Stalin's life and career.

Stalin's youth began as a top student for four years in Gori Church School, and 3+ years in Orthodox Theological Seminary. He was not a committed believer in the faith. Recollections by friends confirm this.

Stalin was a trusted associate of Vladimir Lenin, the patriarch of the Bolsheviks, until Lenin ceased to trust him because of disagreements over the role of the party. However, Lenin died before he could change the situation.

There was disagreement among the Bolsheviks about the ultimate role of the State. Some held that it should "wither away" and that the workers, or proletariat, should rule. Others argued that the party needed to form a central government to guide the
revolution. Lenin argued for the latter view in his important statement The State and Revolution.

Lenin left behind a document, Lenin's Testament, in which he criticized Stalin's rude manner and quest for power. He suggested that Stalin be removed from the post of General Secretary but died before he was to effectuate this and Stalin's power grew. Stalin used his office to consolidate his power in the Politburo by bringing in his friends and collaborators into the Party and removing all opposition. He was allied with Lev Kamenev and Grigory Zinoviev.

His major opponent was Leon Trotsky who was a hero of the Russian Civil War and a military expert. Trotsky believed that there should be a world revolution of communism. Stalin believed on the contrary in "socialism in one country."

In 1928 Stalin replaced the New Economic Policy which allowed a limited form of capitalism with a highly centralized command economy based on extensive central planning.

Stalin's major objective was to transform Russia from a peasant nation into a modern, industrialized nation like the rest of Europe.

Stalin's Russia became the world's second largest economy after World War II. The Russian people paid a terrible price for this growth. Millions of them were either killed or sent to labor camps (Gulag) in remote areas of the Soviet Union or were deported.

The policy of "de-kulakization" involved forcing farmers to joint collectives and to hand over most of their grain to the government for export. Massive resistance to this by the agricultural sector led to the Ukrainian famine of 1932-33.

In 1937-38 Stalin's campaign against former members of the communist opposition and other alleged enemies of the government, and Stalin's potential rivals led to the "Great Purge," a period of massive cruelty during which hundreds of thousands of people were executed.

Stalin abolished Lenin's NEP (National Economic Policy) in a push from greater industrialization and more central control of the economy.

Nikolai Bukharin, a brilliant party theorist, with current Premier Alexei Bykov opposed this policy. Both were removed from the Politburo and marginalized.

The Great Purge of the 1930's was Stalin's push for total power using the NKVD (secret police) to build cases and mount show trials of his opponents.

This led a system of NKVD Troika's. Trials were held quickly and those found guilty (all) were quickly executed, deported or sent to the system of labor camps known as the Gulag.
UNIT IV
Readings
STALIN'S GENOCIDE
SOVIET POLICY & THE FORCED FAMINE

Ukraine was formally incorporated into the USSR as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (UkSSR) in 1922. The Communists were aware that resistance to their regime was deep and widespread. To pacify the Ukrainian people and to gain control, Moscow initially permitted a great deal of local autonomy to exist in the UkSSR. The newly established Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the new All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, non-Communist national institutions of great importance, were both permitted to continue their work until the end of the 1920's.

All of this changed once Stalin came to power. Stalin wanted to consolidate the new Communist empire and to strengthen its industrial base. Ukrainian national aspirations were a barrier to those ends because even Ukrainian Communists opposed exploitation by Moscow. In Stalin's eyes, Ukraine, the largest of the non-Russian republics, would have to be subdued. Thus, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was placed under the jurisdiction of the Communist controlled Russian Orthodox Church. Ukrainian bishops, priests and thousands of Christian lay leaders were sent to Siberian labor camps, the so-called "Gulag". Hundreds of thousands, possibly over a million, of Ukraine's intellectual leaders -writers, university professors, scientists, journalists -- were liquidated in purges ordered by Stalin. Not even loyal Ukrainian Communists were exempt from Stalin's terror. By 1939, practically the entire (98%) of Ukraine's Communist leadership had been liquidated.

Hardest hit by Stalin's policies were Ukraine's independent landowners, the so-called "kulaks" (Kurkuly in Ukrainian). Never precisely defined, a kulak was a member of the alleged "upper stratum" of landowners but in reality anyone who owned a little land, even as little as 25 acres, came to be labeled a kulak. Stalin ordered that all private farms would have to be collectivized. During the process, according to Soviet sources, which are no doubt on the conservative side, some 200,000 Ukrainian families were "de-kulakized" or dispossessed of all land. By the summer of 1932, 69.5% of all Ukrainian farm families and 80% of all farm land had been forcibly collectivized.

Stalin decided to eliminate Ukraine's independent farmers for three reasons: 1) they represented the last bulwark of resistance to totalitarian Russian control; 2) the USSR was in desperate need of foreign capital to build more factories and the best way to obtain that capital was to increase agricultural exports from Ukraine, once known as "the breadbasket of Europe"; 3) the fastest way to increase agricultural exports was to expropriate land through a process of farm collectivization and to assign procurement quotas to each Soviet republic. During the collectivization process, Ukrainian farmers resisted vigorously, often violently, especially when the GPU (secret police) and militia forced them to turn their land over to the government. Thousands of farmers were killed and millions more were deported to Siberia to be replaced by more trustworthy workers.
To increase exports and to break the back of remaining resistance, Moscow imposed grain procurement quotas on Ukraine that were 2.3 times the amount of grain marketed during the best year prior to collectivization. Laws were passed declaring all collective farm property "sacred and inviolate." Anyone who was caught hoarding food was subject to execution as an "enemy of the people" or, in extenuating circumstances, imprisonment for not less than 10 years. To make sure the new laws were strictly enforced, special "commissions" and "brigades" were dispatched to the countryside. In the words of one Sovietologist:

The work of these special "commissions" and "brigades" was marked by the utmost severity. They entered the villages and made the most thorough searches of the houses and barns of every peasant. They dug up the earth and broke into the walls of buildings and stoves in which the peasants tried to hide their last handfuls of food. They even in places took specimens of fecal matter from the toilets in an effort to learn by analysis whether the peasants had stolen government property and were eating grain.

Stalin succeeded in achieving his goals. The grain harvest of 1932 was greater than in 1931, providing more monies for industrial expansion. The cost to Ukraine, however, was catastrophic. Grain procurements continued even though it was clear to Soviet officials that more and more people were going hungry in the Ukrainian countryside. The result was inevitable. A famine, the magnitude of which staggers the imagination, struck Ukraine and still the Soviet government failed to provide relief. Detailed and documented descriptions of the horrors which prevailed in the rural areas of Soviet Ukraine have been presented by Ukrainian eye-witnesses, Congressional reports, and various newspaper accounts. Thomas Walker, an American journalist who traveled in Ukraine during the famine, left us an especially graphic account of the situation in one rural area.

About twenty miles south of Kiev, I came upon a village that was practically extinct by starvation. There had been fifteen houses in this village and a population of forty-odd persons.

Every dog and cat had been eaten.

The horses and oxen had all been appropriated by the Bolsheviks to stock the collective farms. In one but they were cooking a mess that defied analysis. There were bones, pig-weed, skin, and what looked like a boot top in this pot. The way the remaining half dozen inhabitants eagerly watched this slimy mess showed the state of their hunger.

One boy of about 15 years, whose face and arms and legs were simply tightly drawn skin over bones, had a stomach that was swollen to twice its normal size. He was an orphan; his father had died of starvation a month before and he showed me the body. The boy had covered the body with straw, there being no shovels in the village since the last raid of the GPU.
He stated his mother had gone away one day searching for food and had not returned.

This boy wanted to die -- he suffered intensely with his swollen stomach and was the only one of the group who showed no interest in the pot that was being prepared.

The Soviet government has preserved the greatest secrecy concerning the exact number of persons who perished in Ukraine during the Forced Famine but an analysis of recently revealed Soviet census data comparing 1939 with 1926 figures suggests that no fewer than ten million men, women, and children perished. According to American Sovietologists and other experts on the Stalin era, the famine need never have occurred.

Despite the meager harvest, the peasants could have pulled through without starvation if there had been substantial abatement of the requisition of grain and foodstuffs. But the requisitions were intensified rather than relaxed; the government was determined to "teach the peasants a lesson" by the grim method of starvation ..."

By the beginning of the winter all the grain, including the seed grain of the farms in Ukraine, had been seized by the government. The peasants lived on the last remaining potatoes, killed their last remaining livestock. they slaughtered cats and dogs, ate nettles and linden leaves. The acorns were all gone by January, and people began to starve. By March no food at all remained, and they died. The children died first, mostly the younger children, followed by the older people, then usually men before the women, and finally everyone else.

According to one Soviet expert who had access to Soviet statistics, the forced collectivization campaign, the liquidation of the kulaks, and the Forced Famine precipitated the untimely death of some twenty-two million men, women, and children in the USSR.


Anton Antonov-Ovseyenko, p. 65.
STALIN’S GENOCIDE
THE GREAT FAMINE

The Ukraine had been for many years the richest and most productive farmland in the nation. The area also had a strong nationalistic identity which worried Stalin and the rulers in Moscow. Lenin and the leadership had ruled that the peasants or farmers must be sacrificed to hasten industrialization. In 1929, Stalin decreed that the farmers or kulaks would have to contribute major portions of their product to the government for export. This in turn would allow the country to trade for needed equipment to build up their industrial might. Documentary evidence from this period shows that Stalin regarded the Ukrainians as less than human and totally expendable.

The farmers were told to hand over most of their grain to the government or face harsh punishment. There was great resistance to this genocide among the farmers and the Ukrainian leadership and the Communist party. The awful famine that devastated the Ukraine in 1932-1933 was the result of Stalin's policy and his enforcement of it. No grain from the collective farm could be given to the farmers until the government quota was met. Millions starved as a result of this. Regular troops and police units waged war on those who did not cooperate.

A system of internal passports prevented peasants from leaving their villages. The death toll has been estimated between six and seven million. Stalin's office said that "we have shown who is the master here. It cost millions of lives but the collective farm system is here to stay."
The Katyn massacre, also known as the Katyn Forest massacre (Polish: zbrodnia katyńska, mord katyński, 'Katyn crime'; Russian: Katynskiy rasstrel 'Katyn shooting'), was a mass execution of Polish nationals carried out by the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD), the Soviet secret police, in April and May 1940. The massacre was prompted by Lavrentiy Beria's proposal to execute all members of the Polish Officer Corps, dated 5 March 1940. This official document was approved and signed by the Soviet Politburo, including its leader, Joseph Stalin. The number of victims is estimated at about 22,000, with 21,768 being a lower bound. The victims were murdered in the Katyn Forest in Russia, the Kalinin and Kharkiv prisons and elsewhere. Of the total killed, about 8,000 were officers taken prisoner during the 1939 Soviet invasion of Poland, another 6,000 were police officers, with the rest being Polish intelligentsia arrested for allegedly being "intelligence agents, gendarmes, landowners, saboteurs, factory owners, lawyers, officials and priests.

The term "Katyn massacre" originally referred specifically to the massacre at Katyn Forest, near the villages of Katyn and Gnezdovo (approximately 19 kilometers/12 miles west of Smolensk, Russia), of Polish military officers in the Kozelsk prisoner-of-war camp. This was the largest of several simultaneous executions of prisoners of war. Other executions occurred at the geographically distant Starobelsk and Ostashkov camps, at the NKVD headquarters in Smolensk, and at prisons in Kalinin (Tver), Kharkiv, Moscow, and other Soviet cities. Other executions took place at various locations in Belarus and Western Ukraine, based on special lists of Polish prisoners, prepared by the NKVD specifically for those regions. The modern Polish investigation of the killings covered not only the massacre at Katyn forest, but also the other mass murders mentioned above. Polish organizations, such as the Katyn Committee and the Federation of Katyn Families, consider the victims murdered at the locations other than Katyn as part of the overall massacre.

The government of Nazi Germany announced the discovery of mass graves in the Katyn Forest in 1943. When the London-based Polish government-in-exile asked for an investigation by the International Red Cross, Stalin immediately severed diplomatic relations with it. The Soviet Union claimed the victims had been murdered by the Nazis, and continued to deny responsibility for the massacres until 1990, when it officially acknowledged and condemned the perpetration of the killings by the NKVD, as well as the subsequent cover-up.
MAKOHON'S TESTIMONY

Pavlo Makohon, a Canadian citizen, has written an account of how, in 1932-33, whilst still a fourteen yearold boy, he lived through the famine in Ukraine. This book is a journal, a testimony to all he experienced and saw.

By the outset of 1930 the activists had almost destroyed our village; a number of villagers had managed to escape in time, others were "de-kurkulized", tried and brutally punished, many died refusing to the end to give in, and a few people had succumbed to pressure and entered the kolhosp. (See glossary at end)

When they'd finished with the "kurkuls" and "seredniaks", the authorities moved on to the "pidkurkuls" who, although poor, sided with the "kulaks" and kept away from the kolhosp. Soon, my father, Mykyta Makohon, also received a "visit", for he was listed as a "pidkurkul".

My father ... had long since decided never to join the kolhosp. (But, then), the activists began pressurizing my father into signing their declaration.

At that time the following people belonged to my family: my father, mother, and grandmother, myself - the oldest child, then Vasyl, Ivan and Anatoly, my younger brothers, and Maria, my little sister. All in all, eight people. We also had a horse, a cow, and a very humble house which could hardly accommodate us all. Most importantly, we had enough grain for survival with a little to spare for the spring sowing.

There were four churches in our village and, as they visited each "pidkurkul's" house, the activists also gathered signatures for the destruction of these buildings. Our family was also told to sign.

On their first visit to our house these opportunists were accompanied by the head activist himself, Ivan Zayets. He was the same age as my father and they knew one another well. Zayets said to my father, 'Mykyta Ivanovych, what's got into your head? Why do you let these damned kulaks lead you by the nose? You're not like them, you're poor, you're a proletariat (Communist term for "worker," who were the preferred "class" that would rise up and destroy the capitalist system.) It's time for people like you to rule. You should have joined us from the very beginning and helped to build the kolhosp. ...Well, Mykyta, let's stop fooling around. Here's a list; sign that you agree the church should be destroyed, seeing as there's no God, as you know. Sign it here.' And he handed my father a pen. But father, after a long pause said, 'I didn't build the church and it's not for me to destroy it. As for God, I never told you he doesn't exist so I'd thank you, Ivan Zayets, not to make my decisions for me.' On hearing this Zayets first turned red and then pale and tried to convince my father again, only in an altered voice, and I didn't want to listen anymore. And so the conversation continued for two hours and my father remained immovable throughout.
Finally, Zayets turned away from my father and stalked up to us children on the stove, shouting, 'You, Pavlo, you sign and don't listen to your father.' Father turned on him in a rage - 'My children will sign nothing; they are too young to make such decisions, so I will decide for them.' The conversation ended here and an angry Zayets left the house, spitting out numerous threats. We were left inside dejected and sorrowful as we could guess what would now follow. And so ended our first confrontation with the authorities, and our family's tragedy, which was to culminate soon after, began.

The activists worked day and night in their headquarters, summoning people and forcing them to sign into the kolhosp. Most people still refused to do so, but various forms of blackmail were used to break their will. ...But father remained unmoved and did not sign. Then the activists became enraged and threw a sheepskin over my father's head and forced tobacco down his nose to make him cough violently. All this was done just to break my father's stubbornness, but still he did not sign. So they began to prod his body with a sharp awl that made him cry out in pain. Father shouted that they were insane, but they only replied, 'Will you sign now?', but he wouldn't. So then they let him go home advising him to 'talk things over with his wife and then come back and sign.' My father replied that there was little point in him doing so as his mind was made up.

After this, the authorities began to terrorize my father mentally. They called him to headquarters again, and when he wouldn't sign they sent him home. As soon as he reached our house they called him out again, and this continued every ten minutes, all through the night. As soon as he got home the summoner would be there waiting to order him back again.

And so it continued. They tortured father like this night after night, giving him neither a chance to fall asleep nor to even think. But, regardless of how brutally they treated him my father never signed that declaration. He never became a formal member of the kolhosp.

THE BREAD FOR A DOG
by Vladimir Tendryakov
A fragment translated by Dr. Alex Rashin

Summer of 1933; URALS.

>Near a painted with the State prescribed ochre, sooty railroad-station, behind a peeling low fence — a transparent birch public garden. Right on its tramped-down paths, on the roots, on remaining dusty grass, were laying scattered those, who were not any more considered human.

However, each one was expected to have somewhere in the depths of dirty, lice-ridden rags, beslobbered document, certifying that the carrying it non-person also carried a first and family name and even patronymic, that "it" (non-person) was born in some particular place, and on the basis of some decision has been deported after a confiscation of property and stripping of all civil rights. Nobody cared anymore, that a name carrying "deprivee", does not live anywhere, does not work, and eats nothing. "It" fell out from the human multitude.

For the most part they were dispossessed peasants from around Tula, Voronezh, Kursk, Orel and all over the Ukraine. They used to be independent successful, hard-working farmers, who refused to give their last grain to the government, as if trying to hold it in their fists. (That is why they were called "kulak" — Russian for a fist.) From the Ukraine they also brought to our northern town another name "kurukl".

Even outwardly kurkuls did not resemble people. Some of them looked like skeletons, close-fitted with dark, wrinkled, seemingly rustling skin, skeletons with huge, meekly burning eyes. Others looked like tightly blown balloons of skin bluish of tension and ready to burst. Their flesh was swaying, legs were like pillows with sewn on dirty toes hiding under cankers of white pulp.

They also did not behave like people.

Some were pensively gnawing the bark on the birch trees, gazing into space with smoldering, un-humanly wide eyes.

Some, laying in the dust and sourly stinking half-decayed rags, were wiping their fingers with such energy and persistence, which looked like readiness to wipe off the skin itself. Some were despondently stuffing their mouths with the dust and shreds of rubbish.

The most human-looking were those who had already managed to die. They lied restfully, as if sleeping.

Before dying, some of the meekest suddenly rebelled — got up to his full height, hugging the smooth strong birch trunk with thin fragile arms, opened a spaciously black mouth, as if
preparing to scream an incinerating curse. But only foamy wheeze was coming out. And the "rebel" would slide down the trunk, flaying skin on the cheek and ... become quiet forever. These did not look human even after the death — clenching the trees like monkeys.

Adults avoided the public garden. A guard watched that kurkuls did not get out. We, the boys, did not get in — watched from behind the fence. No horrors could stifle our animalistic curiosity. Petrified with fear and disgust, tiring from hidden terrified pity we watched the endings of the bark-eaters, foamy wheezes, and sliding down the tree-trunks.

The station's manager ones turned to us and uttered, either to himself or to the indifferent sky: "What will come out of such children? They enjoy watching death. What kind of world will live after us? What kind of world?..."

Decrees of the Soviet of People's Commissars of January 1918 and of March 6 1920 abolished "trials and incarceration of minors". However, already in 1926 the Article 12 of the Criminal Code allowed trials of minors older than 12 for theft, violence, mutilation and murder. A clarification of the code in 1935 included the death penalty in the list of punishments, which became acceptable starting with the age of 12.

During the time of the War Communism and NEP the number of homeless children in Soviet Russia reached 7 million. By 1930 they all disappeared. Many easily guessed where to.

From the memories of Faat Altybaev,
(abridged translation by A. Rashin)

whose family was de-kulackized in 1929 and sent to the "special settlement" at the Great Stalin's Communist Construction Project - Magnitogorsk, popularly known as Magnitka. Built on a hill of iron ore in the Urals, 800 miles east of Moscow, safe from enemy attack and prying eyes. The centerpiece of Stalin's first five-year plan, 1930-34, proof that the USSR could produce as much steel as the West. ("Stalin," after all, means "man of steel.")
"Our village was between the river Kama and the Ural mountains in the region of the city of Naberezhnye Chelny in Tataria. Before the collectivization in 1929 we had a house, a barn, a horse, two cows, about twenty sheep, farming instruments and five working family members, not counting us — kids. We had enough land and collected excellent crops.

In the fall after we had poured the grain in the barns and animal feed into throws, the kolkhoz (collective farm) organizers came in twenty wagons. They confiscated everything including the cattle feed. We, the kids, did not understand what was happening, but the older brother cried in desperation, because there was nothing to feed the cattle in the winter, which was his responsibility. We were forced from our house in the middle of the winter and it was given to a drinking loafer. We had to move in with parental grandmother.

In the spring of 1930 father with seven others from the village were arrested and sent to Solovki, allegedly for agitation against the collectivization. At the end of June our and a few other families were loaded into wagons in the middle of the night, and driven under the guard to Naberezhnye Chelny, and from there by a steamer to the town of Elabuga. When enough people gathered there they were loaded into a freight barge and shipped up the Kama. Guards with rifles were stomping all the time on the upper deck. A machine gun was directed inside the barge. Near the landing of Krasny Bor two tried to escape, but were shot. The barge with the tugboat was waiting for a day till their bodies were fished out from the river and laid on the stern to assure the full accounting. When we arrived to Sarapul, everybody was loaded into cattle trains waiting right there on the shore.

I do not remember, how long we traveled to Magnitka, but we arrived early in the morning. The train stopped near four-meter high embankment near the mountain and the guards started to throw the people out down the slope. In 300-400 meters, below the mountain, there were crowds of people like us but brought there earlier. We were fed by a thin balanda (watery soup) and left to sleep under the open sky. It rained in the night and everyone was soaked. A few days later mats of reed started to arrive from the Ural river and we built barracks out of them. Near the Magnet-mountain, on one side of the rail track there was dug a ditch dug 4 meters wide and 6 meters deep. Along this ditch mounted guards were riding round the clock. On the other side closer to the mountain were dug-outs. They were guarded all the time. Soon more cattle-trains arrived including some from the Ukraine. In the barracks there were six rows of plank-beds and two stoves. In the middle plank-beds were at three-levels above each other and at the walls at a single level. All kids were placed there.

The most frightening was the commandant of the settlement. Once, when three of us played near the trench, he threw all of us down on the stones. One of us died, another broke his ribs, and I — the youngest — broke my tail-bone. The most terrifying time was the fall-spring of 1931-1932. In barracks people died from famine and deceases during the nights, and in the mornings the dead bodies were stacked in the isles — cars didn't have enough time to carry all of them out.
Many kids lost their parents and were somehow supported by other special settlers, who tore some food from their own hungry kids. The administration did not provide any food for the orphans. Kids food was supposed to be included into their parents meager ration-cards. However, the worst for us came later.

Almost all working population of the barrack died out and the commandant turned on us. He introduced the rule: six years old should take 2 bricks, any older ones 4-5 bricks and carry them up to the 3rd and 4th floors of the construction. And we had to do it all the day. That is how we were building our bright future — communism. At that time they introduced the slogan: "Thanks to comrade Stalin for our happy childhood".

The commandant drove us to work using the lash: "The Soviet power would not feed you for free, kulak degenerates!"- screamed reddening in face this sadist with the komsomol badge on his chest.<

FAMINE TESTIMONY OF VARVARA DIBERT

In 1932 and 1933 Kiev seemed like a paradise to nearby villagers who had been stripped of all they had by the Soviet government. And no wonder: some villages were dying out completely, except for those who still had the courage and strength to flee. There were cases where mothers had gone mad and killed a child to feed the rest of the family. So thousands of villagers flocked to the city of Kiev. Many of the weak ones sat or lay down by buildings or fences, most never to get up again. Trucks, driven by policemen or Communist Youth League members mobilized for that purpose, went around picking up bodies or carrying those still alive somewhere outside the city limits. It was especially terrible to see mothers whose faces had turned black from hunger with children whose little faces had wrinkled up like baked apples, children who could no longer cry, but only squeal, moving their lips in an attempt to find sustenance where there was none. People sought salvation and found death. I saw these things as I walked to work through the Haymarket on Pidvil'na Street near the Golden Gates and Volodymyr Street.

No one in Kiev had the right to allow even their closest relatives to stay the night in their residences. One had to go to the building manager with a certificate and get it stamped with a date indicating the length of stay. For more villagers, particularly the men and boys, such certificates were not easy to get. Single women and girls were more fortunate. Sometimes they were able to get jobs as servants for party people and thereby acquire union cards, even without residency certificates. Later they could even attend evening courses and get permanent jobs. This was sometimes done not only by villagers but also by women of the intelligentsia who had been denied employment because their husbands had been arrested as so-called enemies of the people or because of their own "nonproletarian" class origins. I knew of four such cases of the latter from among my own relatives, and my aunt in this way saved six women. Two of whom had already begun to swell up from hunger.

Townspeople tried in every possible way to help relatives who were living in the countryside, but it was not easy. Workers and officials in Kiev received ration cards, but the rations were so small that even some of them began to swell and even die. Only those allowed to use the so-called "closed distribution points" were able to get as much food as they needed. They had enough of everything. They were members of special organizations and the party, but not even all party members were so fortunate. Civil servants got 400 grams of bread per day and another 200 grams for each dependent. Factory workers got 500 grams per day, while workers at military factories got 800. Some millet, sugar, and fat was also given out. Today some people may say that 400 grams per day does not constitute a famine, but this is because we have other things to eat besides bread and we don't need as much of it. And in those days, what mother would eat her ration if she saw her starving child looking pitifully at her. In 1933 the so-called "commercial bread" appeared in Kiev. You could buy a kilo for two-and-a-half rubles. They would only let you buy one kilo a day, and the lines for this bread were so long that not every working person could wait so long. The police would take villagers from these lines, load them on trucks, and take them out of the city.
The so-called Torgsin (acronym for "trade with foreigners") appeared. For gold you could get all sorts of food and drygoods there. But how was one to get gold? Once my husband brought home a certificate and said he could buy some food with it at the Torgsin. When I stared at him in amazement, he opened his mouth, and I saw he had steel fillings instead of gold ones.

Ever since the revolution Kiev had been full of orphans from age six to fifteen. Although the government set up orphanages, the number of homeless orphans continued to grow, especially when dekulakization started and later when the famine began. Near the house where I lived was a large building. The government converted this building into a so-called "collector" for homeless children caught on the streets, and who, after sanitary inspection, were sent to orphanages. When leaving my home, I would often see how trucks would pull up there and the police would take out the filthy, bedraggled children who had been caught on the streets. A guard stood at the entrance and no one was permitted inside. During the winter of 1932 - 33, I saw five or six times how in the early morning they took out of the building the bodies of half-naked children, covered them with filthy tarpaulins, and piled them onto trucks. Going as far as Artem Street, I would hear a loudspeaker (at that time there was one on every corner) blare out how children lived in horrible conditions in capitalist countries and what a wonderful life they led in our own Socialist Fatherland.

Congressional testimony presented before the United States Ukraine Famine Commission in Washington D.C., October 8, 1986.
FAMINE TESTIMONY OF TATIANA PAWLICHKA

In 1932, I was ten years old, and I remember well what happened in my native village in the Kiev region. In the spring of that year, we had virtually no seed. The communists had taken all the grain, and although they saw that we were weak and hungry, they came and searched for more grain. My mother had stashed away some corn that had already sprouted, but they found that, too, and took it. What we did manage to sow, the starving people pulled up out of the ground and ate.

In the villages and on the collective farms (our village had two collectives), a lot of land lay fallow, because people had nothing to sow, and there wasn't enough manpower to do the sowing. Most people couldn't walk, and those few who could had no strength. When, at harvest time, there weren't enough local people to harvest the grain, others were sent in to help on the collectives. These people spoke Russian, and they were given provisions.

After the harvest, the villagers tried to go out in the field to look for gleanings, and the communists would arrest them and shoot at them, and send them to Siberia. My aunt, Tatiana Rudenko, was taken away. They said she had stolen the property of the collective farm.

That summer, the vegetables couldn't even ripen -- people pulled them out of the ground -- still green -- and ate them. People ate leaves, nettles, milkweed, sedges. By autumn, no one had any chickens or cattle. Here and there, someone had a few potatoes or beets. People coming in from other villages told the very same story. They would travel all over trying to get food. They would fall by the roadside, and none of us could do anything to help. Before the ground froze, they were just left lying there dead, in the snow; or, if they died in the house, they were dragged out to the cattle-shed, and they would lie there frozen until spring. There was no one to dig graves.

All the train stations were overflowing with starving, dying people. Everyone wanted to go to Russia (the RSFSR) because it was said that there was no famine there. Very few (of those who left) returned. They all perished on the way. They weren't allowed into Russia and were turned back at the border. Those who somehow managed to get into Russia could save themselves.

In February of 1933, there were so few children left that the schools were closed. By this time, there wasn't a cat, dog, or sparrow in the village. In that month, my cousin Mykhailo Rudenko died; a month later my aunt Nastia Klymenko and her son, my cousin Ivan, died, as well as my classmate, Dokia Klymenko.

There was cannibalism in our village. On my farmstead, an 18 year-old boy, Danylo Hukhlib, died, and his mother and younger sisters and brothers cut him up and ate him. The communists came and took them away, and we never saw them again. People said
they took them a little ways off and shot them right away -- the little ones and the older ones together.
At the time, I remember, I had heavy, swollen legs. My sister, Tamara, had a large, swollen stomach, and her neck was long and thin like a bird's neck. People didn't look like people -- they were more like starving ghosts.

The ground thawed, and they began to take the dead to the ravine in ox carts. The air was filled with the ubiquitous odor of decomposing bodies. The wind carried this odor far and wide. It was thus over all of Ukraine.

FAMINE TESTIMONY
OF SVIATOSLAV KARAVANSKY

From my childhood years I remember that from 1929, the beginning of industrialization and collectivization, our family and all of the people of Odessa, suffered a great shortage of food. Buttermilk, milk, sugar, and even bread disappeared from the stores. In the period 1929 - 30 the whole city turned to the rationing system. The entire population lived on rations. The portions that were handed out continued to decrease, and in the winter of 1933, I, as a dependent, received 200 grams seven ounces) of black bread per day. My mother, brother, and sister received the same ration. Bread was, and still is, the main source of nourishment for the Soviet population. For comparison, let's consider the daily ration of the Soviet soldier. The soldiers of the Red Army received at that time one kilogram (36 ounces) of bread per day. The entire city of Odessa lived on rations which were insufficient for healthy people, but which kept it from starving. The rural population was not subject to rationing, and it perished. People in the villages could not receive any help from their relatives in towns because the city population was hungry too. It should be mentioned that the closing of churches preceded the great famine. So, the organizers of the famine took into consideration the major role played by the church in dealing with national disasters like the famine. It is known that during the famine of 1921 in Ukraine, churches aided the starving people. During 1932 - 33, the churches did not function, and the clergy were sent to labor camps, which, in reality, were death camps.

Our family lived in downtown Odessa, and I attended school there. I never saw starving people downtown, but many of the latter were seen on the outskirts of the city. Odessa was a port where foreign sailors and businessmen could always be found, so the authorities took measures not to allow peasants to reach the downtown area. But everyone in Odessa knew that there was a horrible shortage of food in the villages. People swelled from hunger and died. In the school which I attended from September 1932 to May 1933, the teacher told us that the kulaks (or kurkuls) were responsible for all the temporary difficulties of the Soviet socialist economy.

My father was employed in the Odessa ship yard, and I heard from adults that a lot of foreign ships in the docks were waiting their turn to be loaded with grain from Odessa grain elevators. My parents wondered how it was possible that such great quantities of food were being exported while the village population was starving. To ask questions about this was dangerous. If a child asked about these things in school, the teachers assumed that he had been taught by his parents, who were thus placed in danger. So, my parents were very careful about telling me not to ask any questions in school, and not to reveal anew here what was discussed in the family.

The entire population was terrorized by the arrests and trials which culminated in 1932 - 33. In those ears so-called "torgsins" were opened in Odessa. In "torgsins" anyone could buy for gold and foreign currency all the food that otherwise was distributed through the rationing systems. Many people who had small golden crosses or wedding rings
brought them to "torgsins." Once my mother went to a "torgsin" as well. She brought back a loaf of black bread, turning the day into a holiday for the entire am it'. There were rumours in Odessa that people were being arrested for selling human sausage in the market place. There was a saying that the sausage makers "had been shot." Such accounts were not published in the newspapers, which only praised the wisdom of the party and the great leader, Stalin.

In 1934, my father, as a ship yard employee, got a free ticket for an Odessa-Batumi cruise on the Black Sea. Traveling to Batumi on the liner, he observed that a large number of Ukrainian peasants had migrated to Georgia where there was no food shortage and no famine.

The famine in Ukraine was over, but those who survived fled from Ukraine. I know that in the local schools in the village of Rossosha near Proskurov (now Khmelnitsky) there was no first year class for the 1940 - 41 school year because the birth rate in 1933 had been zero. In 1953 - 54, the Soviet navy also experienced shortages of healthy servicemen because of the zero birthrate in 1933 in Ukraine. The requirements for service in the navy were reduced because otherwise it was impossible to recruit the necessary numbers of sailors. I received this information from a navy officer who had served a ten year term in Mordovia. In 1970, my wife and I met a woman in the village of Tarussa (Kaluga region) who spoke with a strong Ukrainian accent. She told us that she was born near Kiev. In 1933, she had fled from her native village because of the famine and had found shelter in Tarussa where she later married and settled down, thereby escaping death while her entire family died of starvation.

Since the revolution the majority of the Ukrainian population evidenced hostility toward the Soviet occupation. The artificial famine deepened the hostility. It is believed that half of the entire prison population in the Gulag were Ukrainians. The memory of the famine was especially vivid for the national and human rights Ukrainian dissidents of the 1960's and 70's. The founder of the Ukrainian Helsinki monitoring group, Mykola Rudenko, wrote a poem about the famine entitled The Cross" References to the famine are present in the works of Vasyl' Stus', Oles' Berdnyk, and others.
FAMINE TESTIMONY
OF POLIKARP KYBKALO

The spring of 1933 was the most horrible and tragic moment in the history of the Ukrainian people. In the fall of 1932 and the early winter of 1933 the Russian Communist government had taken away the entire grain crops and all food produce from the Ukrainian farmers in order to bring them into submission and obedient servitude in the collective farms.

In the collective farms of my native district, which numbered 672 people, 164 died that fatal spring of 1933. Actually this collective farm suffered little compared with all the surrounding places, for to induce the farmers to remain there, they were given 300 grams of bread per person baked from all kinds of chaff and some liquid concoction cooked from refuse. But there were villages and hamlets where not a single person remained alive -- for instance, in the large village of Chernychyna, in the Neforoshchanske county, which stretched for two and a half miles, though I do not recall its population, and the hamlet Rybky, of the Sukho-Mayachka village administration, where the population of 60 died.

Here is one of the many incidents of the famine. In my native village there was a stallion kept for breeding mares. He was well fed, receiving 13 pounds of oats daily, but for some unknown reason he suddenly died. This happened at the end of May, 1933. This district administration forbade the stallion to be buried until a special commission arrived and held an inquest.

The dead stallion lay in the open for three days and began to decay. A guard was appointed to shield it from the starving people who would have eaten the meat. On the fourth day the commission arrived and having completed the investigation, ordered the stallion to be buried.

No sooner was that done and the commission gone, then like an avalanche, the people descended on the dead, decaying stallion and in an instant nothing was left of him. Violent arguments ensued because some had grabbed more than their share.

A spectacle I shall never forget was when a 16-year-old boy, who, besides his stepmother was the only survivor in the family, swollen from starvation, crawled up to the place where the dead stallion had been and finding a hoof, snatched it in both hands and gnawed furiously. The boy was never seen again and nonofficial rumors circulated that he had been eaten by his stepmother.

It was forbidden for people to leave their villages. GPU guards blocked all roads and railways. Any food that the farmers happened to be carrying was taken away from them. For picking a stray head of wheat or a frozen potato or beef left in the field a person was sentenced to ten years in prison or concentration camp, according to the ruling passed.
by the government August 7, 1932.

Thousands of corpses littered the streets, byways and buildings. Deaths occurred at such a rate that the government could not keep up with burying the corpses. During all this time there was not the slightest sign of any famine in the neighboring Russian territory. The Soviet press never mentioned the famine in Ukraine but on the contrary even printed misleading propaganda about "flowering Ukraine" and her great achievements in industry and collectivization.

To cover up its bloody crime the Soviet government warned all doctors not to state the true cause of death on death certificates. Instead, they stated that a prevalent digestive ailment was the cause.

THE GULAGS
TOWARDS SLAVE LABOR

In 1928 an Estonian Communist and at that time the Deputy Commissar of the Workers and Peasants Inspection of Soviet Russia, H. Yanson, suggested to Stalin to more energetically use the prisoners' labor for development of the remote lands and construction sites. In 1930 as a Commissar of Justice he promoted the increase in the number of prisoners in general, and in proportion of the long imprisonment terms as well as increased transfer of prisoners from jails and correction camps to the labor camps. He and the NKVD Commissar Tolmachev claimed that the efficiency of the prisoners' work is higher than of freely contracted workers. Also in 1928 a jailed former millionaire, N. Frenkel, wrote to Stalin describing a scheme to avoid the low productivity of slave labor. He proposed a linking of rations to output. It is said that he estimated that in this way six months' work would be forced out of a prisoner, after which he could be written off. Frenkel was released and given high posts in the new system. Thus, arrests, dekulakization, deportations, and labor camps came together in the political campaign of Bolsheviks Forced labor, with a heavy death rate, was to become a central feature of the Stalinist order.

Prison camps, or katogga camps existed in Russia since the 17 century. These were conventional prisons. The Bolsheviks saw them as means to control dissent and disloyalty a month the people Criminals were imprisoned in the Gulags as were political dissidents, radicals and revolutionaries. The Gulag was designed as a prison camp for dissidents in 1930, and was disbanded in 1960.

In 1940 there were almost 500 of these labor camps. Prisoners worked at hard labor and were frequently used in public works projects. Recent studies found that about 1.2 million people died in these camps as a result of terrible conditions and died after leaving the camps for the same reason. <

VORKUTLAG

A part of the camp complex.
with Mine "Kapital'naya" on the horizon
(Kizny, GULAG. Buffalo, NY, 2004, p. 381.)

>...< Source: Rashin, Alexander.
Textbook for high schools and colleges:
Stalinist Genocide and Mass Murder, 2013,
IMEMENTO CLIO, New Jersey.
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Gulag: Soviet Forced Labor Camps and the Struggle for Freedom

Maria Tchebotareva

Trying to feed her four hungry children during the massive 1932-1933 famine, the peasant mother allegedly stole three pounds of rye from her former field—confiscated by the state as part of collectivization. Soviet authorities sentenced her to ten years in the Gulag. When her sentence expired in 1943, it was arbitrarily extended until the end of the war in 1945. After her release, she was required to live in exile near her Gulag camp north of the Arctic Circle, and she was not able to return home until 1956, after the death of Stalin. Maria Tchebotareva never found her children after her release.

*Courtes o the Gula Museum at Perm-36.*

Ivan Burylov

Seeking the appearance of democracy, the Soviet Union held elections, but only one Communist Party candidate appeared on the ballot for each office. Fear of punishment ensured that nearly all Soviet citizens "voted" by taking their ballot and ceremoniously placing it into a ballot box.

Trial of so-called "rich peasants" in 1929. Stalin's drive to seize all private land in the 1920s and 1930s met significant resistance. Some victims were shot, some were arrested and sent into the Gulag camps, and many were exiled to remote parts of the country.

*Courtes o the Central Russian State Film and Video Archive.*

**Soviet Propaganda Poster**

"Look Me in the Eyes and Tell Me Honestly:
Who is your friend? Who is your enemy?
You have no friends among capitalists.
You have no enemies among the workers.

Only in a union of the workers of all nations will you be victorious over capitalism and

Excursion to Gulag

Below are photos of labor prison camps of Soviet Time

Gulag stands for "Chief Administration of Corrective Labor Camps." The system of Stalin's labor camps was the most monstrous death factory in all history, with 'production' exceeding even WW-II's Holocaust. Around 40 million died in Gulag

Camps have been abandoned since summer 1953, when Stalin died. A general amnesty was announced and everyone, inmates and guards alike, quickly fled the area.

Roosevelt observed that capitalism is unequally divided riches while socialism is equally divided poverty. Gulag prison life meant an equal distribution of death among both rich and poor, old and young. Death played no favorites and came readily to all, regardless of gender, beliefs or nationality.
People lived in wooden barracks. Political prisoners, so-called "enemies of the state," and criminals were all kept together. "Enemies" were taken mostly from the ranks of prominent, intelligent and cultured people. Under the inhuman conditions of the camps, the civilised and cultural folks appeared to be less equipped for survival than the criminals.
To establish their iron rule, communists thought they had to rid society of all thinking and honest people. Such types are always a threat to despotic regimes. They almost succeeded: in twenty years of repression they rooted out many values, beliefs, and traditions that had been cultivated for centuries.
SENDING LIBERATED INMATES
OF NAZI PRISONS TO THE GULAG

> Some 40,000 Cossacks, White Russians, Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, including many
women and children, interned in Austria after the British military authorities accepted their
surrender in 1945 were betrayed by the British and handed to the Soviets in violation of all
official repatriation agreements. Large numbers within this group and others were not Soviet
citizens. They had escaped Russia during or before the Revolution, rescued in British and
French warships. They had taken new citizenship or possessed League of Nations passports
attesting to their stateless status.

Among the Cossack officers were many famous heroes who had lead the White Russian Army
in alliance with the British, French and Americans during the Russian civil war. One, General
Andrei Shkuro, had been honored for gallantry by King George V with the Companionship of the
Bath, whose cross he still wore on his uniform alongside others awarded by King George’s
cousin, Emperor Nicholas II.

SMERSH operatives, significantly, had detailed lists of all former White Russian officers on
which they checked off the names as the British relinquished custody of them. When Shkuro
was handed over, the General tore the cross from his chest and threw it at the feet of the attending
British officer. He and the Ataman of the Don Cossacks, Peter Nikolaevich Krasnov, one of the
most famous Russian leaders of all, were hung together in the Lefortovo prison courtyard. Their
helpless compatriots lie buried in mass unmarked grave in Gulag forced labor camps.<

>...< Source: Rashin, Alexander. Textbook for High Schools and Colleges: Stalinist Genocide and
Mass Murder. 2013, MEMENTO CLIO, New Jersey.
THE GREAT TERROR

>Stalin’s Reasons for the Great Terror:

The first large industrial complexes (e.g., Magnitka) were built by the deported, stripped of everything (including their civil rights) victims of de-kulakization and collectivization. There were millions of them in the early camps of 1930s, starving, sick, overworked, abused, tortured, shot by thousands. Kolyma greatly accelerated grinding this camp population into a dust or frozen corpses. A new massive flow of the convicts, comparable in their numbers to the dispossessed peasants, was needed to replenish the required slave force. Show trials and arrests of the remnants of the former ruling classes yielded only rather small numbers of the prisoners. While most of the Party agreed from the start on the Lenin proclaimed goal of the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, which group could be targeted for the next mass liquidation? This required a thorough preparation.

There was still a stiff opposition in the Politburo to the death penalty for the members of the Party elite. E.g., a former party secretary of one of districts of Moscow, Martemyan Ryutin (see Unit VII), with a small group of supporters issued an 'Appeal' to all members of the Party, attacking the destruction of the countryside, collapse of genuine planning, lawlessness in the Party and country, crushing of the freedom of opinion and press, destruction of arts, and all permeating monstrous lies. It called for the removal of Stalin and his clique as soon as possible, forcibly if they won't go voluntarily. Ryutin platform also argued that Bukharin was right on the policy, and Trotsky on the intolerable regime in the party. For Stalin Ryutin's Platform was the worst embodiment of hostility to his plans and rule. Stalin personally demanded a death sentence for Ryutin. However, the Stalinist majority of the Politburo, including Kirov, Ordzhonikidze, Kuibishev and some others were not ready for intra-party killings. Ryutin was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment. Between 1933-34 approximately one-third of the total members of the party were expelled, because they were thought to be "Ryutinites". The other case was the Old Bolshevik A.P. Smirnov, who did not belong to any opposition but supported Stalin's removal from the leading position. Again Stalin's demand to shoot the offender was blocked by the Politburo majority. Stalin had to retreat for a while.

While at the 17th Party Congress (the "Congress of the Victors") all former Stalin's opponents admitted their mistakes and praised Stalin, at least 166 out of 1,225 delegates voted against Stalin (the British embassy cited rumors that Stalin came only third in the number of votes, and that there was a massive election fraud; this agrees with the extermination of 60% of the Congress delegates in the subsequent purges). A number of leading Party figures (including Ordzhonikidze) dared to offer to Sergey Kirov to become a head of the Party collective leadership replacing Stalin's personal rule. Kirov, a loyal Stalinist and Stalin's personal friend, rejected the offer outright and told Stalin about it. Thus, there was a true opposition to Stalin's personal rule in the Party. It had to be neutralized.
Terrible Choices:

A former KGB officer Spragovsky said that during the Great Terror many became accomplices in the murders to protect themselves and their families. The line between the victims and executioners was blurred. It was a trick well known to the gangs: everyone should be a participant in murders. Then there would be no one to protest the crimes. Spragovsky's father was the chairman of a rural council. He was responsible to the NKVD for composing the lists of people to be arrested. If he hadn't, he would have been jailed himself. So he doomed innocent people. That's how he saved his own skin. He also had five brothers, and he managed to keep all his brothers alive by collaborating with the NKVD.

Great Trials:

Then Stalin launched a series of three great overlapping blows: on the Party, on the NKVD and on the Army, which largely solved his major problems. After that he was free to arrest anyone for as little as a joke or a false accusation by a neighbor desiring an extra room. The first blow was at the former left wing of the Party's old guard. It followed the same year by the purge of the NKVD with replacement of its head Yagoda by Yezhov, who purged Yagoda's people in the NKVD, and the second faked public trial of the Party leaders. Stalin promised the accused leniency if they confessed and then ordered the death sentences to be carried out. Waves of people at any time connected to Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev were being arrested. Then Stalin unleashed Yezhov on Bukharin, a relatively moderate right wing leader of the Party who already confessed to his errors. Over the next few weeks Bukharin and the former Premier Rykov were confronting those, who already confessed, like Pyatakov, in the presence of Stalin and the Politburo.

At the height of the Terror Stalin promised: "We shall annihilate every one of these enemies, even if he is an Old Bolshevik. We shall annihilate him and his relatives, his family. Anyone who in deed or in thought, yes in thought, attacks the unity of the socialist state will be mercilessly crushed by us. We shall exterminate all enemies to the last man, and also their families and relatives." This gave the NKVD unlimited number of targets for arrests and executions.

GENOCIDE OF THE FOREIGNERS

>USSR on the brink of ruin

In 1928 it seemed self evident that the Soviet Union is on the brink of bankruptcy and ruin. With the regulations by the market abandoned, inflation ran out of control, the State Bank printed more and more notes, often with identical serial numbers, and the ruble became virtually worthless. The Wall Street Crash also inflicted damage upon the Five Year Plan. After the Crash, Soviet export commodities were suddenly worth only a fraction of their former value. However, all foreign specialists and equipment were to be paid in fast diminishing foreign currency.

The Kremlin's schemes to gather hard currency were driven by a mounting sense of desperation. The NKVD began counterfeiting one-hundred-dollar bills for distribution across Europe and China, forcing US Federal Reserve to issue a warning against the excellent forgeries. Stalin also authorized sale to the West of the Tsars art treasures from the Hermitage and other museums. Most were bought in the US for dollars propping up the Stalin's regime. Export of the local collections (see #7.4) was a small addition to this export program. The remnants of the bread expropriated from peasants dying of starvation were also exported. Through the early 1930s USSR citizens were obliged to hand in their gold to the State. The GPU hunted for gold, foreign currency and jewelry tearing through apartments and rewarding the residents for the denunciation of neighbors' hoards. In a midst of universal shortages "gold stores" were opened where everything could be bought for old wedding rings. However, a more steady and inexhaustible source of the hard currency had to be found.

In the gloomy time of the Great Depression an English translation of New Russia's Primer: The story of the Five Year Plan became a best seller for seven months of 1931. In the midst of the Depression misery, who could not be attracted to the vision of future happiness and social progress? And who would blame those Americans, motivated as much by economic necessity as their own idealism, who gratefully accepted Joseph Stalin's open invitation to work in the Soviet Union. Skilled workers could have even their passage paid! And they saw themselves as the pioneers of a new frontier.

For the first time more people were leaving the US than were arriving. In 1931 Soviet trade agency Amtorg in New York advertised six thousand jobs for skilled workers in Russia. It received one hundred thousand American applications for emigration to the USSR. Ten thousand were hired. Throngs of uncounted adventurers traveled to Russia as tourists to hunt for the jobs on spot. Where would they work in Russia?

Enter Henry Ford and other western industrialists.

Henry Ford, an embodiment of American industrial achievement, was delighted by the prospect of getting 40 million dollars for the old Model A plant he had been planning to scrap. Henry Ford was perfectly aware of the grim reputation of the Soviet state. But the business opportunity was too good to miss. Ford's representative Charlie Sorensen negotiated a seven pages contract with the Soviet Supreme Economic Council in May of 1929; an American construction company under Ford's supervision started construction at Nizhni Novgorod (Gorky) in August of 1930 and completed it by November of 1931.
When after the contract signing Sorensen, who was given as present a silver jewelry box that once belonged to Catherine the Great, wanted to return to Russia to review the construction, Henry Ford was adamantly opposed. "Charlie don't you do it! They need a man like you - if you went over there, you would never come out again. Don't take that chance!" <

In January 1937 a second great show trial was held in which seventeen leading Bolsheviks declared that they had knowledge of a conspiracy between Trotsky and the German and Japanese intelligence services by which Soviet territory was to be transferred to Germany and Japan. A crowd of 200,000 packed Red Square in frigid weather to hear Nikita Khrushchev read out the death sentences. All seventeen were executed. Then on June 11, 1937, the cream of the Red Army, stripped of their medals and insignia, were ushered into the courtroom. They included Marshal Tukhachevsky, the most brilliant soldier of his generation and the pioneer of armored and airborne warfare. The generals were accused of spying for the Germans, found guilty, shot and dumped in a trench on a construction site, all within eighteen hours. Six of the officers who condemned them were soon shot. Of 85 corps commanders 57 disappeared within a year. Of the 100,000 Red Army officers on active duty in 1937, perhaps 60,000 were purged.

The last of the public trials took place in March 1938, as twenty-one leading Bolsheviks, including Nikolai Bukharin (1888-1938), confessed to similar charges and were executed. Also to go was Yagoda, Stalin's hand-picked head of the NKVD.

These public show trials and the secret trials of the generals provide only a faint idea of the extent of the Great Terror. Every member of Lenin's Politburo except Stalin and Trotsky were either killed or committed suicide to avoid execution. A partial list of those who ceased to exist would include:

- two vice-commissars of foreign affairs
- most of the ambassadors in the Soviet diplomatic corps
- numerous members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party
- almost all the military judges who had sat in judgment and had condemned --the Red Army generals
- two successive heads of the NKVD
- the prime ministers and chief officials of all the non-Russian Soviet republics --the director of the Lenin Library
- the man who had led the charge against the Winter Palace in 1917
- a 70 year old schoolteacher who owned a book which included a picture of Trotsky
- an 85 year old woman who made the sign of the Cross when a funeral passed
- a man who took down a portrait of Stalin while painting a wall

Not since the days of the Inquisition had the test of ideological loyalty been applied to so many people. And not since the days of the French Revolution had so many died for failing the test. Arrests multiplied tenfold in 1936 and 1937. Anything was used as an excuse for an arrest: dancing too long with a Japanese diplomat, not clapping loudly enough or long enough after one of Stalin's speeches, buying groceries from a former kulak. People went to work one day and simply did not return -- they were either killed immediately or sent to the GULAG. The NKVD employed millions of secret informers who infiltrated every workplace. Most academics and writers came to expect arrest, exile and prison as part of their lives.
A historian could be sent to exile for describing Joan of Arc as nervous and tense just when the general party line wished her described as calm in the face of death. A linguistic theory held that all language was derived from four sounds.

With the defeat of "national deviationists", the Bolsheviks' policy became more aggressive; all kind of opposition was severely suppressed; those parties which still retained legal status were forced to announce their dissolution and declare their official loyalty to the Soviet authorities between April 1922 and October 1923. Those who continued to operate did that as underground organizations. The Georgian Orthodox Church was also persecuted; over 1,500 churches and monasteries were closed or demolished and a number of clerics were imprisoned, including Catholicos Patriarch Ambrose who was arrested and tried for having sent a letter of protest to the 1922 Genca Conference in which he begged for the "help of the civilized world".

Purges of the Military

> In 1937-1938 the Red Army was purged loosing 3 out of five Marshals, 13 out of 15 Army commanders, 57 out of 85 corps commanders, 110 out of 195 divisional commanders, 220 out of 406 brigade commanders. A total of about 25,000 officers were executed in 1937-1938. At the end of 1938 Yezhov was relieved of the NKVD command which was given to Beria. Yezhov was arrested and accused of excesses towards innocent people.

Kirov’s Assassination and its Consequences

On December 1, 1934, Kirov was shot by a waiting assassin in a corridor of the government office. Kirov’s bodyguard was detained for a sufficient time at the building’s entrance. This bodyguard was killed under suspicious circumstances in the back of the NKVD truck two days later. While there is no documentary evidence (as in many cases of the Stalin era), Stalin evidently gave verbal orders to kill Kirov to the NKVD chief G. Yagoda. While in all previous Stalinist trials there were only unsupported by evidence accusations in plots to murder Party leaders, here was the real corpse and thus a valid reason for a wide search of conspiracies.

On the day of the murder the Central Executive Committee of the USSR adopted the resolution “On the special order of handling cases of a preparation to or carrying out the terrorist acts.” It prescribed to complete all processing of such cases in 10 days without a presence of the prosecution and defense, without right to appeal, and an immediate execution of the sentence. Initially the intraparty opposition was accused of the murder. On December 28 the trial of the "Leningrad Center" took place in which 14 mainly Komsomol leaders of Leningrad were shot. Other 77 arrested party functionaries were sentenced to various prison terms. In the trial of the "Moscow Center" the former Leningrad's party boss Zinoviev was sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment and Kamenev to 5. 663 "Zinovites" were deported from Leningrad, and 325 former oppositionists were transferred to work outside Leningrad.<

Shortly before he died on March 5, 1953, Soviet dictator Josef Stalin accused nine doctors, six of them Jews, of plotting to poison and kill the Soviet leadership. The innocent men were arrested and, at Stalin's personal instruction, tortured in order to obtain confessions. "Beat, beat, and again beat," Stalin commanded the interrogators.

The unfortunate physicians can be described as lucky only in comparison with Stalin's eighteen million other victims. The dictator died days before their trial was to begin. A month later, Pravda announced that the doctors were innocent and had been released from prison. It later became known that after their pro-forma trial and conviction, Stalin intended to organize pogroms around the country, after which prominent members of the Jewish community would publicly beg him to protect the Jews by sending them all to Siberia. Indeed, when Stalin died, the supposedly spontaneous appeal by leading Jews had already been written and signed; the signatories had been coerced into signing.

In accusing the Jewish doctors of being poisoners, Stalin was, of course, reviving a libel that was common among medieval anti-Semites. The most notorious incarnation of the "Jews as poisons" libel occurred in the fourteenth century when they were accused of having caused the devastating Black Plague by poisoning the wells of Europe. In addition to all the Jews who died from the plague, thousands more were murdered in pogroms prompted by these accusations. In 1610, the University of Vienna's medical faculty certified as its official position that Jewish law required doctors to kill one out of ten of their Christian patients. One wonders what it must have been like to be in a Jewish doctor's office — in back of nine other patients.

While one would think that all Jews would have breathed an enormous sigh of relief upon Stalin's death, there was no shortage of Russian Jews who shared in the country's paroxysm of grief. Even more peculiar, I. F. Stone, a well-known left-wing Jewish journalist in the United States, attacked President Eisenhower for not issuing a more effusive note of condolence on the mass murderer's death.

Source: [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/History/Human_Rights/plot.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/History/Human_Rights/plot.html)
UNIT IV Activities
PERFORMANCE TASK:
STALIN ON TRIAL

Time: Present

The United Nations and the World Court has decided to try Joseph Stalin posthumously for the alleged crimes he committed during his tenure as ruler of the Soviet Union. As part of the prosecution team, you will review the evidence, catalog and evaluate the possible charges, and prepare an introduction to the jury as well as a summation speech at the end of the presentation of evidence.

The charges are as follows:

1. Responsible for the death of millions of innocent people.
2. Using the government as an instrument of repression.
4. Causing the extermination of many of his colleagues.
5. Creating and using a vast system of prisons to punish those who disagreed with the government.
6. Using military power to suppress dissent.
7. Using immigration to achieve military objectives and industrialization
8. Supporting and sanctioning anti-Semitic policies.
9. Subverting the trial system in a series of show trials which were presented to the people as real trials
10. Subverting through the government the following: religion, work, family life, consumer goods, education, and the arts.

Each of these charges must be addressed in your summation after you have carefully reviewed the evidence as presented in this dossier and which includes the content of the STALIN PROJECT and the attached descriptions of the Stalin era.
SOME POSSIBLE CAUSES OF THE FAMINE?

TASK

Check off all that apply.

In 1917, Ukraine broke away from the czarist Russian Empire and reclaimed its independence. Ukrainian Nationalists drew most of their mass support from the village populations. Most varieties of Marxism (and for all intents, Communism) reject nationalism in favor of loyalty to the international working class. Did Stalin kill the Ukrainians in order to stamp out nationalism?

During the Civil War in Russia (pitting the Red "Communists" versus the White armies), Vladimir I. Lenin's Bolshevik/Communist/Reds mistrusted the peasants as petty property owners and relied on forced requisitions of agricultural produce to keep the urban populations fed. Did this early practice by the Communist government provided Stalin with precedence?

Under Vladimir I. Lenin, (the Communist leader prior to Stalin), Ukraine was forcibly incorporated as one of the Soviet Republics of the USSR, but was allowed freedom as a means to gain control. Did Stalin see these allowances as weak measures for a totalitarian state?

In the 19th century, and temporarily under Lenin's rule, Ukrainians underwent a national revival; that is, the romantic explorations into the local language and history brought a spreading sense of local patriotism and national identity. Was Stalin attacking Ukrainian pride?

The population of the Ukraine, roughly 30 million at the outbreak of the Famine, constituted two-fifths of all non-Russian inhabitants of the USSR. Was the harsh treatment of the Ukrainians an "example" to the rest of the Soviet republics?

Ukraine was the Soviet Union's most productive agricultural area. Of Ukraine's total land area of 60 million hectares, roughly 42 million is classified as agricultural land, which includes cultivated land (grains, potatoes and vegetables, and fallow), gardens, orchards, vineyards, and permanent meadows and pastures. Was Stalin exploiting Ukraine's valuable natural resources?

Stalin saw the world as "class struggles" (rather than racial ones employed by Hitler and the Nazis.) The independent small-holding peasants were seen as petty capitalist holdovers of an earlier era. Were the Ukrainian farmers categorized as ideological enemies of Stalin's version of communism?
Lenin saw class differentiation among peasants in three groups: the relatively wealthier kulaks or village exploiters, the subsistence farmers, and the poor peasants who could only make ends meet by working for others. Was there a history of class warfare (as similar to the widespread anti-Semitism in Germany), which Stalin could then "use" for scapegoating?

Small farmers saw Stalin's forced collectivization as a reinstitution of serfdom, and therefore resisted. For example, in 1930, the Ukrainian village of Kharkivtsi numbered 780 individual farmers. Out of this number, only four initially joined the commune. Did Stalin use famine as a punishment tool to force peasants into collective farms?

Stalin, in efforts to consolidate his totalitarian state, created a propaganda campaign that convinced Soviet citizens that the Soviet Union was under siege by the hostile capitalist world that encircled it. Soviet industry had to catch up with the West, or be crushed, Stalin argued. Would Stalin argue that crash collectivization was necessary (a type of "no pain, no gain")?

The drought of 1931 and poor weather of 1932 required Soviet leadership to pull food from agriculturally-rich areas to feed the cities.
Use any of these sites. Write an essay on your feelings about the Gulag System.
THE GREAT TERROR

Contrast the Moscow "Show Trials." with trials here in the USA. Based on what you have learned about Stalin's use of trials, what were they like and how different were they from our system of trial by jury here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Soviet Trial</th>
<th>US Trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STALIN’S LIFE AND CAREER
(Answer Key)

Unscramble the following events in Stalin's life and career as supreme ruler of the Soviet Union. Order them from 1 to 15.

5 Great Famine
6 Great Terror
1 First Secretary of the Party
10 Pact with Hitler
2 Revolution of 1917
4 Lenin dies
7 Trotsky killed in Mexico
8 Death of his wife
13 Doctors Plot
9 Gulags used for terror
15 Show trials
11 Victory at Stalingrad
12 World War II ends
14 Cold War
3 War Communism
STALIN’S LIFE AND CAREER

Unscramble the following events in Stalin's life and career as supreme ruler of the Soviet Union. Order them from 1 to 15.

1. Great Famine
2. Great Terror
3. First Secretary of the Party
4. Pact with Hitler
5. Revolution of 1917
6. Lenin dies
7. Trotsky killed in Mexico
8. Death of his wife
9. Doctors Plot
10. Gulags used for terror
11. Show trials
12. Victory at Stalingrad
13. World War II ends
14. Cold War
15. War Communism
PERFORMANCE TASK

There were many disagreements among the Bolsheviks in regard to political, social and economic issues. The Central Committee was the ruling group within the party. It included Stalin, Trotsky, Bukharin, Kamenev and others including Lenin until his death. The major economic issue during the period of the late 1920's was how to move forward with industrialization in relation to agriculture which was also an important aspect of their lives.

As a member of the Central Committee, you agree with Bukharin and Kemenev, that the policy should move carefully and not be too harsh in dealing with the farmers. This is in opposition to Joseph Stalin who favored "dekulakization" or crushing the Resistance of the farmers by any means necessary. You feel that it would be better would be better for Russia if the kolkhoz farmers, and kulaks, heads of Farm collectives, would be permitted to move in an orderly fashion towards more collective farming as Russia moves toward the industrialization that everyone agrees is needed.

Write a letter to Comrade Stalin explaining your views in this matter.
DEBATE

Have students debate question “were Stalin’s massacres a genocide or random deliberate acts of terror?”

Students should use the genocide definition, the UN Human Rights declaration and their own opinions and research. Conduct debate in a formal manner.
UNIT V
Stalin During WWII and the Holocaust

With a Camera Around the Camps by: Sergey Melnikoff
UNIT V
INTRODUCTION

In August 1939, Stalin entered into a Non-Agression pact with Nazi Germany. This pact allowed both dictatorships to extend their control over nearby territories. In Russia's case, these included Poland and others. After Hitler violated the pact by invading USSR, Stalin joined the Allies (US, England et al) in the war. The Russians stopped the Nazi advance in costly battles in Stalingrad and Moscow. The Russians reversed the course of the war and drove all the way to Berlin in 1945. Meanwhile the Allies were driving aft Normandy to Berlin where they met the Russians.

Stalin's tactics in dealing with prisoners of war were brutal. An example is the Katyn Massacre of 27,500 captured Polish officers. Stalin introduced Red Army from order No. 270 requiring that deserters be shot on the spot. Several commanders were shot for "cowardice" without a trial. Order No. 227 required that commanders retreating without permission be tried for desertion.
UNIT V
Readings
STALIN’S CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY
DURING WW II

During WW II Stalin was afraid that parts of the population that suffered from his repressions might support the invaders to topple his regime. Therefore in the course of the war he diverted large military and economic resources, which could be used to fight the enemy, for the deportation of millions of soviet citizens on the basis of their ethnicity. Some of the mass deportations were "preventive", and some were considered to be "retaliatory" both being applied to the entire ethnic group for the betrayal by some of its members. It did not matter that tens or hundreds of thousands members of these groups fought Nazis in the ranks of the Soviet Army, died on the battlefields, and many were distinguished with the highest soviet military decorations. Stalin wanted his troops fight to death, and those who were captured by the Nazis and then escaped or just broke from the encirclements were either accused of a betrayal and sent to forced labor camps of stripped of their military ranks and sent to the penal battalions to be used in the most hopeless and bloody operations.

Surrendering Germans would be chopped to pieces by the Soviet cavalry. At any suspicion that a village might hide an enemy the entire village would be wiped out with all its civilian inhabitants including women and children. Stalin ordered the "Scorched Earth tactics": all settlement left in the soviet retreat had to be thoroughly destroyed to make them unusable by the enemy; all their population had to be evacuated, not to rescue it but just to prevent their use by the enemy. Initial German advances were too fast for a full implementation of these tactics. Stalin used the Allied agreement for the forced repatriation, which betrayed soviet refugees, liberated Nazi camp inmates, and those forcefully taken by Nazis to work in Germany, to execute many without trial, and to send millions to the forced labor camps. Even those Russians, who fled to the West during the Civil War and never were soviet citizens, were turned to Stalin to be executed.

In 1939 he agreed with Ribbentrop to remove the Jews from all positions of importance as soon as he would have enough qualified non-Jews to replace them. Lists of positions forbidden for the Jews were compiled. Despite that Soviet Jews provided half a million of the battlefield forces, commanded many military units and were second only to Russian majority in the absolute number of the Heroes of the Soviet Union, they were just used and tolerated. Starting with 1943 promotions and prestigious decorations in the Army were often denied to Jews.

Grisha Kalshtein recalls: Our "work battalion" was retreating fast from Bessarabia to the Azov Sea (Bessarabians were not trusted to carry arms). There was an 18 KM long and 6 KM wide split butting into the sea there with three settlements: Ukrainian, Moldavia and German. It was a fertile land and barns stood full with melons, and other fruits. We dug defensive trenches across the split and finished our job. Suddenly at midnight there came a light so bright, that one could see a needle on the floor. It was from candle bombs slowly descending on parachutes. After that followed terrible bombing, screaming, cries.
It appeared from the information we were given later, that German tanks had crossed through the mud to the split, and the army went to the German village to investigate. The local Germans denied that there were any Nazis in the village. However, a number of German officers and tank crew members had been found. After that the villagers were threatened with punishment if they did not hand over all German military men hiding there. They still denied that there were any, but more were found in the searches. Then the German village was bombed out flat in that illuminated night.

Fragment from "Gustav and Katerina" by Beniamin Dodin. Translation from Russian by Dr. Alex Rashin.

In August 1957, Carl-Gustav Junior (the grandson of the Finnish general and President, Mannerheim, who defeated Stalin in 1939-1940 Soviet-Finnish war) eventually took risks of visiting Russia. For the first and the last time he met his Moscow grandmother (and my aunt) Katerina Vasilieva Geltser (formerly a famous ballerina). At that time I was not in Moscow. From February I was on my new "vacation" — a new exile in Altai Mountains. The exile was the result of an attempt to initiate a criminal case about "Bakinski transport" by myself and my friend from Gulag camps, Ivan Alexakhin. The transported included 110,000 soldiers and officers of Stalin's "Penal battalions" of 1941-42 (put into those battalions for minor violations of discipline or because they were imprisoned by the Nazis and then escaped). In the Caspian seaports they were forced into 43 old oil-tankers. After the tankers' hatches were securely sealed with twisted wire, the transport was sent through the Caspian Sea and Volga river to "Bezymian-lug" (literally — "Nameless Camp") near Samara (named Kuybishev at that time). After 8 months, from March to November of 1943, 41 sealed tankers reached their destination — filled with jellied human remains.

Unloading of tankers by the camp inmates, with shovels and wearing gas masks, ended with our revolt of the inmates absolutely crazed with disgust and stench and their vicious fight against the convoy. The fight naturally turned into a frenzied carnage of the bewildered guards by the inmates. Punitive units were sent in. A group of underwater sluggers including myself escaped their reprisals by swimming underwater to one of the tankers. We were found there by the paratroopers of the Volga Military Fleet and transferred to one of their ships. Later the Prosecution of the Fleet deported us to the Arctic. There it "lost us" saving from a shooting execution to which we were condemned in absentia.

In 1957 Ivan Pavlovich Alexakhin and myself perceived the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist party almost as a dawn of the Russian democracy. We made decision to start a criminal case "... following the facts of the monstrous murder of the Soviet soldiers from penal battalions, who defended Stalingrad, by asphyxiation and starvation in the sealed tankers." This attempt turned by a stroke for Alexakhin and for me new exile.

113
Massacre of Surrendering Germans

Marshal Zhukov continued to coordinate operations of the 1st and 2nd Ukrainian Fronts commanded by Vatutin and Konev correspondingly. By 30 December the 1st Ukrainian Front had torn the hole in the German lines 300 kilometers wide and 100 kilometers deep. The Germans counterattacked and regained about 30 kilometers, stabilizing the front. The 2nd Ukrainian Front's left flank succeeded in moving forward, but the right flank was stopped by strong German resistance. Zhukov decided to halt operations and to organize an encircling operation by both Fronts to liquidate the German armies that were blocking further Soviet advances in the area near the town Korsun-Shevchenkovskii. The encirclement succeeded, but Germans fiercely tried to break out. On 9 February they refused Zhukov's ultimatum to surrender.

Zhukov was a ruthless warrior brought up in the atmosphere justifying massive human sacrifices in both industrialization and war. Later the westerners were shocked by Eisenhower's retelling of the differences in the Allied and the Soviet views on the human costs of military operations revealed by Zhukov. He told Eisenhower, that in attacking through the mine fields the Soviet infantry would move forward as if the mines were not there. The Soviet theory shared by Zhukov was that losses from antipersonnel mines would be the same as those that could be inflicted by machine guns or artillery if they were used instead. After the infantry moved through and established a bridgehead, the combat engineers removed the anti-vehicle mines to clear the pass for the tanks and artillery. Zhukov showed complete unconcern for the Soviet soldiers captured by the Germans 'because they could not fight any more'. He was also uninterested in protecting the foot soldier from fatigue and exhaustion as too expensive measures not contributing to the victory. Zhukov was no angel. But the battle around Korsun-Shevchenkovskii showed some other generals played against Zhukov by Stalin.

Konev, who commanded the 2nd Ukrainian Front, was a number of times saved by Zhukov from a demotion or arrest at the beginning of the war. A few days after the Germans refused to surrender at Korsun-Shevchenkovskii, Zhukov was awakened to answer Stalin's call. Konev reported to Stalin that the Germans had broke through the 1st Ukrainian Front, which was not true, and Stalin transferred command of both Fronts to Konev to complete the final liquidation of the Germans in the pocket. Zhukov tried to convince Stalin that no command transfer was necessary, and the operation would be completed within a few days. But Stalin, who quite likely wanted to embarrass Zhukov, transferred the command anyway. Konev's report of the liquidation has been retold by the Yugoslav communist leader M.D. Jилас. Tens of thousands of Germans were forced into a limited space, where their heavy arms were smashed by Soviet tanks, after which they were finished by the Cossack cavalry. Smiling Konev was telling Jилас that he allowed Cossacks to enjoy chopping up the enemy, and they chopped off even the hands of those who raised them to surrender. Jилас was glad that the Germans were repaid for their inhumanity in Yugoslavia, which he observed at close quarters, but at the same time awed and repulsed by the cruelty of the action.
DEPORTATIONS

The decree of the State Commissariat of Defense about the deportation of the Chechens and Ingush was adopted on January 31, 1944 accusing some of them in collaborating with the enemy. On February 17 Beria reports to Stalin the completion of preparations to the deportation of 460,000 Chechens and Ingush. On February 21 follows the NKVD order for the deportation. On March 1 Beria reports to Stalin that between 23rd and 29th of February 478,479 people were loaded into 180 trains and deported. Thus it took only one month to decide upon, organize and carry out the deportation of about half million people. There were 10 Heroes of the Soviet Union among Chechens and Ingush.

It is claimed in some sources that all 20,000 Crimean Tatars conscripted to the Soviet army deserted and joined the German forces. According to other data out of over 100,000 Crimean Tatars, mobilized to the Soviet army, about 50,000 died on the battlefield. Stalin signed the decree of the State Defense Committee #5859 "On Crimean Tatars" on May 11, 1944. On May 20 Serov and Kobulov reported deportation of 191,044 Tatars. The operation was carried out by 20,000 internal troops and 5,000 NKVD and NKGB personnel.

Decree #5894 of July 2, 1944 required to deport in the beginning of July from the Crimea in addition to Tatars 37,000 Bulgarians, soviet Greeks and Armenians.

All these deportations were considered to be "retaliatory" to the entire ethnic group for the betrayal by some of its members.

It can be noted that in all these deportations were used thousands of the American made Studebakers provided by the US government to the USSR within Land-Lease program.

Sending liberated inmates of Nazi camps and refugees to Stalin's hard labor camps.

Some 40,000 Cossacks, White Russians, Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, including many women and children, interned in Austria after the British military authorities accepted their surrender in 1945 were betrayed by the British and handed to the Soviets in violation of all official repatriation agreements. Large numbers within this group and others were not Soviet citizens. They had escaped Russia during or before the Revolution, rescued in British and French warships. They had taken new citizenship or possessed League of Nations passports attesting to their stateless status.

Among the Cossack officers were many famous heroes who had head the White Russian Army in alliance with the British, French and Americans during the Russian civil war. One, General Andrei Shkuro, had been honored for gallantry by King George V with the Companionship of the Bath, whose cross he still wore on his uniform.
alongside others awarded by King George's cousin, Emperor Nicholas II.

SMERSH operatives, significantly, had detailed lists of all former White Russian officers on which they checked off the names as the British relinquished custody of them. When Shkuro was handed over, the General tore the cross from his chest and threw it at the feet of the attending British officer. He and the Ataman of the Don Cossacks, Peter Nikolaevich Krasnov, one of the most famous Russian leaders of all, were hung together in the Lefortovo prison courtyard. Their helpless compatriots lie buried in mass unmarked graves in Gulag forced labor camps.

On 11 February 1945, at the conclusion of the Yalta Conference, the United States and the United Kingdom signed a Repatriation Agreement with the USSR. The interpretation of this Agreement resulted in the forcible repatriation of all Russians regardless of their wishes. The forced repatriation operations took place in 1945-1947. Many Soviet POWs and forced laborers transported to Nazi Germany were on their return to the USSR treated as traitors and sent to GULAG prison camps. The remainder were barred from all but the most menial jobs.

Many of the Russian prisoners were transported to Britain and were held in training camps originally used for British troops. Soon the British authorities received their first glimpse of what it meant to be faced with the possibility of compulsory return to the world's first Marxist state: Russian POW suicides began in July of 1944. The matter was brought before the British Cabinet (the Americans were only marginally involved at this time). One member of the government who spoke up for the unfortunate prisoners was Lord Selborne, who was responsible for occupied Europe's sabotage and espionage operations. Russian-speaking officers under his direction recorded dozens of appalling stories of suffering from the POWs. Common to all of them was an absolute dread of returning to the Soviet Union. They were certain that they would be killed or, at the very least, sentenced to the unspeakable horrors of the labor camps. Selborne wrote to Winston Churchill who promised to consider the matter. But at a second cabinet meeting, Selborne was barred from presenting his evidence and Anthony Eden was able to convince the Prime Minister that all Russian POWs must be repatriated, forcibly if necessary.

In December of 1944, the first shipload of Soviet soldiers sailed around the North Cape of Murmansk by the White Sea. Here is one British observer's account: The disembarkation started at 18.30 hrs. and continued for 4 1/2 hrs. ... 32 prisoners were marched or dragged into a warehouse 50 yards from the ship and after a lapse of 15 minutes, automatic fire was heard coming from the warehouse; twenty minutes later a covered lorry drove out of the warehouse. These were not the only victims in this incident. Altogether, about 150 Russians were separated from the rest and marched behind sheds on the quayside. There they were massacred by executioners, many of whom appeared to be youths aged between 14 and 16.
MASS RAPE OF GERMAN WOMEN
BY SOVIET RED ARMY

There is a side to the Soviet liberation of Europe, and in particular Germany, which is rarely told. It is a story of frenzied violence and mass rape committed against civilian populations that was often approved or, at the very least, tolerated by all levels of the Soviet command.

Up to two million German women were raped during the last six months of WWII, around 100,000 of them in Berlin, based on medical reports. 240,000 women died as a result, many of them through suicide. Antony Beevor describes it as the "greatest phenomenon of mass rape in history". According to Natalya Gesse, a Soviet war correspondent and a close friend of the Soviet scientist Andrei Sakharov "the Russian soldiers were raping every German female from eight to eighty." Gang and repeated rapes were common. Dr. Phillip Kuwert, a senior physician at the University of Greifswald's department of psychotherapy and psychiatry, estimates that about 200,000 children were conceived by native German women raped by Russian soldiers. After the summer of 1945, Soviet soldiers caught raping civilians were usually punished to some degree, ranging from arrest to execution. The rapes continued, however, until the winter of 1947-48, when Soviet occupation authorities finally confined Soviet troops to strictly guarded posts and camps," completely separating them from the residential population in the Soviet zone of Germany. (Wikipedia).


"A certain amount was from the archives of the Ministry of Defense, a large amount from the Central State Archive – and this is very significant because one has reports from the NKVD chiefs of the army groups of the front advancing on Germany and into Germany reporting back.

As the Soviet advance progressed and news of the behavior of Soviet soldiers spread westwards, attempts were finally made by the Kremlin to re-instill discipline. On 11 April, a new order went out from Moscow and instructions saying that, "As Comrade Stalin has always said, Hitlers come and go but Germany remains and we must remember that our enemy are the Nazis and not innocent German civilians.

Some officers who tried to enforce the Kremlin order, Beevor says, were denounced by their own men. "There were also cases - where officers who tried to impose discipline were either shot down by their own troops or even were accused of bourgeois humanism and pity for the enemy, which was almost tantamount to treason."

Incidences of looting and rape in the closing days of World War II were, of course, recorded among the ranks of other Allied forces. But nothing remotely compares to the Soviets.
PARTY PURGE IN LENINGRAD

The Leningrad Affair (or Leningrad case) was a series of criminal cases fabricated in the late 1940s—early 1950s in order to accuse a number of prominent members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of treason and intention to create an anti-Soviet organization out of the Leningrad Party cell.

The Leningrad party leadership played a prominent role in the city's defense during the WWII as well as in the running of the Soviet war economy. Of course, they were a part of the system and participated in its crimes, but some of them were also capable administrators and economic theorists, promoting some elements of the market economy on the basis of the experience in running the economy during the war.

First signals of wrongdoing in Leningrad started to come to Moscow in 1947-48. The earliest one alleged that the Leningrad's leaders announced their win in the local elections as "unanimous" while there were some votes against them. While formally a fraud such "unanimity" was a common practice in the USSR. The second signal was more serious for Stalin because it indicated insubordination in undertaking some economic initiatives without receiving prior approval from Moscow.

In February, 1949, Stalin dispatched Malenkov to Leningrad to purge an overly independent Party chapter. It is worth noting that this purge happened at the time of the break between Stalin and Tito, who also introduced market economy elements in Yugoslavia and whose emissaries were friendly met in Leningrad in 1948. In 1949, Stalin’s Deputy Prime Minister, N. Voznesensky, already removed from all his positions, was summoned to Stalin's dacha. Stalin embraced him, sat him down to eat and drink with former friends in the Politburo, and even drank a toast to him. Voznesensky left happy, and was arrested on the way home. Stalin liked Voznesensky and gave a farewell banquet for him. Nearly 200 leading members of the Leningrad party organization were arrested in 1949 and put on trial in September, 1950. Two top Leningrad communists, Nikolai Voznesensky and Alexey Kuznetsov, denied all charges.

However, the court stated that:

"The accused pleaded guilty to having formed an anti-Soviet group in 1938, carrying out diversionary activity in the party aimed at undermining the organization in Leningrad and turning it into a base for operations against the party and its Central Committee... To this end, they tried to arouse local discontent with Central Committee measures, they spread slanderous allegations and uttered traitorous plots... They also sold off state property... As the documents show, all the accused fully confessed to these charges at the preliminary investigations and in court."
The means by which confessions were extracted was revealed by one of the prisoners, still in the camp, in January, 1954:

"I committed no crimes and did not regard myself as guilty, nor do I now. I gave my evidence after being systematically beaten because I denied my guilt.

Beginning Soviet Discrimination of the Jews

Stalin was not a maniacal anti-Semite like Hitler, but his anti-Semitism was boosted by Hitler's ascendancy to power. He was impressed by Hitler's effective use of anti-Semitic sentiment in the power struggle. In 1933 internal passports were issued to all urban residents of the USSR sixteen and over, which listed residents' nationality (ethnic descent). This was determined during registration from the required 'nationalities' of both parents. Only if the parents were of different nationalities, the sixteen-year-old could select one of the two. In mid-1990s originals of secret pact of a close cooperation between NKVD and Nazi Gestapo signed in 1938 found secret archives. A signed part of it obligates the NKVD to recommend to the Soviet government removing Jews from positions of power, from education and culture. After signing the 1939 pact of alliance between Nazi Germany and USSR, Ribbentrop reported that 'Stalin ... had made it clear ... that he would oust the Jews from leading positions when he had qualified non-Jews with whom to replace them'.

Apparently Stalin expected Israel to form a left wing government which he would be soon able to transform into fully communist government like he did in Czechoslovakia in 1948. When by the end of 1948 it became clear that Ben-Gurion leans to form a centrist Israeli government, which would not include the left pro-soviet party Mapam, all Jewish publications and theaters were closed. In December, 1948, and January, 1949, the entire leadership of the JAC was arrested. In total in 1949 were arrested about 400 Jewish public figures and members of the cultural elite. Jewish students started to be expelled from the best colleges. The arrested were accused in anti-soviet activities (Article 58 of the soviet criminal code) because they supported and developed the Jewish culture. According to the MGB (and supervising it Stalin) this was a nationalist activity, and any nationalist activity is an anti-soviet activity.<

UNIT V
Activities
PERFORMANCE TASK

It will be difficult to defend Joseph Stalin in the usual sense. Stalin's misdeeds are too well known and chronicled for that.

This is a lesson in doing history for students. They will understand that historical research is constantly uncovering new information about all of history. It is important to understand that there can be varying viewpoints and perspectives. New knowledge can change our view of the past. The recently uncovered secret communications of the KGB to American collaborators (Venona Transcripts) revealed a considerable effort by the Soviets to recruit spies in America and use of them to get valuable information. The most egregious example of this is Ethel and Julius Rosenberg who worked in the US atomic bomb project as scientists. They were convicted of treason in having passed atomic secrets, to the Soviets. The fact of this act was substantiated in a cable from Stalin to an American spy. Julies Rosenberg was executed as a traitor by the US Government in 1947.

There will be a prosecutor and a defense counsel. These should individual student teams of 3 or more. Each member of the team should have a specific role. The roles are:

Presenter of the case, who presents the evidence to the "jury"

Organizer of the information, who collects the information which each member of the team will collect

Research investigator, who discovers sources of information in print and the internet. A few trips to the library will be necessary.

It is necessary for all members of the two teams to thoroughly review the material in THE STALIN PROJECT first (www.stalin-project.com). This will provide for an overview of the story including Stalin the man, his early years, his work with the party, then his ascendancy to the leadership of the country. Students will understand his bureaucratic abilities, and his attention to detail. Having studied unit I of this package, they may be able to apply some of the findings of philosophy, and psychology to Stalin's personality and to his actions, especially his paranoia and his willingness to punish and to kill human beings for political, and frequently for personal objectives.

In addition to the above, each team member needs to read what we have called, using legal terminology, the Exhibits. These are selected excerpts from the longer original document by the Prakhin Foundation. These excerpts will provide the information the class will need to work on this Performance Task. It is suggested that the teams also use the internet and the library to secure additional information on such widely document topics as the Bolshevik takeover and their program, Lenin's economic
program, the NEP, the Ukrainian Famine, the Great Terror, the Show trials, the Gulags (there were many), and other sordid aspects of Stalin's career. Several suggestions for websites that will be helpful have been provided. See this site especially, http://loc.gov/exhibits/archives/intrn.html, which is a series documents revealing Soviet secrets from their own internal documents. Students will want to see authentic videos of Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky speaking to the Soviet Central Committee of the Communist Party at this site: www.zunal.com/webquest

Students should consult the hundreds of video clips on YouTube about many aspects of the history of this period in Russian history. This will help to bring this topic to life for them.

Both teams should prepare lists of notes on the major topics. They then need to work on their presentation to the jury (the class) should be based on the evidence they have found not only in the exhibits, but also in other sources. Evidence in this case does not mean actual objects or artifacts. It means credible claims, and believable accounts of events which seem to be accepted by most scholars and supported by parallel accounts. Eyewitness accounts presented herein should be considered credible because they have been assembled by the developers of this project.

The Defense team will be looking for inconsistencies, questionable truth claims, and disagreements among scholars. A good place to find information other than what we have presented here would be the list of scholars who worked on the STALIN PROJECT.

This list is presented on the home page of the project. The defense team may wish to present some arguments from "revisionists" in order to challenge the Prosecutor who will have the stronger case with overwhelming evidence. Students will learn that history is complicated; it is not just "what happened." It is evidence, plus interpretations and reinterpretations
DISCUSSIONS

Focus:

Discuss with students the cruelty of the Soviet communist regime which continued mass deportations, neglected lives of its own military, annihilated civilians in punitive military operations, persecuted refuges and liberated inmates of the Nazi camps and committed war crimes against the members of allied military and POWs.

Discussion:

Suggested questions:

1. Why did Stalin order deportation of "undesirables"?
2. What happened with ethnic Japanese in the US after attack on Pearl Harbor?
3. Do you think deportation of Germans was a pilot project for mass deportation of other ethnic groups?
4. Why was Stalin so cruel towards Soviet military? Why "Penal battalions" were created? Why did "Bakinski Convoy" happen?
5. Why didn't Stalin sign "The Geneva Convention"?
6. The population of the Soviet Union was much larger than that of Germany. Was it the main reason Stalin did not care about the number of casualties? Or there were other reasons — for example, the desire to decrease the population so it is easier to keep it more obedient?
7. Why Soviet regime was so cruel — ordering to take no prisoners, allowing raping German women, sending all liberated POWs — Europeans and Americans included — to Soviet concentrations camps where most of them were destined to die?
8. Why Nazi's anti-Semitic demands were accepted and then expanded by Stalin?
9. What do you think about life of ethnic groups accused in collaborating with the enemy and deported to inhabited places surrounded by people not speaking their language?
10. Why did Stalin want all Russians, even those who were not Soviet citizens, to be repatriated?
EVENTS

1. Identify and discuss each of the following events:
   
a. Katyn Massacre
   
b. Nazi-Soviet Pact
   
c. Soviet Army Order no. 270
   
d. Soviet Army Order no. 227
   
e. NKVD
   
f. Battle of Stalingrad
   
g. Peter Krasno
UNIT VI
Stalin After WWII

A Camera Around the Camp by: Sergey Melnikoff
UNIT VI
INTRODUCTION

The Soviet Army was part of the victorious coalition which crushed the Nazi's in World War II. Russia under Stalin now emerged as a major power in Europe. Meetings at Yalta and Potsdam between Stalin and allied leaders Roosevelt and Churchill resulted in agreement between the powers about allowable spheres of influence in Europe. The influence of the Soviets covered most of Eastern Europe with leftist governments under Moscow's control. This led to an extended "Cold War" in which Moscow tried to destabilize many countries in Europe and the Americas.

As the Venona Papers have revealed, there was a network of Soviet spies in the US reaching to the highest levels of government. Stalin's death in 1953 led to a de-Stalinization period in Russia, and eventually to the collapse of the Soviet Union and of communism.
UNIT VI
Readings
STALIN'S POGROM

The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee was established on Stalin's order by Solomon Mikhoels, renowned Yiddish actor and theater director in Moscow. They were involved in numerous projects to support the Soviet war effort against the Nazi's. They were sent by Stalin in 1943 to raise money and support for the Soviet war effort. At this point they came under suspicion of being too pro-American and pro-Israel. They were later accused of passing state secrets to American communist Paul Novick, editor of Morgan Freiheit, a New York communist daily and Yiddish journalist B.Z. Goldberg, son-in-law of Sholem Alecheim. When the JAC began to raise questions about the treatment of Jews in the Ukraine during the war, they were denounced for "slandering Soviet reality." At this point Stalin turned against the JAC. He suspected them of being too pro-American and too sympathetic to Israel. Stalin had tried to co-opt Israel as a client state and had been rebuffed.

With the outbreak of the Cold war and the establishment of Israel in 1948, Stalin's fear of the outbreak of a war with the United States, Stalin began to believe that Soviet Jews would not be loyal to the USSR. Mikhoels was murdered on Stalin's orders in January, 1948. The JAC was now suspect and was being investigated. A trial for the other members was held in 1952. They included five Yiddish writers and ten other people who had been active with the JAC. All the defendants in the trial were arrested between September 1948 and June 1949.

The principal defendant was a former member of the Central Committee, Solomon Lozovsky, who was not a Yiddish writer. He knew Lenin and Stalin well and had been prominent in the Profintern (cf. Profintern in Internet Marxists Archive) the international communist-dominated trade union movement. He was appointed in 1939 by Molotov as one of three deputy foreign ministers. As head of the JAC he had been tireless in promoting Soviet interests. A second prominent official tried was Boris Shimeliovich. A third was biologist Lina Shtern, at the time the only woman member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and inventor of Soviet penicillin, which saved thousands of lives at the front during the war. Several lesser known functionaries were included as well. There was also one informant, Itzik Feffer, who joined the JAC in 1942 and reported back to Stalin about "nationalism" and questionable loyalty within the committee.

All were brutally interrogated and tortured until they "confessed." Many were subjected to anti-Semitic insults and invective. Colonel Vladimir Komaroff who conducted the case screamed at Lovosky that "the Jews are a foul and dirty people, that all Jews are worthless scum, that the entire opposition to the party was made up of Jews, and that all Jews spit on Soviet power."

During this period there were again discussions with Beria about the possibility of setting up a separate Jewish State in the Crimea. Initially the regime took this idea seriously, but Kaganovich and Beria dismissed the idea.

Soviet judges expressed misgivings about trying people who were not apparently guilty of the charges, but were told to "do what you have been told to do."

128
STALIN'S ANTI-WESTERN CAMPAIGN

> The anti-West campaign had its roots in the core of the Communist ideology. When Litvinov (a former Soviet Foreign Minister) was asked by Harriman in November 1945 what the West could do to satisfy Stalin, Litvinov replied "Nothing." By June 1946, Litvinov (by then Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs) warned Westerners that Stalin could not be appeased by concessions. This, as he told an American correspondent, was because "the ideological conception prevailing in the USSR is that the conflict between the Communist and capitalist worlds is inevitable." The correspondent asked whether the West granting all of Moscow's demands could ease the tensions. Litvinov responded that "It would lead to the West being faced, after a more or less short time, with the next series of demands."

The General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, Earl Browder, in December 1943 declared that peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism was possible. In April 1945 this position was denounced as a "deviation from correct Marxist analysis," and soon Browder was expelled from CPUSA. In his February 1946 speech, Stalin gave an advance notice on the coming anti-West ideological campaign. The campaign was launched by Stalin's second in charge, Andrei Zhdanov, in August 1946. New categories for arrest were secretly approved: a) "Praising American Technology," b) "Praising American democracy," c) "Abasement before the West."

On February, 1947, the Decree "On prohibition of marriages between the soviet citizens and foreigners" was published. Approval of the "Act on State Secrets" in June made practically any contact with a foreigner an anti-soviet activity.

NEW CATEGORIES FOR ARRESTS

Realizing that millions of soviet people saw a better life beyond the USSR he started the anti-west campaign to isolate and annihilate all those who were impressed by western achievements. Mass repressions, fear and anti-west feelings were also his tools for preparing destruction of the capitalist democracies in a new war. On the way to achieving his goals he expanded hard labor camps by a system of hunger and exhaustion and authorized deadly "medical" experiments on prisoners. He continued mass deportations with high death rate from his newer border regions to liquidate possible resistance, desire for independence, and memories of a better life. He purged communists in his and satellite countries who showed signs of political independence from him. In the arms race, he led soviet industries to production labor camps. Being rebuffed by the market-supporting Communist Yugoslavia and Israel, who avoided traps that allowed Stalin to subjugate Georgia and Czechoslovakia, Stalin added Yugoslavia and Israel to the U.S. as his major enemies. He helped to start and kept smoldering the Korean conflict to distract western military resources and keep West Europe unprotected. He built nuclear weapons and prepared to neutralize possible US reaction by a threat of one way nuclear bombing raids on American cities. To consolidate his country for the new war by fear and hatred he initiated a massive anti-Jewish (anti-Zionist) campaign which would allow him to carry out a new purge within the country. But he was likely assassinated by his closest associates fearing for their own lives, which action terminated many of his possibly murderous plans.
DEPORTATION FOR RUSSIFICATION

Operations "Priboy" ("Surf") and "Yug" ("South"): 

Of key importance to the debate on Soviet regime's justification and planning of the mass deportations of 1949 is the file on top secret USSR MGB Operation "Priboi" (Russ. for 'Surf), the operational code name for the mass deportations. In the early 1990s, when Russian archives were more open to foreign researchers than now, Heinrihs Strods discovered this file amongst the records of the USSR Interior Forces Chief Administration held by the Russian State Military Archives in Moscow. This file, consisting of 435 pages, including maps, is entitled "Materials on USSR MGB Interior Forces' Top Secret Operation 'Priboi', 25 February — 23 August 1949 ". 

By the end of February 1949, Burmak had calculated preliminary estimates of the manpower and resources required for the fulfillment of the secret government orders in each of the Baltic republics. First, he listed the existing forces and resources available to the MGB in order to deport 30,000 Baltic families on "D-I" -- the date for undertaking the operation. There followed Burmak's estimates of the extra units and resources needed in each case to be brought in from other parts of the USSR.

Burmak also outlined measures intended to hide the true purpose of the operation from the people in Baltic countryside:

"In order to keep the local inhabitants of Latvia and Estonia misinformed, military spring training exercises are to be openly staged for the sake of appearances. ... Commanders are forbidden from using the word 'Operation' in any documents: all orders, payments, telephone conversations, and similar items are to employ a different designation, i.e. 'training exercises'.

MGB troops were required for a complete cover up to assemble and load onto the trains items necessary for training exercises (noisemakers, blank rounds, training grenades, etc.)." Burmak hoped that the true scope and purpose of the operation would thus be disguised from the people slated for deportation, until "Priboi" was already underway. This actual purpose for the Baltic states was the transfer of the large part of the its native population deep into Russia, replacing them by Russians, absorption within the Soviet Union itself, and subjection of the Baltic states to a conscious policy of Russification.
ANTI-ZIONIST PURGES IN SATELLITE COMMunist PARTIES

Stalin looked for conspiracies of Party leaders everywhere. In Czechoslovakia, which became a Soviet Communist satellite only in February 1948, an anti-Titoist purge was developing too slow for Stalin's purposes. It started as in Hungary. Extorted confessions about a Titoist-imperialist plot, involving sixty prominent Czechoslovak Communists, were received in Prague from Soviet and Hungarian torturers. President of Czechoslovakia Gottwald and General Secretary Rudolf Slansky appointed a commission and soon recommended arrests. "Gottwald informed the MGB advisor, General Belkin, that with the arrest of the 'Swiss group' the purge of the U.S. spies who had infiltrated the Party, had been completed." The commission had found no hard evidence against the so-called 'London group' which would include many prominent Communists and everybody connected to the late Czechoslovak President Benes.

Stalin and Hungarian Communist boss Rakosi were furious. Rakosi sent Gottwald a letter explaining that a lot of Czech names would come up as spies during the Rajk trial, and if these people remain at liberty, they would protest vehemently and try to undermine the credibility of the charges and thus of the Rajk trial itself. Polish Communist torturers extracted confessions from the Poles which incriminated Czech Communists.

Gottwald conceded and, with the insistent help of the Soviet MGB, a number of 'Londoners' were arrested. In 1950, two Jewish deputy ministers of Foreign Affairs, Vavro Hajdu and Artur London, were arrested among thousands of others. The 'chief criminal', the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Vladimir Clementis, followed.

Stalin ordered construction of a Jewish-Zionist plot of the top party leaders in Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1951. Incriminating evidence against Slansky, who was a Jew, started to be extorted from those already arrested. In September, Slansky was demoted to the powerless position of Deputy Prime Minister for "grave mistakes in cadre policy." In November 1951, MGB presented Gottwald with 'evidence' of Slansky's guilt as head of a Zionist-Imperialist plot. He was arrested by the end of the month under the general control of MGB general Beschasnov. Slansky was barbarously tortured for two months, and after a failed suicide attempt, confessed everything. The beating phase was concluded in August 1952, and the final text of the indictment was approved by Gottwald, new General Secretary Antonin Novotny, and then by Stalin himself.
The indictment included the following: "Slansky, Geminder, and the other plotters supported the subversive activities of Zionism, the trusted agent of the imperialists"; "The government of Ben-Gurion ... transformed Israel into an American possession and supports unconditionally the criminal plans ... to turn Israel into a deployment zone against the USSR"; "Zionist organizations offered an advanced base in fight against the people's democracies and the Soviet Union"; "Slansky is the son of a wealthy Jewish family, the great hope of all of the Jews within the Communist Party"; "American spies used Israeli diplomatic passports as a cover ... The former Israeli Ambassador to Czechoslovakia ... established an espionage contact with Geminder and others."

An arrested member of Mapam, Mordechai Oren, confessed to being the contact between Slansky and the Israeli spy agency. In Slansky's trial a Jewish doctor Haskovitz linked to both Zionists and Party plotters was accused of having "shortened the life of Gottwald." <

UNIT VI
Activities
DISCUSSION & ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. What was the victorious Stalin’s objectives after the end of World War II?

2. What were some of the strategies he used to achieve his objectives?

3. How did Joseph Stalin deal with a dissident communist state?

4. How was it possible for anyone to disagree with Stalin and live?

5. How did the Cold War begin? What was the nuclear “stand off”?

6. What was Stalin’s middle eastern strategy at this point?

7. What were the elements of Titoism?

8. What do the Venona transcripts tell us about Soviet subversion in other counter?  
   (Internet needed for this one.)

9. What was the “Gulag”? How were they used by Stalin’s government? With what effects?

10. Describe the Leningrad Purge? Include the purpose, who was involved, and the results.
UNIT VII
Resistance to Stalin & Communism

Sculpture by: Haum Epelbaum
UNIT VII
INTRODUCTION

>Even in the most brutal political systems courageous people keep rising ready to fight for freedom, dignity and justice. They are often exterminated by the evil system, but new ones rise again and again. One has a reason to hope that while prolonged repressions deprive the repressed society of its best members and corrupts it, the evil political systems are bound to produce forces leading to their demise.

The Bolsheviks fought not just against the enemies of the working people when they suppressed strikes of the Petrograd workers by arresting their leaders, outlawing any meetings, introduced martial law and threatened all violators with severe punishments under this law.

It became even clearer, when demands in support of the striking workers by the sailors of the Baltic Fleet, who just a year earlier were the major force of the Revolution, were responded to by the suppression with the military force. The sailors, who did not expect such brutal approach, fought back but were overwhelmed.

Four million peasants and workers of the Tambov region, who wanted democratic elections, resisted the imposition of the Bolshevik rule by creating the Tambov Democratic Republic and an army of 50,000 peasant fighters. Bolsheviks managed to suppress them only with the help of chemical weapons.

The people of Georgia formed an independent democratic republic, which signed a non-aggression treaty with Moscow. Bolsheviks violated the treaty, invading Georgia with overwhelming military force. Brave Georgians went to war for their independence and fought gallantly, but were defeated. Bolsheviks, led by Stalin, made Georgia one of the Republics of the Soviet Union, subjugated to Moscow. In a few years Georgians rebelled but were defeated again.

Workers of the third largest industrial region of Russia went on strikes and rebelled objecting to sharply rising exploitation and starvation rations. They declared that Bolsheviks betrayed the Revolution. Their courageous leaders were ready to sacrifice their lives for their convictions. Stalin had to silence the workers' leaders, because they challenged the legitimacy of his rule.
The secret police learned how to slowly undermine, isolate and then decapitate the workers movements by false propaganda and arrests of its leaders. Moscow realized that the organs of political repression had to be mobilized against workers - and their leaders - at the first indication of the resistance. The delay enabled the leaders to acquire enough popularity to defend themselves for some time. To prevent new leaders from springing into existence the OGPU had to be given the resources and authority to make arrests quickly - indeed, preemptively.

UNIT VII
Readings
PETEBSBURG STRIKES AND KRONSTADT UPRISING

>It should be noted that the Baltic fleet sailors were one of the major military force which made possible the Bolshevik revolution. Kronstadt is an island fortress impregnable when the sea is not covered with ice.

At the end of the Civil War, Bolshevik Russia was exhausted and ruined. The droughts of 1920 and 1921 and the frightful famine during the latter year added to the disaster.

Market places had officially been abolished. But in nearly all towns there were semi tolerated illegal markets, where barter was carried out. Suddenly, in the summer of 1920, Petersburg's Bolshevik leader Zinoviev issued a decree forbidding any kind of commercial transaction. The few small shops still open were closed and their doors sealed. In January 1921, workers in metal smelting factories were allocated rations of 800 grams of black bread a day; shock workers in other factories 600 grams; workers with A.V. cards: 400 grams; other workers: 200 grams. Black bread was the staple diet of the Russian people at this time.

But even these official rations were distributed irregularly and in even smaller amounts than those stipulated. According to official statistics, working class wages in 1920 in Petrograd were only 9 per cent of those in 1913.

A few workers were seeking refuge in the countryside. The bulk remained. There was certainly no significant influx of peasants into the starving towns! It was the famous Petrograd proletariat, which had played such a leading role in both previous revolutions that was finally to resort to the classical weapon of the class struggle: the strike.

The first strike broke out at the Troubotchny factory, on 23rd February 1921. On the 24th, the strikers organized a mass demonstration in the street. Zinoviev sent detachments of 'Koursanty' (student officers) against them. Meanwhile, the strikes were spreading.

The Baltisky factory stopped work. Then the Laferma factory and a number of others: the Skorokhod shoe factory, the Admiralteiski factory, the Bormann and Metalischeski plants, and finally, on 28th February, the great Putilov works itself.

The strikers were demanding measures to assist food supplies. Some factories were demanding the re-establishment of the local markets, freedom to travel within a radius of thirty miles of the city, and the withdrawal of the militia detachments holding the road around the town. But along these economic demands several factories were putting forward political demands for freedom of speech and of the Press, the freeing of working class political prisoners. In several big factories, Party spokesmen were refused a hearing.
Confronted with the misery of the Russian workers who were seeking an outlet to their intolerable conditions, the servile Party Committee and Zinoviev, (who was behaving in Petrograd like a real tyrant), could find no better methods of persuasion than brute force.

On 24th February, the Party leaders set up a special General Staff, called the Committee of Defense. It was composed of three people. They were supported by technical assistants. In each district of the town, a similar Committee of Three ('troika') was to be set up, composed of the local Party organizer, the commander of the Party battalion and of a Commissar from the Officers' Training Corps. Similar Committees were organized in the outlying districts. These were composed of the local Party organizer, the President of the Executive of the local Soviet and the military Commissar for the District.

On 24th February the Committee of Defense proclaimed a state of siege in Petrograd. All circulation on the streets was forbidden after 11 PM, as were all meetings and gatherings, both out of doors and indoors that had not been specifically permitted by the Defense Committee. 'All infringements would be dealt with according to military law.' A general mobilization of party members was decreed. Special detachments were created, to be sent to "special destinations". Then the strike leaders were arrested.

On February 26, 1921 delegates from the Kronstadt sailors visited Petrograd to investigate the situation. On February 28, in response to the delegates' report of heavy-handed Bolshevik repression of strikes in Petrograd, the crews of the battleships Petropavlovsk and Sevastopol held an emergency meeting which approved a resolution raising fifteen demands:

1. Immediate new elections to the Soviets. The present Soviets no longer express the wishes of the workers and peasants. The new elections should be held by secret ballot, and should be preceded by free electoral propaganda.
2. Freedom of speech and of the press for workers and peasants, for the Anarchists, and for the Left Socialist parties.
3. The right of assembly, and freedom for trade union and peasant organizations.
4. The organization, at the latest on 10 March 1921, of a Conference of non-Party workers, soldiers and sailors of Petrograd, Kronstadt and the Petrograd District.
5. The liberation of all political prisoners of the Socialist parties, and of all imprisoned workers and peasants, soldiers and sailors belonging to working class and peasant organizations.
6. The election of a commission to look into the dossiers of all those detained in prisons and concentration camps.
7. The abolition of all political sections in the armed forces. No political party should have privileges for the propagation of its ideas, or receive State subsidies to this end. In the place of the political sections various cultural groups should be set up, deriving resources from the State.
8. The immediate abolition of the militia detachments set up between towns and countryside.

9. The equalization of rations for all workers, except those engaged in dangerous or unhealthy jobs.

10. The abolition of Party combat detachments in all military groups. The abolition of Party guards in factories and enterprises. If guards are required, they should be nominated, taking into account the views of the workers.

11. The granting to the peasants of freedom of action on their own soil, and of the right to own cattle, provided they look after them themselves and do not employ hired labor.

12. We request that all military units and officer trainee groups associate themselves with this resolution.

13. We demand that the Press give proper publicity to this resolution.

14. We demand the institution of mobile workers' control groups.

15. We demand that handicraft production be authorized provided it does not utilize wage labor.

On March 1, a general meeting of the garrison was held, attended also by Mikhail Kalinin and Commissar of the Soviet Baltic Fleet Nikolai Kuzmin who made speeches for the Government. The general meeting passed a resolution including the 15 demands given above. On March 2 a conference of sailor, soldier and worker organization delegates, after hearing speeches by Kuzmin and Vasiliev, President of the Kronstadt Executive Committee, arrested these two and amid rumors of immediate attack approved formation of a Provisional Revolutionary Committee.

There were little signs of any careful advance preparation. Had there been a prearranged plan, surely the sailors would have waited a few weeks longer for the ice to melt, which would make Kronstadt impregnable to the land forces. The rebels, moreover, allowed Kalinin (a leading Communist) to return to Petrograd, though he would have made a valuable hostage. Further, no attempt was made to take the offensive... Significant too, is the large number of Communists who took part in the movement, and that the vast majority of the sailors were the same who served in 1917. The rebels also underestimated the Bolsheviks' cruelty and determination as well as paid for the lack of qualified officers to direct the rebellion, as most officers were expelled by the revolutionary sailors in 1917.

The Bolshevik Government responded with an ultimatum the same day, and began its attack on Kronstadt on March 7 upon approval of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and other leaders. 60,000 troops under command of Mikhail Tukhachevsky took part in the attack. The Petrograd workers were under martial law and could offer little support to Kronstadt. There was a hurry to gain control of the fortress before the melting of the bay as it would have made it impregnable for the land army. Many Red Army units were forced onto the ice at gunpoint and some actually joined the rebellion. On March 19, the Bolshevik forces took full control of the city of Kronstadt after having suffered additional fatalities ranging from 527 to 1,412.
Although there are no reliable figures for the rebels' battle losses, Historians estimate that 1,200 to 2,168 rebels were executed in the days following the revolt, and a like number were jailed, many in the Solovki prison camp. Official Soviet figures claim approximately 1,000 rebels were killed, 2,000 wounded, and between 2,300 to 6,528 were captured.
THE LARGEST UPRISING OF RUSSIAN PEASANTS AGAINST BOLSHEVIKS

The documents of the bloody suppression of the Tambov uprising survived by a miracle. They were being burned in a church by NKVD to erase all traces of real history. However, burning of the documents in the church led to a fire, which was fought with water cannons and sand. Many papers survived under the sand in a rather good condition and were found in 1982 (Sennikov, Moscow 1984). Here we provide some fragments, translated by us, and short comments.

Peasants' of Tambov region rose up against communist power which, to weaken people's resistance, decided to rob them of all food. According to the Decree 'On Food Dictatorship', signed by Lenin on May 9, 1918, the Russian population had to starve. People could get scarce rations of bread as the only means of survival only if they worked for communists. All trade was banned, and was considered as counter-revolutionary speculation punishable by the shooting death.

There was more than enough food in the rural areas, with all elevators and storage facilities filled to the brim. However, Bolsheviks knew that who owns the food — owns the power. Their monopoly on food, an artificially created famine and the Red Terror could give Bolsheviks an unlimited power. To create the famine they decided to take away all food from the peasants. Part of this food was simply destroyed, because of lack of non-local storage facilities and the transportation mess; another part was sold abroad."

MASS ARMED RESISTANCE TO BOLSHEVISM IN TAMBOV REGION

It should be noted that long time residents of Tambov never were serfs. The serfs were imported to Tambov region from other parts of Russia, but after the liberation reforms of Alexander II all residents became free and remained free until Bolsheviks tried to enslave them. Thus the love for freedom was deeply ingrained, and anti-Bolshevik resistance spread wider and wider. Mamantov left a lot of war ammunition to the peasant partisans and now they could successfully fight of the Bolshevik gangs.

In summer of 1920 isolated partisan groups and thousands of Cossacks and anti-communist officers organized three Tambov rebel armies with a centralized command. The peasant rebellion entered a well organized phase of a peasant war against communists. All activities of the Soviet penal squads, Cheka and mercenaries were terminated. In November all forces were united under command of Lieutenant P. Tokmakov with the General staff headed by colonel A. Boguslaysky. Antonov remains the head of staff of the 2nd rebel army subordinated to the central command. The Union of the Toiling Peasants declared formation of Tambov Democratic Republic, organized local and central democratic governments on all its territory, restored school education for all children and raised the old Russian flag. All parties except for Bolsheviks were allowed. Remaining in Tambov Soviets tried to soften their rule, but peasants already annulled all their decrees. The rest of the 1920 and a part of 1921 were a success of the free Tambov region. In 1920 the peasants gathered their crops for the first time in 3 years. The number of rebel regiments reached 30. Eventually the rebels commanded up to 50,000 armed fighters.

Bolsheviks managed to suppress the rebellion only with the help of the chemical weapons (WMDs) despite large advantage in military forces and wide spread mass murder (See Unit IV).

Leaders of Tambov Rebel Armies. First from left — Commander-in-Chief P. Tokmakov, next to him — Head of the Staff of 2nd Rebel Army A. Antonov.

Fighters of one of the Regiments of the United Rebel Army.
BOLSHEVIK'S PUTSCH IN TAMBOV

In the spring of 1918 Bolsheviks organized a putsch in Tambov and declared the Soviet power there. From Tambov Bolsheviks sent "flying squads" formed from fanatics, sadists and non-Russian mercenaries to establish the Soviets in small towns and villages. Their first action would be a sadistic shooting of officers, priests and students of gymnasiums. After the first shock peasants who brought arms from the WWI organized self-defense, with church bells informing neighboring villages of an approaching "flying squad" and calling for help, which always arrived. These self-defense formations would repel or annihilate the "flying squads".

In August 1919 2,500 strong White Cossack cavalry group of general Mamantov for 40 days successfully raided the rear of the Red armies, defeating Budenny cavalry, the Latvian, Chinese and other "internationalist" mercenary red units, and forcing Trotsky himself to flee from his headquarters. Many joined Mamantov, and he returned from his raid with an army of 10,000. Bolsheviks ran from Tambov at Mamantov's approach and he took the town without a single shot. He was happily greeted by the population, tired of the Bolshevik excesses, and his Cossacks distributed among the people all of the goods requisitioned by the communists.
TAMBOV PEASANT UPRISING

Three congresses of Tambov peasantry took place from April to September 1917, organizing The Union of Toiling Peasantry and adopting the following resolutions (abridged):

1. To approve the policy of the Provisional Government.
2. To collect food for the active Russian Army and donate it to the Government Committee.
3. Start elections to the Constituent Assembly (they were held at the end of Nov. 1917), which is the only plenipotentiary organ to decide the future of the state, whether it would revert to the monarchy or become a democratic republic.
4. Disallow unauthorized seizure of land and wait a resolution of the land ownership issue by the Constituent Assembly.

One month before the meeting of the Constituent Assembly Bolsheviks and Left Social Revolutionaries seized the power in a putsch. Tambov region did not recognize their unlawful rule and organized Provisional Regional Executive Committee supported by a vast majority of the population.

A Left Social Revolutionary Antonov was elected head of the Tambov militia and, supported by railway workers, who knew him from his youth, armed them and stopped the wave of crimes and riots which came from the big northern cities threatening to overflow the Tambov region. By 1918 Antonov became disillusioned with the revolution and officially left the Social Revolutionary party. Leaving for a smaller town Antonov gathered a tight battle group and went underground. The peasants uprising started in 1918 in a few localities where Bolsheviks began imposing their order. It later widened to the entire region and spread to parts of neighboring regions.
REPRESSIONS OF CIVILIANS, FIRST GAS-CAMBERS AND DEATH CAMPS

After the occupation of Tambov region by the Red Army it started to "clean up" the area with the help of Cheka. The following orders were issued by the head of the Authorized Executive Commission, Antonov-Ovseenko, and the Commander of the Red Forces in Tambov region, M. Tukhachevsky:

Order #116. Representatives of the political Commission arrive to the designated especially dangerous "bandit" areas of Tambov province together with military regiments selected for the clean-up (internationalists). Upon arrival the entire volost (the smallest administrative unit in pre-revolutionary Russia) is surrounded by the military and declared to be in the state of siege. Hostages are taken from among the most prominent people (priests, teachers, veterinarians, etc). Then the meeting of all inhabitants is called were the orders #130, #171 and the sentencing to the volost are read. All inhabitants are given two hours to give up all arms of the hiding bandits and their families. All the population is informed that in case of refusal to submit, all hostages will be shot. If a full submission is not achieved in two hours a new gathering is called and the hostages are shot in front of the gathered people eyes. New hostages are taken and the whole procedure is repeated till all arms and bandits (with their families) are turned in. The remaining people are interrogated by the questioning commissions. If any of the questioned refuses to give the requested information to the commission — he/she should be shot on the spot. During this period any entering or leaving the volost are prohibited.


Order #171.

1. Everyone refusing to give his name is shot on the spot.
2. Families which might be hiding arms should be taken hostages and shot on the spot.
3. If arms are found everyone should be shot on the spot.
4. The entire family hiding a bandit should be arrested, its head is shot on the spot, the rest of the family is deported and its property is confiscated.
5. Any family which was hiding members of bandit's family or their property is considered a bandit's family and its head is shot on the spot.
6. Peasants pointing to the family that was hiding a bandit receive the property of that family; the family is arrested and awaits deportation and its head is shot on the spot.

Many actions of Cheka were not authorized as witnessed by one of Tambov Chekists: "To shoot someone we do not need any evidence, interrogations or suspicions, and even less any stupid writing of papers. If we find necessary to shoot someone — we shoot."
Two large concentration camps were organized by Bolsheviks in Tambov itself. One was stationary near the jail, and another — on the opposite side of the river near Kasan monastery then occupied by Tambov Province Cheka. In the second 'field' camp people just sat on the grass without any roof over their heads. Families of the resistance fighters, children, elderly and women, were brought there from the entire region in unending flood. The camps were guarded by the Chinese, Latvian and Hungarian mercenaries, who practically did not know Russian and therefore could not be talked to by the detainees. People died from hunger all the time. They were fed rotten raw potatoes, beets and other raw vegetables. Except for the suckling babies, who soon died because hungry mothers lost milk, children were separated from mothers and kept in different camps.

Soon the field camp overflowed and its branch was organized on one of Tambov squares near the Seminary. The square was surrounded by peasants' wagons. One heavy machine gun was set on Seminary's balcony, another on one of the neighboring churches. In this open city camp it was not allowed to stand up, and the mercenaries shot anyone who did. Detainees sat on the ground packed tightly as sardines. There were no toilets. People relieved themselves where they sat and buried their excrements in the ground. Rotten vegetables were thrown into the crowd with shovels, and those in the middle did not get any. Corpses of dead elderly and sick were not removed every day and they decayed in the sun. Some became insane of hunger and ate the corpses. Some stood up to commit suicide, but guards fast understood this and did not shoot the volunteers. The dead were replaced by the newcomers. A group of schoolchildren tried to run away and were all cut down by the machine gun from Seminary's balcony. An epidemic started and to protect themselves Chekists transferred this camp out of the town. Jails of neighboring towns were packed with families of the rebel fighters. About 10,000 half-alive were transported to Solovetsky Camps; thousands of frozen corpses were delivered by cattle trains to the northern Arkhangelsk.

The Menshevik newspaper "Revolutionary Times" wrote about 2,000 Tambov prisoners in Petersburg's jail: "Those moving inside the jail are shadows, not people. Moaning does not stop round the clock. They are not fed at all, because they were brought here to die." Children of school and pre-school ages from villages were sent to Tambov camps. One document lists 850 of them, next group — 563, one more 490. Another document names 23 shot, aged from 13 to 16. In Kasan monastery Cheka mass shootings of captured rebels were carried round the clock. Two gas-generating cars were serving as mobile gas chambers and unloaded suffocated victims on the riverbank next to those shot. Those who were shot were undressed before the execution. The suffocated ones were buried dressed and homeless kids undressed them during the night risking their own lives to get clothes. Nobody knows how many were suffocated. (Hitler had good teachers.)
CRUSHING THE TAMBOV REBELLION WITH POISON GASES BY BOLSHEVIKS

At the beginning of 1921 Moscow sent Red Army divisions and brigades to Tambov region but they suffered a series of defeats from the rebel armies. Bolshevics started to use aviation against the rebels.

Frightened Bolsheviks decided to throw the best military forces against the rebel army. Commanders of three Red fronts Gittis, Frunze and Tukhachevsky sent against the Russian people of Tambov region their best forces, artillery, armored vehicles and trains. At about the same time the Red Baltic fleet in Kronstadt near Petersburg rebelled demanding basic democratic rights for all socialist parties and an end of Boloshevik dictatorship. The rebellion was poorly prepared. If the sailors waited for the ice to melt the island of Kronstadt would be unassailable. As it was 60,000 Red troops under Tukhachevsky command stormed it moving on the ice. After crushing the Kronstadt sailors the Bolshevik CC concentrated on Tambov region, announcing that it is in the military siege state comparable to that of Kronstadt. Lenin and Trotsky insisted on appointing the bloody executioner of Kronstadt, Tukhachevsky, as a commander of all anti-rebel Tambov forces.

Against the peoples' army Bolsheviks threw a few cavalry divisions, 9 brigades, 6 armored and 5 auto regiments with heavy machine guns, 9 artillery brigades, a few divisions of Cheka and "internationalist mercenaries, regiments formed from students of military schools, 4 armored trains, 2 aviation groups and uncounted smaller detachments with artillery and machine guns. Initially rebels had only about a tenth of about 100,000 in Red forces, but were successfully repelling Tuchachevsky's assault, because 4 million population of the region supported them. The Tambov rebel army switched to purely partisan tactics. To avoid military attacks on the villages it operated only from the forests where heavily armed Bolshevik units could not catch them, but from which it could deliver devastating blows to the Red forces. Nevertheless, frustrated Bolsheviks erased many villages with the artillery fire and by the punitive squads. Later Tukhachevsky acknowledged that it was the war against the entire people.

Eventually Tukhachevsky had no other choice than to use the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) — the poison gases — against the rebels and the popu anion. The gases allegedly were provided to Bolsheviks by the Germans. There are documents signed by top Bolshevik officials confirming orders to use poison gases as well as reports of their delivery and use. The rebels had no defense against poison gases which were massively used by Tukhachevsky, who needed a fast victory to avoid a demoralization of his troops fighting their own people. Rebel forces retreated to the marshes and shallow rivers where chemical shells did not explode hitting a soft ground. However, the casualties were heavy and WMD helped Tukhachevsky to win. Because the entire large areas had to be "disinfected" large numbers of unarmed peasants were also murdered.
The communist papers in Tambov called for "poisoning of the bandits", "liquidation of their families, who should be held responsible", etc. An authorized Executive Commission of the Russian Federation in its infamous resolution #130 prescribed to kill the population of the rebellious area and imprison families of the fighters in the concentration camps regardless of age or health. The use of poisons continued from June into the fall. While the initial spring orders from Moscow demanded a victory within a month, the battles continued into the fall and 1922. The last rebel was arrested only in 1942.

In 1982, digging trenches for new sewers, these burials were partially opened and residents saw thousands of shot through sculls with arms' bones tied with wire. During digging for the foundation of a new apartment building near the stationary concentration camp in the 1970's human remains were being removed by dump-trucks for four days. In 1970-80's the author of the book was sent to help villagers in Tambov region to weed the fields. An old woman told them about one of the poison gas attacks, and how she and other children at that time found corpses of the poisoned partisans on the strawberry field in the forest. The Chinese mercenaries sent the hostages with shovels to bury them. The author with friends found the place and at the depth of 30cm human bones, shoes, belts—all over the field. Many mass graves were found in other places. Some contained a mix of adult and children's sculls chopped with sabers. Some of these executions are reflected in survived documents. Commander Uborevich reporting to Tukhachevsky: "captured 1,000 people, 1,000 shot."

According to estimates 240,000 residents of the Tambov region were killed by Bolsheviks.

Do terms matter? Quarter of a million of Russian people were annihilated "to build a happy future" by its Bolshevik designers and perpetrators.
GEORGIA’S RESISTANCE

Georgia’s loyalty to the new regime proved not easy to obtain. The Bolsheviks recruited fewer than 10,000 people into their party, while the Mensheviks still popular in Georgia, counted over 60,000 members in their organizations. The short 1918-1921 independence was crucial in the national awakening of Georgia, winning a high popular support to the ruling Menshevik party. A forced Sovietization and loss by Georgia of sizeable portion of its pre-Soviet territories to Turkey, Azerbaijan SSR, Armenian SSR and Russia, fueled a widespread opposition to Bolshevik government. The Georgian peasantry was overwhelmingly opposed to collectivization and dissatisfied by economic troubles. The situation was further aggravated by a famine and the summer 1921 outbreak of cholera with thousands of victims. The working class of Georgia, with its severe economic problems, was also hostile toward the new regime. Subordination of workers' organizations and trades unions to the Bolshevik party committees and Moscow discontented even the multiethnic workers of Tiflis who were the most sympathetic to Communists. The national intelligentsia and nobility also had pledged loyalty to the Menshevik republic.

In the course of the Red Army 1921 invasion, part of the defeated Georgian forces withdrew into the mountains and organized themselves into a number of small partisan groups. From 1921 to 1922, guerrilla warfare broke out in several regions of Georgia. One of the revolts in northern Georgia lasted for six months. In early 1922, the rebellion against the Soviet rule broke out in another mountainous district in northeast Georgia. Soviet troops using aviation managed to stop this rebellion from spreading, but could not crush it completely.

Still, these revolts were local and spontaneous and did not attract large masses. The deplorable situation of the anti-Soviet opposition forced all major underground parties to seek closer cooperation. However, it was not until mid-1922 that the Mensheviks reached an agreement with other political groups to coordinate their efforts against the Bolsheviks. Soon the opposition parties congregated into an underground movement known as the Committee for the Independence of Georgia or the "Damkom". Sponsored by the government of Georgia-in-exile, the Damkom began preparations for a general uprising in Georgia. The organization set up a "Military Center" and appointed General Spiridon Chavchavadze the commander-in-chief of all rebel forces. Several members of the former Menshevik government returned clandestinely from exile. They had still expectations that the Western powers intended to help. They also hoped that other Caucasian peoples will rise in arms, but the secret negotiations with them either failed or were aborted due to mass arrests in Northern Caucasus.

The Damkom planned a general insurrection for 2.00 AM August 29. However, through a misunderstanding the mining town in western Georgia rose in rebellion a day earlier, on August 28. This enabled the Soviet government to timely put all available forces in the region on alert. Yet, at first the insurgents achieved considerable success and formed an Interim Government of Georgia chaired by Prince Giorgi Tsereteli. The
uprising quickly spread to neighboring areas and a large portion of western Georgia and several districts in eastern Georgia wrested out of the Soviet control.

The success of the uprising was short-lived. Although the insurrection went further than the Cheka had anticipated, the Soviet reaction was prompt. Stalin immediately sent into Georgia additional Red Army troops which employing artillery, aviation and the Cheka support managed to force the rebels into forests and mountains by August 30. The epicenter of the revolt shifted into eastern Georgia, where, on August 29, a large rebel force under Colonel Cholokashvili assaulted the Red Army. On September 3, Cholokashvili made the last desperate attempt to turn a tide of the rebellion and took the town of Dusheti in a surprise attack. However, he could not hold off a Red Army counter-offensive and withdrew into mountains. The suppression of the rebellion was accompanied by an unprecedented full scale outbreak of the Red Terror. By mid-September most of the main rebel groups had been destroyed.

Colonel Kakutsa Cholokashvili, one of the leaders of anti-Soviet guerrilla movement in 1922, is venerated as national hero of Georgia.

Prince Kote Andronikashvili, chairman of the Damkom (1923-4)!!
On September 4, the Cheka arrested Prince Andronikashvili, the Damkom chairman, and his associates. On the same day, Beria met with the arrested oppositionists in Tiflis, and proposed to issue a declaration urging the partisans to put down their arms. The committee members, tied up and facing death themselves, accepted the proposal on the condition of an immediate order to stop mass executions. Beria agreed and the rebels signed the declaration in order to put an end to the bloodshed.

Reports of the extent of the repressions caused an outcry among socialists abroad, prompting the Politburo to set up a special investigative commission. In October 1924, some members of the Georgian Cheka were purged as "unreliable elements" offered up as scapegoats for the atrocities. Ordzhonikidze himself admitted at a meeting of the CC in Moscow in October 1924 that "perhaps we did go a little far, but we couldn't help ourselves." In early March 1925 the Chairman of the All-Union Executive Committee, Kalinin, arrived in Georgia and called for the amnesty of the participants of the August 1924 insurrection, and for the suspension of religious persecutions. As a result, the Cheka grip in Georgia was relatively eased.<

>...< Source: Rashin, Alexander. Textbook for High Schools and Colleges: Stalinist Genocide and Mass Murder. 2013, MEMENTO CLIO. New Jersey. 154
THE TEIKOVO STRIKE

Facing rapidly diminishing stocks of grain, caused by forced collectivization and exports, Moscow responded in March 1932 — as it had twice before in recent years — by cutting daily bread rations. For workers on the special and first supply rolls, mostly in heavy industry, rations fell 12.5%, to seven hundred grams. For those on the second and third supply rolls, most of who were employed in the light industry, they fell 31 to 47%, to four hundred and three hundred grams, respectively. As for dependents, their meager rations were cut in half — or, in some instances, eliminated. It was only fitting that the Soviet government implemented the new policy on April Fool's Day. It was in a final year of the development program that was promised to put the workers within a stone's throw of the socialist paradise.

Teikovo was one of the IIR's oldest mill towns with population of 21,000 and about 50 kilometers south-west of Ivanovo. After months of conflict over food shortages, intensification measures, declining wages, and the conditions of work and life, the Teikovo strike began spontaneously on April 8, 1932, in response to the sudden introduction of "starvation" rations. Perceiving a threat to their survival, the town's cotton workers — especially those with families to support — demanded immediate talks with their superiors. When this demand was dismissed out of hand, the workers withdrew their labor and engaged in a week of public demonstrations that culminated in a "hunger march" to Ivanovo. The unrest came to an end only when the marchers were intercepted, key strike leaders were taken into custody, and a determination was made by those still at large that the risks of pressing forward were too high to bear. Leaders, who declared repeatedly that the strike had only the goal of restoring previously existed rations, were followed by the majority of workers allowing prolong the strike, which would be crushed by the OGPU faster if it took a more radical trajectory.

THE VICHUGA STRIKE AND UPRISING

"We didn't destroy the soviet, but the OGPU, the civil police and the district party committee."

- Vichyga strikers.

Vichuga was an old mill town, sixty kilometers northeast of Ivanovo, with three cotton factories, a machine-building plant, and a brick factory; nearby villages had five more prerevolutionary mills. Vichuga factories employed some 20,000 workers.

In March 1932, a student at Vichuga Textile College contradicted official assertions: "The condition of the working class isn’t improving, as was stated in the decisions of the 17th Party Conference, but is deteriorating. As a result of intensifying food difficulties the workers are beginning to starve." The teacher of civics at the college validated the student's assertions and repeated them in his lectures.

When starvation rations were implemented in April 1932, the Vichuga's shop floor erupted in a rebellion. On April 6, 15% of the weavers at one factory idled their looms. A few days later, most of the district's 17,000 textile workers were on strike. The refusal of authorities to negotiate fueled popular hostility. To restore order authorities sent in the mounted police. Strikers fought back with stones forcing the police to retreat and laying siege to the police station, were supposedly their arrested comrade was held. Overpowering the guards, strikers confronted the chief of police with the demand to free the arrested. Frustrated by the answer, that he was not there, they proceeded to beat up every officer in the building, ransack offices, rummage through arrest files, and eventually breaking into the holding chamber and liberating everyone, including petty criminals, but not finding their arrested friend. The strikers vented their rage by destroying the station and beating the police chief and his deputy into unconsciousness. Then the strikers laid siege to the headquarters of the party and the OGPU. Inside the strikers fulfilled the crowd's battle cry — "Beat the Chekisty and the communists!" The district's head of the OGPU came closest of all the officials to loosing his life. The arrived Ivanovo OGPU squad fired on the crowd, killed one worker, wounded a few more, and managed to disperse the strikers. However, the strikers ingeniously tapped directly into Vuchuga's telegraph cables and sent telegrams to the Central Executive Committee of Soviets, to Ivanovo and other neighboring mill towns. Peasants from the neighboring villages were joining with complaints that they have no weapons besides pitchforks and axes. Large groups came from other mills and districts.

Moscow dispatched Politburo member Kaganovich and Commissar of light industry Liubimov to pacify Vichuga. It was at least a symbolic sign that Moscow is listening. Combined with the workers prerevolutionary faith in the continued existence of "a good tsar", it helped to gradually relieve the tensions. Kaganovich promised that lowering of the rations was temporary till the fall harvest while for the present was impossible to lift. The regional party committee made it clear that it heard the shop floor
message. The local supply agencies were ordered to distribute rations earlier in the month, to increased allocations to the district, honor existing allocations in schools and child care facilities, to draft plans for the development of "supplementary resources" (including rabbit and pig breeding), to open "Soviet bazaars, to allow "independent kitchen gardens for workers" and individual cultivation of unoccupied strips of land near town, as well as a review of bread supply norms for workers with large families. Given that Moscow soon implemented similar measures across the country, it seems that Vichuga strike wave had national ramifications. While wide accusations of the strikers in anti-Soviet activities were dropped from the official pronouncements, 8 activists were sentenced to the terms in concentration camps, and twenty four others to exile. Vichuga example inspired similar acts in other parts of the USSR.
RESISTANCE IN THE VILLAGES
PITELINSKII UPRISING, RIAZAN

Pitelinskii district with population of 50,000 is located about 100 miles east of the county center, Riazan, which in turn is located 125 miles south-east of Moscow. In winter of 1929-1930 Moscow sent mass of activists to the countryside to help in the forced collectivization. On the night of 27 January 1930, a member of a collectivization brigade raped a peasant woman in the village of Malye Mochily in Pitelinskii district, which initiated a massive rebellion against collectivization encompassing over twenty villages. It raged openly for six days, simmered for months and involved thousands of peasants.

By 22 February, the villagers of Veriaevo had had enough, and they chased the collectivizers out of the village. The villagers broke into the barn and sel'sovet, seized property confiscated from the dispossessed peasants and returned it to its owners. The collectivizers ran to the neighboring village, but were met there by another huge crowd, twice larger than in Veriaevo, warned by the church bells from Veriaevo. The collectivizers were beaten and chased to the next village. The armed detachment was sent to Veriaevo but despite shooting in the air it had to retreat under pressure and threats of the peasant crowd. Thousands of peasants from about ten neighboring villages coalesced on Veriaevo summoned by its church bells. On 23 February a general meeting of the villagers called for a trial of a few local officials within 48 hours, threatening to hang them on the meat hooks otherwise. They also demanded a return of their recently confiscated grain reserves, noting that the grain was simply rotting in the current storing conditions. For the next few days the villagers were undoing the collectivization returning grain and cattle to their owners. Village schoolchildren tore up posters and portraits of Soviet leaders. On 26 February, the OGPU agents and the armed platoon fired into the crowd, killing two peasants. For days peasants milled about the village streets calling out: "We welcome Soviet power without collective farms, grain collections, and local communists." Only in March the regime began to gain the upper hand, instituting a repressive clampdown on the district. 333 people were arrested, of which two thirds were "middle peasants" and not "kulaks". There were repeated attempts to prevent the deportation of kulaks from the district. Local officials were scapegoated for the events, accused of using excessive force and were sentenced to various hard labor terms or fired.
PASSIVE RESISTANCE

Violent uprisings against collectivization were relatively rare in the Russian heartland. This was partly because of the state's ruthlessness in suppressing them (anyone involved could be branded as "kulak" and shipped off to Gulag or deported to Siberia), and partly because young males, who could fight, were leaving the village to work in the cities or new industrial sites. Among the strategies Russian peasants used to cope with the collectivization were forms of "everyday resistance" standard for coerced labor all over the world: foot dragging, failure to understand instructions, refusal to take initiative, pilfering, unwillingness to start working early, etc. All this was familiar to Russian peasants from the times of serfdom, when they had to perform "barshchchina" (labor obligations) for a master. In 1931-32, as it became clear how much of the crop the state was determined to take, the peasants' passive resistance — expressed in demonstrative apathy and inertia, unwillingness to sow, and reduction of the acreage under cultivation — reached levels so high that Stalin called it "go-slow strike." The famine of 1933 was the consequence of an irresistible force (the state's demands for the set quotas of grain) meeting an immovable object (the peasants' stubborn resistance to these demands).
IVANOVO TEXTILE WORKERS' RESISTANCE AND STRIKES

Ivanovo Industrial Region (IIR) came into being in 1929 as a result of the merger of four of Russia's oldest textile regions. It had a land mass four times the size of Belgium, population of 4.7 million, and was second only to the provinces of Moscow and Leningrad (formerly Petersburg) in terms of the level of industrial employment and the value of industrial output. This value constituted nearly one third of that produced by the soviet textile industry. Of the region's 328,000 factory workers — one eighth of the Soviet total — 210,000 were employed by 105 cotton mills, and 60,000 were employed by 42 linen mills. The hastily launched in 1928 First Five Years Plan (FFYP) assigned to IIR a crucial and unattainable goal in the forced capital surplus accumulation for the further industrialization of the country.

The FFYP strategy suffered fatal flaws lacking internal coherence that industry experts understood even if party leaders did not. One of the major flawed assumptions was that each planned measure would yield the anticipated outcome, resulting in no margin for error in an undertaking that was bound to produce plenty of both. The plan assumed that collectivization would provide cheap and abundant bread thus helping to boost the workers' productivity. However, as the collectivization rather led to the opposite effect of famine and inflation, so too many of the measures of the FFYP for IIR failed either completely or partially.

As the result of the Stalinist 1928-1932 hard course workers wages reduced in half, workloads were relentlessly elevated, there were severe shortages of raw materials, leading to unexpected furloughs, the rapid deterioration of equipment and hence of the working conditions. The worst of all were severe food shortages and near hunger rationing of food except for the privileged Moscow and Leningrad enterprises. All this led to a resistance. To get organized resistance needed fearless leaders respected by the workers. What worried the Stalinist leadership most was the emergence in a number of mills of outspoken opponents of Moscow's policies. The profile of these disaffected workers spelled trouble for the party. Literate, skilled, and relatively well paid, they boasted long and distinguished factory careers and strong ties to Soviet power. Their influence on the shop floor was immense.
KLEPIKOV AFFAIR

The forty-nine-year-old weaving overlooker Kapiton Klepikov emerged in the 1920s as one of the most prominent shop-floor critics of the Bolshevik dictatorship. He was deeply committed to the practical and utopian ideals of the Revolution. The former he understood to include the establishment of civil rights and the expansion of educational opportunities for workers; the latter, as the immediate emancipation of workers from poverty, humiliation, oppression and exploitation. Klepikov's critique was blunt and powerful: the Bolsheviks had betrayed the ideals of the Revolution and of the workers in whose name they ruled. His tragic story is important for two reasons: his eloquent articulation of the sense of this betrayal of workers, and because the silencing of his voice was a pivotal moment in the party's struggle to enforce its exclusive right to define the meaning and determine the outcome of the Revolution.

Kapiton Klepikov was born to a peasant family near Rodniki, an old mill town to the north east of Ivanovo. He was organizer of strikes in 1907 and 1914. According to his supporters in 1920: "he everywhere defended the workers' interests before the old factory administration." While never a party member, before the Revolution he always voted for Bolshevik Duma candidates. However, as he put it under interrogation in 1920, he was an anarcho-libertarian who opposed the party dictatorship as a betrayal of the Revolution's promise of the equality for the lower classes. At the height of NEP he built a home near the Rodniki mill for himself, his weaver-wife and five children. In 1928 he was also promoted to the rank of overlooker, which put him in charge of his own team. It was to be his best job and his last as a free man. Klepikov's hobby was writing politically informed poetry. A weaver who wrote politically subversive poetry in a provincial mill town was, by all accounts, an extraordinary figure. His stature was substantial, and the cotton workers at Rodniki routinely elected him to the office. His earliest act of defiance was in 1920, when workers suffered from severe food shortages. After being elected to lead a protest delegation to Lenin, he gave a speech to colleagues: "The current regime is not a people's regime," he declared, but is "worse than monarchist regime. It is composed of some sort of small band of people who call themselves Communists ... and procure essential goods for themselves, but do not care at all for the people." His comments were well received but he was arrested by Cheka and sentenced to six months of forced labor. In 1924 he decided to run for a seat at the factory committee. His platform: only Klepikov could stand up to management. In his campaign speech he said: "In the old days the workers ... didn't witness such exploitation as now. Factory committee does not defend the workers' interests." He won in a landslide. He continued his attack on the party: "Lenin and Trotsky were wrong. ... They destroyed private capital and led the country to total collapse. And now recognizing their mistake they've begun to create anew the very same capital, only under a different name. ... things were bad for the worker, but now they are worse: wages are falling, taxes are rising, and exploitation is absolute." The next year in a speech at a local trade union congress Klepikov declared that "Instead of feeding the workers, the party exports all the food and leaves us hungry".
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He said that the trade union failed to "defend the workers' interests." His speech was so successful that Klepikov wrested control of the congress from Communist delegates and secured passage of the opposition's resolution. He was arrested and detained by the OGPU for several weeks.

He continued to expand his list of betrayals by the party: elections were "fraudulent," and new elite of "party bosses" lived in luxury while the workers went "unpaid."

In July 1928 Klepikov with a group of weaver overlookers organized a fact-finding tour of the nearby mills. Klepikov reported: "We work like oxen, but earn little. ... we must organize all overlookers and seek a wage increase by means of a work stoppage." He went further: "Stalin ... has deported the best defenders of the working class to 'frying pans' in Solovki... to wring the last juices out of the worker." He concluded his denunciation of "the despotic system and government in our country" by reciting his three recent poems. Two of them just celebrated liberty, but the third was a lengthy denunciation of Bolsheviks, who placed workers "under the thumb of a new class of parasitic exploiters."

After failing in attempts to discredit Klepikov locally, Moscow and the region powers organized campaign against him first expelling him from the factory committee, then from the union, and over a year later, on June 21, 1930, an OGPU court convicted Klepikov under Article 58 of the Criminal code to five years in a labor camp. Stalin had to silence Klepikov and other workers like him, because they challenged the legitimacy of his rule in the name of revolutionary workers.
LIULIN AFFAIR

Valsilii Liulii, one of the leaders of shop-floor unrest, provoked the most alarm in the corridors of power. The Iaroslavl' Red Perekop Mill, at which he worked as a lathe operator, was crucial for the Stalinist economic plans, because it produced specialized fabric for heavy industry, and therefore was supervised not by a regional industry trust but by the Supreme Economic Council in Moscow.

Liulii was twenty nine when he emerged, in 1928, as an outspoken critic of the FFYP's program of forced capital accumulation program and of its impact on workers living standards. Like Klepikov, Liulii believed that the Bolsheviks betrayed the promise of the October Revolution. However, he understood it less idealistically than Klepikov. LiulII expected from it gradually rising living standards, gradually declining workloads, and responsiveness of the officialdom to the concerns articulated by the shop floor's duly elected representatives. Liulii was satisfied with the NEP. Only when Stalin's "great turn" in 1928 shattered workers' living standards, made workloads next to unbearable, and eradicated the last remnants of shop-floor democracy did he join the ranks of the party's critics.

His parents, farm laborers by social origin, worked at the same mill for 34 years, and Vasilii started to work there at the age of 12. After the February Revolution he joined the new trade union and then volunteered for the Red Army. He dropped out from the Moscow Party School because it demanded from a Communist to renounce his personal life, family, and a wife had to be independent of her husband even in sexual relations. He was also disaffected by his treatment in the Red Army. After his four years of active duty he declined to join the party. After a four month course at the Sverdlov Communist University in 1921 Liulii resumed his duties as a lathe operator at Red Perekop, and settled with his wife and three children in a private home near Iaroslavl. He was a model Soviet citizen, but his cooperation with the authorities ended in 1928 when he began to denounce Stalin's assault on workers' interests.

With bread shortages becoming severe, at June 1928 trade union conference devoted to FFYP Liulii mounted a podium and delivered a scathing assault on the recent deterioration in the living standards. "They make the workers work harder," he declared, "but restrict the amount of bread they can buy at the cooperative." He won workers' support and reputation of one who "stands up for the poor." The mood deteriorated further with the rumors that workers in Moscow were supplied better than in the regions. On August 31, Liulii persuaded an assembly of workers to dispatch a delegation of workers under his leadership to Moscow to investigate conditions there, and to persuade authorities that given the elevation of workloads restrictions on bread purchases should be lifted. Disregarding objections from the local party and union officials the delegation which included one informer but no communists embarked on the trip to Moscow. The encounters with the officialdom were absolutely fruitless. During a visit to a high Central Cooperative Union official Pozdnyshiev, Liulii said: "You have everything here, Comrade Pozdnyshiev.
Apparently Moscow is America, and Iaroslavl is an American Colony."

The official shot back: "What, you want to treat Iaroslavl the same as Moscow!?"
Liulin: "What, we are a bunch of monkeys or something!?" Official: "There's no flour!"
Eventually the officials gave oral promises but refused to give written ones. Liulin insisted: "The government demands work from us. We devote all our energy to production, so the government must give the worker the nourishment he requires. ... If these demands aren't satisfied, then the intensified labor regime must be canceled — or else the workers will declare a strike."

Back in Iaroslavl the officials tried to argue that better supplied Moscow workers are not exploiting Iaroslavl workers, but that Moscow should be supplied better because it was the capital of the international socialist movement and the place where foreigners' impressions of the Soviet Union were formed. The workers countered that before spending resources on building new factories the government should have thought about feeding the mass of workers, who cannot work if they do not eat.

On October 10, regional party and union leaders reported to the Politburo member Kaganovich about unrest in Leningrad, Moscow, Ivanovo, Rodniki and other industrial centers. "The workers don't see the fruits of the Revolution. In the eleven years since the Revolution, there hadn't been any improvement at all." Kaganovich let them understand that the Kremlin would continue implementing the forced industrialization over the workers' objections.

On October 21, the factory conference rejected the communist delegate and chose Liulin as their delegate at the Eighth All Union Congress of Trade Unions in Moscow in December. A campaign to discredit Liulin was unleashed in mid-November. This just increased Liulin's popularity, who promised his supporters to condemn all government policies — from grain exports to financing the Comintern — that had a negative impact on workers' living standard. He also planned to contact the Right Opposition which shared his concerns. He told the colleagues on the eve of the congress: "Stalin is bringing back the times of Peter the Great. Just as Peter built Peterburg on the bones of the workers, so the Communists are building socialism on the back of the working class." On the wave of support for Liulin one the supporters declared that "the Bolsheviks have their own party, and we nonparty workers must build our own because we outnumber the Bolsheviks." Liulin's supporters won at all local conferences and sent Liulin to Moscow. However, they were weary of the inevitable Communists and OGPU revenge. Liulin returned from Moscow disillusioned and abandoned his plans to contact leaders of the Right Opposition as politically unprofitable at the moment.

Although he expected to be arrested by the OGPU, Liulin remained unconcerned about his fate. He hoped that "the time will arrive and I'll scream: 'Comrades, organize yourself and crush these vermin (the Communists)!" An unwavering supporter of the October Revolution, Liulin shared fantasies of Soviet power without the party dictatorship.
The final chapter of Liulin’s affair began in the aftermath of the 16th Party Conference, which formally approved the maximum variant of the FFYP and, not coincidentally, launched a vicious campaign against the Right Opposition. Liulin could not remain silent and he took the podium at the local party cell open assembly. In Liulin’s words, the Five Year Plan was a bondage for the workers. The state and collective farms that the Bolsheviks are building in the countryside give workers nothing. Individual, private holdings should be developed. The entire policy of the party is built on the blood and sweat of the working class, the exploitation of which is becoming more and more acute." "It would be more profitable for us to be under somebody’s heel, to become a colony or semi-colony of England or France," declared Liulin at the workers’ conference. Alarmed by the destabilizing effects of Liulin’s speech, the district party committee filed the last of the series of applications for his arrest. On June 11, 1921, Liulin was arrested in his home under Article 58 of the Criminal Code, convicted and sentenced to three years of exile in the Northern Region.

Efforts of Liulin’s supporters to organize demonstrations failed. The credit for neutralizing opposition belonged to the OGPU, whose agents confiscated all the leaflets before workers had a chance to read them. These leaflets ended with "Down with the yoke, Soviet capitalism! Long live a genuinely free life and existence!"

The party’s resurrection of the language of class war in 1928 was a response to the shop floor’s opposition to the party’s policy and the sacrifices it would impose. Moscow also realized that the organs of political repression had to be mobilized against workers — and their leaders — at the first indication of the resistance. The delay in responding to Liulin enabled him to acquire enough popularity to defend himself for some time. To prevent more Liulin types from springing into existence the OGPU had to be given the resources to monitor shop floors closely, and authority to make arrests quickly — indeed, preemptively. Another conclusion made by Moscow was a need for the reliable information. The only organization that fulfilled Moscow’s thirst for such information was the OGPU. The monopoly over politically sensitive information was vital to the longevity of Stalin’s dictatorship. In September 1928, a dozen officials received OGPU circulars on the Liulin affair. By August 1929, the number of the recipients dropped to seven, including Stalin, the OGPU chief, and Politburo members Kaganovich and Molotov. Liulin’s view that Stalin’s policy was a betrayal of the Revolution enjoyed currency on shop floors and won authority for those who articulated it. Workers with such authority posed a threat to Stalin’s plans. For this reasons they had to be destroyed.<

SEGALS GUARDIAN ANGEL
(From "RAZGULIAY SQUARE" by Benjamin Dodin)
Fragment #2
Abridged translation from Russian by Dr. Alex Rashin

> We were regular boys and therefore were fascinated by cars... Our fascination was helped by my neighbor in the apartment building, driver Moisey Segal... In 1927 my mother did surgery on his wife, Zhehaya. After getting to know us closer they started to visit us. ... Moisey and his brother Lev with their families lived in the second floor apartments with different street entrances but with the common back wall of rebuilt large stable.

To congratulate Segals with the New Year, 1939, to the apartment building 43 came a quartet of "Santa Clauses" from Lubyanka. They started from Lev's apartment, leaving at the staircase landing a yard-caretaker couple as witnesses, to call in if necessary. It was two in the morning — the proper time for evil spirits to come with arrest orders.

While this and that, - searching the apartment, throwing things around in search of nobody knows what, - a couple of hours passed. Cowardly Bertha Israilevna, Lev's wife, is shaking — cries because of the night visit, of the nightmare befallen the family, of little Isya cries..., and because of fear that the neighbors would hear... But the neighbors aren't idiots — they understand everything, and they don't sleep.

Nobody responded to the knocks at the doors of both apartments. Then the doors were forced. The inhabitants were not in the apartments. However, all four "Santas" were found laid accurately, one next to the other on the bedroom floor in Lev's apartment. All had "symptoms of asphyxia" and "traces of a blow with a dull object" at the base of the skull. There were found no blood or traces of a fight or a resistance to the murderers. Also missing were the registered arms or personal documents of the deceased as well as the small bus with its driver which brought the "Santas". Documents, photographs, valuables of the members of both families were also missing.

This happening in our Razguliay during the night from the first to second of January, turned upside-down all my conceptions about the omnipotence of the system, with which I started my single childish combat. The system appeared to be less omnipotent, not really unassailable. Two people, close to me, who did not offend a fly during all the times I observed them, two law-abiding unarmed Jews, with no noise or fuss knocked down a group of armed bandits, who snuck into their home to break their lives in the dark of the night.

Knocked down and disappeared, leaving the bandits' masters bewildered and frightened.

RESISTANCE OF THE TOP COMMANDERS AFTER WWII

Marshal Georgy Zhukov was the Soviet military leader, who contributed most to Hitler's defeat. He was wildly popular and jealous and suspicious Stalin moved against him in 1946. In early June, Zhukov was summoned to the Supreme Military Council, where gloomy Stalin ordered the Chief of Staff Shtemenko to read a note with testimonies from over seventy arrested (and tortured) officers, stating that Zhukov was politically unreliable, hostile to the central committee, and plotted against the Party, government, and Stalin. After the reading Stalin remarked that Zhukov's behavior was intolerable and asked the Council what should be done.

The entire Politburo went against Zhukov judging that he was dangerous and behaves as a Bonaparte. However, the Politburo was supported by only one Marshal. The rest of the military commanders defended Zhukov, stating that he was a difficult person but a loyal patriot. The military understood that if Zhukov will be in jail they'll follow. They did not want a repetition of the Tukhachevsky affair. Especially outspoken was Marshal of the Armored forces Pavel Rybalko, who warned that "the Army would not tolerate interference with its affairs of denouncing services and irresponsible laymen".

Stalin realized that alienating the entire Army leadership would be too dangerous and backed off. He just sacked Zhukov from the Command of the Ground Forces and sent him to command the unimportant provincial military district.

A measure of the effect of Zhukov's disgrace on other commanding officers transpires from the transcript of MGB secret recordings of Colonel General Gordov conversations with his wife and Major General Rybalchenko. She commented, "They have even broken such a spirit as Zhukov. And he apologized and went off to work. Someone else, with convictions as you have, would ask for retirement and walked away from all this." Gordov responded, "It's like the Inquisition, people are just dying. He could not do it, they would not release him. Now they only clean out those in whom Zhukov had the slightest confidence. They will keep Zhukov a year or two and then he will be in the soup and that will be all." Gordov, his wife, Rybalchenko, other officers, and Marshal Kulik, who grumbled that politicians are stealing the credit from the soldiers, were arrested in January 1947 and shot in August 1950. In 1948 MGB arrested generals who closely worked with Zhukov. Miniuk, Varenikov, Terentiev, Telegin. All of them were barbarously tortured to sign compromising denunciations of Zhukov. In addition to the severe beating and sleep deprivation, executioners pulled Telegin's teeth and tore out pieces of his flesh. In 1941 Stalin ordered to bring to him from jail General Rokossovski and made him one of the major military figures of WWII. Similarly, in 1950 he returned Zhukov to Moscow as a delegate to the Supreme Soviet, and in 1952 made him a candidate member of the Party Central Committee. Stalin needed him for something.
YOUTH ANTI-STALIN GROUPS

In 1988 the Russian poet (and former Gulag prisoner) Anatolii Zhigulin published his memoirs on the activities of the illegal 'Communist Party of Youth', an organisation with 53 members that led a short but memorable life in the late 1940s in Veronezh. The publication of his Thernye Kamni— an incredible tale of young rebels and clandestine meetings— evoked fierce discussion in press and society. Was it really possible that secondary school pupils resisted the all-encroaching and all-embracing propaganda of party and Komsomol? Was it really believable that a few provincial lads created a fully developed anti-Stalinist organization, which featured not only an ideological program but also several publications and conspiratorial circles? Was it indeed plausible at all that youngsters with little access to outside information were able to create their own mental and intellectual space?

The attentive researcher of published materials, memoirs and archival documents can find mentioning of a number of anti-Stalinist youth organizations, which formed during or after the Great Fatherland War (WWII). The publications and revelations on this subject in the early 1990s and the discovery of some relevant archival material lead to speaking of the birth of an 'Anti-Stalinist youth movement'. The emergence of organizations such as the "Union for the Struggle for the Revolutionary Cause", "Army of the Revolution", "Union Fighting for Freedom" is impressive evidence that youth did dissent from the official party line and that the conditions of the post-war Soviet Union provided the motivation and the environment in which such organizations could form. Overall, there is evidence of 27 illegal youth organizations which considered themselves to be anti-Stalinist, claimed political motivations and were, according to their own statements, aware of the consequences of their actions.

A good example is the story of Susanna Pechuro who was a member of a group of six people, arrested in 1951 and charged with plotting against Stalin. Pechuro's group was a real conspiracy in Moscow— the heart of the empire. All six of group's members were teenagers aged from 16 to 19. Three were shot, two died in the labor camps or afterwards. Pechuro remained the only one alive. Eleven more young people, who were not members, were also arrested just because they were members friends. According to Pechuro herself, they accomplish almost nothing— issued two leaflets, developed a program. The program said that Russia did not have a dictatorship of a proletarian but a Bonapartist regime headed by a dictator; that there are two imperialist systems that divided the world into spheres of influence; that there was servfdom, also if was called collective farming; that all officially proclaimed principles were violated; and that all this should be fought against. It was a straight forward childish logic— they believed in the slogans of the Revolution and felt honor-bound to fight for them. They knew that they could be arrested any day, but hoped that someone, remaining at large, would continue to carry on what they understood. They learned from Lenin's will, found among old books, from works of banned poets, from memoirs of nineteenth century revolutionaries. They made a hectograph— a primitive printing machine. None of the people with whom we talked told on us. When they speak of mass betrayals, mass cowardice of the entire nation, it was not so among
their friends. The MGB watched them overhearing them discussing banned poets. The group was formed in 1950 and arrested in 1951. Pechuro's father told her after she returned that he felt cheated. He still believed, when she already understood everything His life had been spent in lies. They did little, but their rare act of defiance shunted them to the very top of the police machine: at one point Pechuro was personally interrogated by the minister of State Security Abakumov.

It took her some time to realize that she was not in a Tsarist jail she read about in memoires. The first think she asked her cellmates was whether one could escape. They were surprised, and for Pechuro it was the end of the childish part of her activities. The cellmates taught her a lot, including tapping, and when she was transferred she was an experienced prisoner. Pechuro spent five years in prisons and labor camps. She was among the last Stalin's political prisoners to be released. Some of her former inmates refuse to recall their imprisonments. Others meet and joyfully laugh recalling episodes of their camp lives. The experience had not break but enriched their lives, so that the daughter of one said enviously: "One might think you should be grateful to the government. You've got all that to remember, and we don't!" Pechuro is less interested in documenting deaths and suffering than in the courage of rebellions that shook Gulag a year after Stalin's death.
THE CLOSEST CIRCLE’S PLOT AGAINST STALIN

In 1952 Stalin threw threatening accusations at Molotov, Mikoyan and Voroshilov, removed his long time personal secretary and arrested the head of his personal security service. Beria’s appointees were removed from almost all important security positions, and Beria himself was threatened. Malenkov was in a highly threatening position of Stalin’s anointed successor; Khrushchev was a counterweight to Malenkov and could be liquidated along with him. Bulganin was afraid of some new purge of the military. The current head of MGB and Stalin’s guards, Ignatiev, was threatened by Stalin to be shortened by head if he would not succeed and had a heart attack. All this was done within the context of a massive anti-Zionist (anti-Semitic) campaign. Stalin was known to execute his heads of secret police, top leaders of the Party, his closest associates from the pre-Revolutions times, heads of the Party and government in the Republics and major cities, top military leaders, most Old Bolsheviks, and even members of his own family. In 1953 his inner circle knew this rather well. They were all afraid and admitted it later.

Avtorkhanov was the first to systematically analyze various rumors about possible assassination of Stalin. He wrote: “In the despotism regimes, the politics is the art of alternating intrigues. The courtiers intrigue to get closer to the tyrant, and the tyrant intrigues to set the courtiers against each other so that they, consumed by rivalries, could not organize a conspiracy against the tyrant. Stalin and his clique were unsurpassed in this game.” It can be added that major short-term goals for each of the players are to stay in the game and to possibly improve his/her position. Knocking any player out of the game for either short-term or long-term gains was a part of the game. For the ruler to expect the courtiers to play along, and not just to drop out voluntarily because they perceived their personal game already utterly lost, the ruler needed to keep each courtier persuaded that he had a good chance to stay in the game and improve his position.

Stalin appointed to his secret services supporters of each of his for closest associates. The most experienced and thus dangerous for Stalin associate, Beria, had only one his protégé, Goglidze, as the Deputy Minister of MGB, all others were demoted or purged. The MGB Minister, Ignatiev, who was also made responsible for Stalin’s security, was a former party functionary and Malenkov’s protégé, who made a few more of his people MGB Deputy Ministers. Khrushchev was brought to the top by Stalin to be a counterweight to Malenkov. He controlled MGB deputy minister Serov, a professional secret police expert, as well as a few new party functionaries made new MGB Deputies appointed after Abakumov’s fall. Bulganin was a former OGPU man, made a carrier as a military commissar and a Defense Minister, and had wide connections within the Army and its own secret service, GRU. The system worked for long time with each faction in security services reporting on any moves on the part of all other factions to Stalin or their patron among Stalin’s closest associates.
Therefore none of them could make a move against Stalin on his own avoiding a detection by other factions in the security services. Beria, because of the smallest representation at the top of MGB and the recent personal threat in the Mingrelian purge, apparently had the smallest chance of moving against Stalin on his own.

However, four closest Stalin's associates knew that all large political campaigns led to execution of some top people. For a while each could have hoped, being manipulated by Stalin, that the axe would fall on others necks. But they were worried. A few alleged conversations between the four associates about the danger had been ascribed by Avtorkhanov to 1962 reports of "a committee of rehabilitated Old Bolsheviks". According to the report, Khrushchev initiated secret discussions, with the other three, of methods to neutralize Stalin, and eventually pressed Beria to respond that he and his 'chekists' (MGB members) could trust only a dead Stalin. The assignment of the roles may reflect a political need of the time to shed the best light on Khrushchev. The group asked Beria to offer plans, and he presented them with two in a few days.

In one, Stalin's dacha would have been blown up during the time Stalin usually slept. Stalin would have been stupid not to foresee and neutralize such a possibility: he might as well have slept at different places. The second plan was based on poisoning, and Beria needed the cooperation of all four to implement this plan which required switching off all of Stalin's communications. Stalin either had to expect Beria's early morning visit or for some reason did not get alarmed by or suspicious about the Beria-raised emergency. Nevertheless, an attempt at Stalin's assassination was extremely dangerous and Stalin's associates would take the risk only if inaction was even deadlier.

In addition to lack of communications between Stalin's guards and MGB Minister Ignatiev for 12 hours when Stalin's usual routine was severely violated, and a deliberate delay of medical help by Malenkov, Beria and two other Stalin's associates, there are other strong, while indirect, signs of possible assassination of Stalin. First of all, Ignatiev did not give any orders to the guards when they called him late on March 1, but ordered them to call Malenkov or Beria. Then Malenkov did nothing before finding Beria about an hour later. Beria called and ordered guards to tell nobody about Stalin's illness. When Stalin died Beria was given full control of all security forces, MGB and MVD. It was a large and very dangerous power to give to a man who did not have control of any of these ministries.

There are two somewhat differing disinformation stories put into circulation by Ehrenburg and CC member Ponomarenko in 1956-57. According to these stories members of the Presidium objected to Stalin's plans of deportation, Stalin got enraged and suffered a stroke in the Kremlin. The place agrees with the first official announcement of Stalin's illness, but disagrees with later multiple descriptions of Stalin's illness observed by many in Kuntsevo. It is likely that some meeting did take place, Stalin's courtiers, who would never risk to object to Stalin, unless they knew that he wanted it, did raise some objections. Stalin imitated an irritation and suggested to
ask Beria to look into the objections, in fact giving him extraordinary powers in Stalin's and Presidium's name. Among these powers could be an order to arrest Malenkov, Ignatiev, Khruschev and others. If Beria could show the others that either they would be arrested by him on Stalin orders or cooperate in a preemptive strike, that could seal the assassination plot. No information from the MGB factions would go beyond their bosses, and these would cover them up. This actual, while informal, power given to Beria before Stalin's death might explain why Ignatiev and Malenkov acknowledged Beria's decisive control in the night of March 1, and why after Stalin's death Beria's informal control over the security forces was just formalized. (Rashin). Molotov and Kaganovich later confirmed that Beria boasted: "I did him in! I saved you all!"

Furthermore, official published reports of Stalin's illness and autopsy clearly state significant hemorrhages in multiple organs: brain, heart muscle, stomach, intestines and urinary tract. A careful analysis of modern medical compilations as well as interviews with experienced pathologists and other doctors show that such combination of symptoms observed in the treatment and autopsy of Stalin had never been reported elsewhere in the medical literature. With the exception of these published official reports all medical records of Stalin are apparently destroyed.<

UNIT VII
Activities
RESEARCH

Explain to students that ANY regime has its opponents but there is a huge difference between democracy and an oppressive regime in dealing with opposition. But even in the most brutal political systems, courageous people keep rising ready to fight for freedom, dignity and justice. They are often exterminated by the evil system, but new ones rise again and again. One has reason to hope that while prolonged repressions deprive the repressed society of its best members and corrupts it, evil political systems might be bound to produce forces leading to their demise.

Discussion & Research:

Suggested questions:

1. Petersburg workers' strikes and Kronstadt Baltic fleet sailors' meeting were peaceful. Why the repression was so cruel?
2. Do rebels in the Tambov region and in Georgia have something in common?
3. Why did strikers believe that the Bolsheviks had betrayed the promise of the October Revolution?
4. What strategies did Russian peasants use to cope with the collectivization?
5. What was the importance of Ryutin's group treatise "Stalin and the Crisis of the Proletarian Dictatorship"?
6. Did hard labor camp prisoners come to better understanding the essence of the communist regime?
7. Why most of anti-Stalin youth groups called for a return to "Lenin's norms" of political life and used Marxism as the accessible theoretical basis of their views? What thoughts did some young opposition thinkers have going beyond Marxism?
8. Was the closest circle's plot against Stalin based on fear? Fear of what?

For homework:

1. Why cruel repression of any kind of opposition was the only method used by Stalin? Did he come to the conclusion that a communist regime was ineffective and that was the only way for him to stay in power?
2. What would have happened if Stalin were to live 20 more years?
3. Can you compare Stalin and Hitler?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locale/Date</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905 Moscow</td>
<td>Strike and uprisings all over Russia—Lenovo Day of Infamy brings down the Tsar as hundreds are slaughtered.</td>
<td>Factory workers strike bad conditions, lack of food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - Write a newspaper account of this event.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917 - Revolution</td>
<td>The Revolution erupts due to lack of confidence in the government. General discontent with the Tsarist government</td>
<td>Various factions compete for power. Bolsheviks prevail over social democrats (Mensheviks). Brief period of democracy before the takeover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - Form two groups - Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Each group prepares a statement of their beliefs. HINT: Use the Internet for this one.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-1921 Georgia</td>
<td>This was a period of significant resistance to the Bolsheviks in Georgia which had a long history of independence and self rule and presented a special challenge to the government of Lenin and company.</td>
<td>There was a civil war of Bolsheviks versus Mensheviks. Colonel Sholokashvili and the army of Georgians restated heroically but were ultimately defeated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - As a soldier in the Menshevik Army, write a letter to your family at home.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 Kronstadt</td>
<td>In the nation's largest naval base, a military revolt took place. Sailors presented a list of 15 demands for freedom of themselves and the people.</td>
<td>The people were crushed by the Red Army. Demands of the crew of the Battleship Potemkin were rejected by the bosses in Moscow although they were widely hailed by the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - Evaluate the demands of the Kronstadt rebels. As an official in Moscow, prepare a written response to these demands. Remember, you are a Bolshevik!</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 Liulin</td>
<td>Very influential shop floor radical led worker resistance to Communists and fought for worker rights.</td>
<td>Liulin was widely celebrated for his ideas. He was eventually jailed for five years for speaking out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - Write a speech for Comrade Liulin to deliver to a large assembled group of his fellow workers in the factory. Remember he is a shop floor radical who is speaking truth to power.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921 Tambov</td>
<td>Largest single revolt ever, they formed own government. After a period of autonomy, they were subjugated by the Red Army.</td>
<td>Bolsheviks attacked, defeating the rebels with better army and use of poison gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - Research this very big revolt on the internet. Write a two page summary of this important event highlighting participants, activities of both rebels and the government, and outcomes of the event.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928 Kiepikov</td>
<td>Most prominent shop floor rebel speaking publicly and often about worker rights in factories. Openly opposed the harsh measures of Stalin's first Five Year Plan.</td>
<td>When Moscow began to see Stalin's growth, workers were arrested and sent to the Gulag Work Camp for five years and were not heard from again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - Write a letter to your family from the Gulag</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928 Ivanovo</td>
<td>Massive strike of textile workers over a large and involving 325,000 workers. The poor central planning from Moscow led to the failure of the Five Year Plan which was the beginning of Stalin's master plan to industrialize Russia.</td>
<td>The central planning system collapsed due to lack of coordination, poor alignment of work units, and mistreatment of workers who were blamed for the failure, and were starving because of the lack of coordination. Strike was settled by force by the Red Army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT ACTIVITY - What did it feel like to be a part of a resistance movement?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Piteinski</td>
<td>Moscow sent a collectivization team to a district 125 miles southeast of Moscow to push for compliance with the Five Year Plan. On Jan. 27, 1930 a village peasant woman was raped by one of the collectivizers. In the village of Malye Mnichy in the Piteinski district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Vichuga</td>
<td>An outspoken student at the local textile company spoke publicly about worker abuse and the inadequacy of the Five Year Plan. His eloquence led almost 20,000 mill workers to leave their workplaces and march in the streets to protest especially against worker abuse for “efficiency” and against inadequate food supplies for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Teikovo</td>
<td>Another revolt of workers in a mill town near Ivanovo because of deplorable working conditions. There was a public demonstration and a hunger strike.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNIT VIII
INTRODUCTION

> After unexpected liberalization reforms by the MVD chief Beria, who was moving to the power pinnacle, a series of Stalinist style events took place. They started with Beria's execution of fabricated charges, went through crushing of uprisings in the Gulag, and ended with brutal military suppression of the Hungarian anti-Stalinist revolution and execution of its leaders. This followed by the earthquake of revelations about Stalin's crimes against the devoted Old Bolsheviks, delivered by Khrushchev at the 20th Party Congress in 1956. These revelations were used as weapon in Khrushchev's struggle with his competitors. Khrushchev used these revelations against his Old Guard competitors along with Army and KGB support. After their defeat Soviet leaders stopped to execute their high ranking competitors. However, brutality towards regular citizens decreased only slightly if at all. This period witnessed the birth of the dissident movement, supported by the democratic West, which eventually led to the collapse of Communism. On the way to its decay Communist leadership crushed with military force attempts of democratization in Czechoslovakia. Its leaders were not executed. Dissidents were exiled and thrown into labor camps, psychiatric and special jails. Expansion of Communism by military means and support of every anti-West movement, exhausted Soviet resources, leading to economic and political disasters. After the dying out of the older politicians Gorbachev tried to reform Communism borrowing ideas from dissidents and defeated Czech reformers. Communism appeared to be incompatible with democracy and collapsed the Soviet Union fell apart into a multitude of independent states. Russia entered a period of economic, social and political instability with democracy and corruption, ending up under the government dominated by Security forces. Democracy and market economy are not banned, but limited. Stalinization forces are for now slightly weaker then anti-Stalinist forces.<

UNIT VIII
Readings
KHRUSHCHEV’S SECRET SPEECH
DENOUNCING STALIN’S CRIMES

>General-turned-historian, Volkogonov, claims that in 1988 the former KGB head Shelepin told him, that a whole series of (execution) lists bearing Khrushchev’s signature were removed on Khrushchev’s orders from the archives by Serov, then Deputy Minister of State Security. They were handed over to Khrushchev, who apparently wanted to diminish his recorded participation in the Stalinist murders by destroying those lists. That gave him certain advantage in the power struggle against other members of the old guard. He asked the other members of the Presidium what to do with the collected flood of information on Stalinist terror, and who should make it known to the Party. He met hard and fierce resistance from Molotov, Voroshilov and Kaganovich, which increased his advantage: he was ready to confess to the Party and repent, and they were not.

Then at the closed session of the 20th Party Congress on February 13, 1956, Khrushchev himself gave his famous "secret speech" on the "Cult of Personality and its consequences" focusing on the lawless mass executions and tortures of honest and devoted Communists on Stalin’s orders. The speech was not intended for the general public, which did not matter in the power struggle, but was leaked and shook the Soviet and world Communist movement. However, within a few months the Soviet Union showed that the system built by Stalin still uses his methods.

STALINIST STYLE SUPPRESSION OF HUNGARIAN UPRISING & EXECUTION OF ITS LEADERS

The display of ‘thaw’ out from Moscow encouraged the long suppressed resentment in the Soviet satellites to break open. The Polish crisis, which started first, was settled peacefully despite Soviet threats, because the Polish Army was ready to fight, and the Polish Party leadership stood firm, offering Khrushchev an acceptable compromise, followed by the withdrawal of Soviet troops from around Warsaw.

Hungarian resentment developed more radically, leading to demands for a multiparty system and the withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact. Both demands were accepted by the new Hungarian leadership under Imre Nagy. The Hungarians fought off the first attempt of Soviet troops to take over Budapest, which was requested by the Presidium on advise of the future KGB and Party head, Andropov, who served as the soviet observer in Budapest. Hated security officers and informers were executed in the streets by angry mobs of long-persecuted Hungarians. When the situation in Budapest deteriorated and it could no longer be guaranteed that Hungary would remain a Soviet satellite, the Hungarian revolution was bloodily crushed by the Soviet and Warsaw Pact troops. The final operation was reportedly commanded by Konev.

According to the childhood memories of Alex Rashin, in the fall of 1956, columns of Soviet tanks rumbled on cobblestones one block from his family apartment in Mukachevo, near the Soviet side of the Hungarian border, on their way to crush the Hungarian uprising and to install a Soviet-approved Hungarian leadership. Kadar's Hungarian government had been formed in the villa of the Officers' Club in Mukachevo, a few blocks from the apartment where his family lived.

Soviet actions were met with disapproval by many foreign Soviet sympathizers, who made it known to Khrushchev. Despite this, the legitimate Hungarian leadership had been lured into traps with guarantees of safety and diplomatic immunity, and then they were arrested by Serov's KGB, and later executed. This led to an uproar of indignation from a non-orthodox Left in the West. The Stalinist methods were still in full force.
KHRUSHCHEV IN POWER

Khrushchev allowed a modest amount of freedom in the arts. In 1958, however, he ordered a fierce attack on Boris Pasternak after his now famous novel, Doctor Zhivago was published abroad (publication was denied in the Soviet Union). Pasternak was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature, which, under heavy pressure, he declined. Once he did so, Khrushchev ordered a halt to the attacks on Pasternak. After his fall from power, Khrushchev stated, "We shouldn't have banned it. I should have read it myself. There's nothing anti-Soviet in it."

In 1962, Khrushchev, impressed by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, persuaded the Presidium to allow publication. That renewed thaw ended on December 1, 1962, when Khrushchev was taken to the Manezh Gallery to view an exhibit which included a number of avant-garde works. On seeing them, Khrushchev exploded with anger and issued a call for artistic purity. However, despite the premier's rage, none of the artists were arrested or exiled. The Manezh Gallery exhibit remained open for soacigme after Khrushchev's visit, and experienced a considerable rise in attendance after Khrushchev's criticisms.

Khrushchev's abandonment of the physical elimination of political rivals and people criticized by him was reciprocated after his fall in 1964. He was not executed but comfortably retired under KGB surveillance.

Khrushchev's overthrow was plotted for five month in his absence by Supreme Soviet head Leonid Brezhnev, KGB Chairman Vladimir Semichastny, his KGB predecessor Aleksandr Shelepin, and others. On October 12, Brezhnev called Khrushchev to notify him of a special Presidium meeting to be held the following day. At the meeting he was attacked by Brezhnev and other Presidium members for his policy failures and what his colleagues deemed to be erratic behavior. Khrushchev put up little resistance, and that night called his old friend and Presidium colleague Mikoyan, and told him, "I'm old and tired. Let them cope by themselves. I've done the main thing. Could anyone have dreamed of telling Stalin that he didn't suit us anymore and suggesting he retire? Not even a wet spot would have remained where we had been standing. Now everything is different. The fear is gone, and we can talk as equals. That's my contribution. I won't put up a fight."

Khrushchev's "voluntary" retirement from his offices was accepted. Brezhnev became General Secretary, while Aleksei Kosygin succeeded Khrushchev as premier.

After the suppression in 1968 by the Warsaw Pact armies of the Czechoslovak attempt at democratization, Czech leaders, Party Secretary Dubeek, Smrkovsky and others were not executed but slowly removed from their leadership positions and retired in contrast to the treatment of Hungarian leaders in 1956.
THE DISSIDENTS

Andrei Amalrik (1938 - 1980), was a Russian writer and dissident. He was best known in the Western world for his essay – "Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?" published in 1970. Amalrik predicted the collapse of the regime would occur between 1980 and 1985. Amalrik was incorrect in some of his predictions, and as 1984 drew nearer, he revised the timetable but still predicted that the Soviet Union would eventually collapse.

For several months after the publication of Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984? (1970) and Involuntary Journey to Siberia (August 1970), abroad, a criminal offense under Soviet law, Amalrik remained free to walk the streets of Moscow and to associate with foreigners. Inevitably, for "defaming the Soviet state", Amalrik was arrested in November 1970 and sentenced to three years in a labor camp in Kolyma.

Quotes:

• In Russian history, man has always been a means but never an end
• "...any state forced to devote so much of its energies to physically and psychologically controlling millions of its own subjects could not survive indefinitely."
• Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau visited the Siberian city of Norilsk. Trudeau lamented that Canada had never succeeded in building so large a city so far north — unaware, or unconcerned, that Norilsk had been built by prisoners.

Anatoly Marchenko (1938 —1986) was an influential and well-known Soviet dissident, author, and human rights campaigner. He was the first recipient of the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought of the European Parliament, awarded to him posthumously in 1988 (the only recipient to be honored in this manner).

He first became widely known through his book My Testimony, an autobiographical account of his then-recent sentence in Soviet labor camps and prison, which caused a sensation when it was released in the West in 1969, after limited circulation inside the Soviet Union as samizdat. It brought home to readers around the world, including the USSR itself that the Soviet gulag had not ended with Stalin.

He also became active in the Soviet human rights movement. He was one of the founder members of the influential and much-emulated Moscow Helsinki Group. He organized protests and appeals, and authored a number of open letters, several of which landed him in prison again.

He was imprisoned for several different terms, spending about 20 years in prison and internal exile. Nathan Sharansky said of him: "After the release of Yuri Orlov, he was definitely the number one Soviet prisoner of conscience."
SOLZHENITSYN

After Khrushchev's ouster publishing of Solzhenitsyn's work quickly stopped; as a writer, he became a non-person, and, by 1965, the KGB had seized some of his papers, including the manuscript of The First Circle. Meanwhile Solzhenitsyn continued to secretly and feverishly work upon the most subversive of all his writings, the monumental The Gulag Archipelago. After the KGB had confiscated Solzhenitsyn's materials in Moscow, during 1965-1967 the preparatory drafts of The Gulag Archipelago were turned into finished typescript in hiding at his friends' homes in Estonia. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn had befriended Arnold Susi, a lawyer and former Estonian Minister of Education in a Lubyanka Prison cell.

In 1969 Solzhenitsyn was expelled from the Union of Writers, but in 1970, he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature. Solzhenitsyn received his prize at the 1974 ceremony after he had been deported from the Soviet Union.

The Gulag Archipelago was composed during 1958-1967. This work was a three-volume, seven part work on the Soviet prison camp system (Solzhenitsyn never had all seven parts of the work in front of him at any one time). The Gulag Archipelago has sold over thirty million copies in thirty-five languages. It was based upon Solzhenitsyn's own experience as well as the testimony of 256 former prisoners and Solzhenitsyn's own research into the history of the penal system. It discussed the system's origins from the founding of the Communist regime, with Lenin himself having responsibility, detailing interrogation procedures, prisoner transports, prison camp culture, prisoner uprisings and revolts, and the practice of internal exile. The Gulag Archipelago's rich and varied authorial voice, its unique weaving together of personal testimony, philosophical analysis, and historical investigation, and its unrelenting indictment of communist ideology made The Gulag Archipelago one of the most consequential books of the twentieth century. The appearance of the book in the West put the word gulag into the Western political vocabulary and guaranteed swift retribution from the Soviet authorities.
DECLINE OF STALINISM

>Apparently there were two attempts of re-Stalinization: in 1969 (Stalin's 90th birth anniversary) and in 1979 (Stalin's birth centennial). While an underlying Stalinists' pressure was partially accommodated by the tightening of the Soviet regime, the open re-Stalinization did not happen. There are some indications of how it happened in 1969. In summer of 1970, Nikolai Bulganin, former Minister of Defense and Premiere, gave interviews about preparations for the deportation of the Jews, of which he was a part, to the Jewish historian Yakov Etinger. At that time Bulganin had been removed from any power, retired, and, as all those who knew too much, was monitored by the KGB. His place may have been bugged. In his interview, he named in addition to Stalin, Malenkov and Suslov as the two major figures behind the preparation of the deportation. Bulganin refused to name others involved in the preparation of the genocide, because, "I would have to mention too many of those who now decide the affairs of the State." However, he named as a major culprit Mikhail Suslov, who at the time of the interview was the second most powerful man in the Soviet hierarchy after Leonid Brezhnev Ruthless Yuri Andropov was the head of the KGB from 1968, mercilessly throwing dissidents that were too talkative to psychiatric asylums and Gulag.

In the Soviet system of total monitoring, it was more than likely that Suslov would learn about Bulganin's accusations. Why was it that Bulganin stuck out his neck, and nothing happened to him? It was still puzzled why Suslov allowed Bulganin to make accusations in a crime that, even today, has not been acknowledged by the Soviet and Russian officials. Such patience and forgiveness were not characteristic of the Communist power holders.

A possible explanation might be hidden in "All Stalin's Men" by R. Medvedev: "Whether Suslov thought he might one day become the head of the Party we do not know. He was certainly irritated by Brezhnev's growing authority. ... At the CC Plenum, in late 1969, Brezhnev gave a speech in which he criticized many shortcomings in economic policy and management. (While not intended so) the speech was taken to be an expression of policy. After the Plenum, Suslov, A. Shelepin (a Politburo member, and KGB chief in 1958-1961), and K. Mazurov (a Politburo member and first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers), sent a letter to the CC containing a number of critical comments about Brezhnev's speech. It was to be expected that the dispute would come up at the CC spring Plenum, but it never took place, as Brezhnev managed to enlist the support of the most influential members of the CC in advance, and Suslov, Shelepin, and Mazurov withdrew their criticism. ... Suslov fell silent and contented himself with second place in the Party hierarchy and the role of ideologist-in-chief".
Thus Bulganin's puzzling revelations seem to be a tip of a solid political blackmail inspired from the top, perhaps by Brezhnev, and therefore un-punishable. Whether Bulganin's story was embellished is impossible to tell, but it had to touch on basically correct facts to be effective as blackmail.

Brezhnev was not deeply involved in the Doctors' Plot, but many of "the most influential members of the CC" were. Bulganin, on Brezhnev's request, probably gave his deportation story to these members (before giving it to Etinger), and Brezhnev could clearly indicate that he would expose all of them if they support efforts to undermine his rule. It was what Stalin likely planned to use against the Old Guard, and what Khrushchev was afraid of being used against him.<

GLOBAL EXPANSION AND STAGNATION

The Soviet Union under Khrushchev and his heirs was heavily involved in military, political and economic expansion of its sphere of influence. It would suffice to mention Vietnam, Cuba, Angola, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Chile, Ethiopia, Arab countries, Indonesia. This cost a lot of money and resources. The support of the world Communist and pro-Soviet parties as well as various terrorist groups also consumed significant amount of resources. While the Soviet military-industrial complex developed new more powerful and expensive weapons, Soviet agriculture could not produce enough food for the population. While at the end of the 1960's meat was not a rarity in Moscow, it started to disappear from the stores by the end of the 1970's, and was followed by the shortages of fresh vegetables and potatoes. Situation in the industry also deteriorated judging from conversations with top specialists. Such conversations usually have similar patterns. The expert would say that the system as a whole works, but not in his field. The metallurgist from Zaporozhe conveyed that the quality of special steels declines steadily to a dangerously low level. The electronics specialist would reveal that the percentage of produced and working semiconductors is very low compared to the western standards. A pollution expert would express hopelessness because a cleanup of the industrial waste of Moscow factories poured into the river would cost as much as the entire annual budget of all these factories poor planning led to dangerous pollution of the largest Earth reservoir of fresh water — Lake Baikal.

The Army needed cellulose with a low content of silicon for the airplane tires. Some bureaucratic Party planners had an insightful guess that because of the purity of Baikal water pines of the Baikal taiga would provide such low silicon cellulose. Japan was ready to pay in gold for piping there pure drinking Baikal water. Government planners built on its shore a huge cellulose plant disposing into Baikal very toxic industrial waste. The planners were right on the purity of the Baikal water (before they started to pollute there), but the cellulose appeared to be too rich in silicon to be used in airplane tires, and the entire giant polluting plant was directed to produce paper. Activists fought the pollution for over 20 years, some suffered heart attacks, but high placed bureaucrats were involved in the initial and the following approvals of the construction and the paper and it was impossible to shut down the polluting plant. Some timid steps to save Baikal were made during Perestroika, but now the problem is the lack of funds and the threat of losing 3,000 jobs at the plant.

In 1982 Brezhnev died, followed within 4 years by 2 successors: the former KGB chief Andropov, and Stalinist Chernenko.

COLLAPSE OF THE COMMUNIST REFORMATION

Perestroika

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev owed his steady rise to power to the patronage of Mikhail Suslov, the powerful chief ideologist of the CPSU. During Yuri Andropov's tenure as General Secretary (1982-1984), Gorbachev became one of the Politburo's most visible and active members. With responsibility over personnel, working together with Andropov, 20 percent of the top echelon of government ministers and regional governors were replaced, often with younger men.

Gorbachev became the seventh and last General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, serving from 1985 until 1991, and the last head of state of the USSR, serving from 1988 until its collapse in 1991. He was the only Soviet leader to have been born after the October Revolution of 1917. Upon his accession at age 54, he was the youngest member of the Politburo.

As de facto ruler of the USSR, he tried to reform the stagnating Party and the state economy by introducing glasnost ("openness"), perestroika ("restructuring"), demokratizatsiya ("democratization"), and uskoreniye ("acceleration" of economic development), which were launched at the 27th Congress of the CPSU in February 1986. Notably, he borrowed slogans of glasnost and democratizatsiya from the dissident movement, with which he made peace. Symbolically, Andrei Sakharov was invited to return to Moscow by Gorbachev in December 1986 after six years of internal exile in Gorky. The Central Committee Plenum in January 1987 would see the crystallization of Gorbachev's political reforms, including proposals for multi-candidate elections and the appointment of non-Party members to government positions. He also first raised the idea of expanding cooperatives at the plenum. Economic reforms took up much of the rest of 1987, as a new law giving enterprises more independence was passed in June.

1988 would see Gorbachev's introduction of glasnost, which gave new freedoms, including greater freedom of speech. This was a radical change, as control of speech and of government criticism had previously been a cornerstone of the Soviet system. The press became far less controlled, and thousands of political prisoners and many dissidents were released. Gorbachev's goal was to pressure the CPSU conservatives who opposed his policies of economic restructuring, and he also hoped that through openness, debate and participation, the Soviet people would support his reform. Gorbachev acknowledged that his liberalizing policies of glasnost and perestroika owed a great deal to Czechoslovakia's Alexander Dubček's "Socialism with a human face".

The Law on Cooperatives enacted in May 1988 was perhaps the most radical of the economic reforms during the early part of the Gorbachev era. For the first time since Vladimir Lenin's New Economic Policy, the law permitted private ownership of businesses in the service, manufacturing, and foreign-trade sectors.
THE FIRST FREE ELECTION

In June 1988, Gorbachev launched radical reduction of the party control of the government apparatus. He proposed a presidential system, as well as a new legislative element, to be called the Congress of People's Deputies. Elections to the Congress of People's Deputies were held throughout the Soviet Union in March and April 1989. This was the first free election in the Soviet Union since 1917. Gorbachev became Chairman of the Supreme Soviet (or head of state) on 25 May 1989. On 15 March 1990, Gorbachev was elected as the first executive President of the Soviet Union with 59% of the Deputies' votes being an unopposed candidate. The Congress met for the first time on 25 May in order to elect representatives from Congress to sit on the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, the Congress posed problems for Gorbachev; its sessions were televised, airing more criticism. In the elections, many Party candidates were defeated. Furthermore, Boris Yeltsin was elected in Moscow and returned to political prominence to become an increasingly vocal critic of Gorbachev.

Internationally Gorbachev also began the process of withdrawing troops from Afghanistan and Mongolia, and on 11 October 1986, Gorbachev and Reagan met in Reykjavik, Iceland to agree in principle to removing INF systems (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces) from Europe and to equal global limits of 100 INF missile warheads.

In February, 1988, Gorbachev announced the full withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan. Same year, Gorbachev announced that the Soviet Union would allow the Eastern bloc nations to freely determine their own internal affairs. This led to a string of counter-revolutions in Eastern Europe throughout 1989, in which Communism was overthrown. With the exception of Romania, the popular upheavals against the pro-Soviet Communist regimes were all peaceful ones. The loosening of Soviet control over Eastern Europe effectively ended the Cold War, and for this, Gorbachev was awarded the Otto Hahn Peace Medal in Gold in 1989 and the Nobel Peace Prize on 15 October 1990.

However, domestic reforms were suffering from increasing divergence between reformists, who criticized the pace of change, and conservatives, who criticized the extent of change. Gorbachev tried to find the middle ground between both groups, but this would draw more criticism towards him. 1991 brought Gorbachev increasing demands for independence of the Soviet Republics, which was unacceptable to still powerful conservatives in the Communist Party, KGB and the military.
ATTEMPTS TO TEACH HISTORY TRUTHFULLY

In May 1988, the Soviet government abruptly announced that, for the entire country, the annual high school exam on the country's 20th century history would be canceled, because the standard textbooks were "full of lies." It made an earthquake.

However, the Soviet educational bureaucracy dragged its feet as the rest of the Soviet bureaucracy. A partially revised textbook that challenged Stalin but not Lenin was introduced in 1989, without mentioning the Soviet-Nazi Pact of 1939 and claiming that the Baltic states joined the USSR voluntarily.

Hochschild visited an elite physics & mathematics school in Moscow to watch a class history seminar on the topic "Sources and Mechanism of the Stalinist Totalitarian Regime." There were half a dozen booklets on the table and students, looking stiff and anxious, in a rapid monotone in ten minutes summarized the main point of an article from a booklet: "Svetlov says this ...", "Borisov said that ...". At one point the teacher asked a student, "And what do you think?" — "I don't know," replied the boy anxiously. There was no discussion whatsoever. Hochschild realized that the choice of the subject was irrelevant, except that the lesson provided the best possible illustration of the "Mechanism of Totalitarianism."

A new generation of teachers was needed, and some did try. Igor Dolutsky wrote high school history books himself and published them in batches of dozens of scrap paper. He devised a series of books that expressed no particular point of view. They were collections of documents and questions. In a chapter on the early 1920s, when actually the Bolsheviks ruthlessly crushed any democratic tendencies, he gave, without naming them, the Bolshevik platform and a few opposing ones, asking which one each particular student would prefer and why. Otherwise, he claimed, the students would support the point of view imposed on them by the teacher. He would actually say to them: "Listen, kids, you shouldn't trust me. Investigate for yourself!" The danger, he says, is that usually everything is just presented in reversed colors: before, the Tsar was bad, now the Tsar is saint. Let's see. In 1918 Bolsheviks shot demonstrators supporting the Constituent Assembly (the democratically elected national legislature) and they dissolved the Assembly by force. Aren't they bad? Yes, they are. But in 1905 a huge demonstration of people came to petition the Tsar, and he also shot them down! Why are the Bolsheviks terrorists but Tsar is a saint?

Dolutsky organized his students to play a trial of the Bolsheviks and of Stalin. There were defense and prosecution witnesses: an Old Bolshevik, a Party official, a Tsarist general, a member of Tsar's family. The roles were distributed but the students prepared the scripts themselves. A student playing the Tsarist general sided with Stalin. Why? Because Stalin had created an empire! Other teachers and parents were invited and allowed to participate, but they were scared and reported on Dolutsky, who played Stalin's defense attorney, because it was easy to accuse Stalin. Dolutsky was fired from his teaching job.
THE END OF COMMUNISM IN RUSSIA

Notes of an American Observer
(by Dr. Alex Rashin):

In August 1991, I still had some money from my grant and an unfinished collaboration project with my former colleagues from the Institute of Biophysics in the Academic Center in Pushchino, from which my family emigrated in 1982. We made mutual arrangements for one month visit and the first week of August 1991 I flew to Moscow. It looked drab and dirty but for $1 could be driven by cab to anywhere in Moscow. The trees in Pushchino grew taller in nine years of my absence, but there were no electric bulbs in most hallways and elevators of the apartment buildings. After the US the hallways looks like undersized cells. Pensioners were smashing dominoes among the trees near the buildings.

It felt like reminding me something. Yes, it all reminded the poorest housing projects of Harlem. And just fifteen years ago it felt like a magic oasis in the USSR. Computers were similar to the American ones, but the toilet bawls were all cracked and dirty, with rusty chains without handles which pull at to flush from the overhead water tanks. Food was worse than when we left.

I was given a key to a studio with a separate kitchen, toilet and bathroom, similar to one my whole family lived in before the emigration. A bike hanged on the wall above the bed. The owner (or rather the regular occupant) of the studio was on vacation. We worked usually till midnight or later. In the morning, at about 9 AM, I would wake up and stay in bed for another 20 minutes thinking over the work plans for the day. Then my colleague would politely knock at the door waiting for my invitation to come in. I would get up, dress, we might drink some tea, and go to the Institute.

In the morning of August 19, I was still thinking over the working plan when without any polite knock the key turned in the door lock and my collaborator rushed into the room with the words whose absurdity made me very many for the entire day: "Alex, put on your pants and go — we have a coup!" It sounded like some quote from O'Henry's "Cabbages and Kings". Nevertheless, I had to call the US Embassy in case there were some instructions to follow for the US citizens. Generally the phone connection from Pushchino to Moscow (only 60 miles apart) was practically nonexistent: one might wait for hours, but the Institute had a direct line, and I was allowed to use it. The Embassy told me to call in three hours. When I did, a professional female voice told me: "There is no immediate danger for American citizens. Just don't climb the tanks."

My old friends ran to the highway from the south, on which tanks were rumbling toward Moscow, and asked the crews, whether they understood what they were doing. The tankers responded that they have orders to advance to Moscow, but when they get there — they'll see... Faxes from the Russian President Yeltsyn started to be pinned to the announcements board at the Institute in which it was stated that a reactionary anti-constitutional coup had taken place and calling on everyone not to follow any orders from the plotters.
I called my friends and colleagues Sergey and Tatyana Nikitin (popular bards), and Sergey in a depressed voice told me that tanks are rolling along the Leninsky Prospect below their windows. It was an impressive set of shows that year: the "Desert Storm" and now "Moscow Coup"! Meanwhile, chief of staff of a tank battalion of Tamanskaya motorized infantry division who had orders to guard the White House declared his loyalty to the leadership of Russia. Yeltsin climbed one of the tanks and addressed the crowd. Unexpectedly, this episode was included in the evening news program broadcast by the state TV.

The commander of Moscow military district appointed by the plotters declared the curfew in Moscow from 11 p.m. to 5 a.m., starting August 20. This was understood as the sign that the attack on the White House was imminent.

The defenders of the White House prepared themselves. Most of the volunteers were unarmed. The tank company guarding the White House was moved from it in the evening. The makeshift White House defense headquarters was headed by General Kobets, a Russian people’s deputy. He was helped by a number of generals and senior officers (some of them retired) who volunteered for the defense of the White House. We watched TV and followed events on the radio.

In the afternoon of August 20 the plotters finally decided to attack the White House. The operation was to be carried out by Alpha Group and Vympel Group, the KGB’s special forces detachments, with the support of the paratroopers, Moscow OMON, Dzerzhinsky division of Internal Troops, three tank companies and a helicopter squadron. Alpha Group commander General Karpukhin and other senior officers of Alpha Group together with General Lebed, deputy commander of the Airborne Troops, mingled through the crowds near the White House and assessed the possibility of undertaking such an operation. After that, Karpukhin and Vympel Group commander Colonel Beskov tried to argue that the operation was impossible, as it would result in bloodshed. Lebed, with the consent of Grachev, the commander of the Airborne Troops, returned to the White House and secretly informed the defense headquarters that the attack would begin at 2 a.m.

In the night of the August 21st Alpha Group and Vympel Group did not move to the White House as it had been planned. When the plotters learned about this, the troops were ordered to pull out from Moscow. Gorbachev refused to talk with the plotters. Instead, after the communication with the dacha was restored, Gorbachev declared void all the decisions of the plotters and dismissed all members of the conspiracy from their state offices. The USSR General Prosecutors Office started the investigation of the coup attempt. My old friends were running around Pushchino sealing with stamped red wax Party and KGB offices. Local party and KGB officials disappeared from site.

On August 22 the Supreme Soviet of Russia declared the historical Russian white-blue-red national flag the official national flag of Russia, instead of the Soviet red flag.
Russian President Medvedev told the newspaper "Izvestiya" that there is no possibility for a Stalinism revival in Russia.

"The reality is clear — The Great Patriotic War was won by our people, not by Stalin or even the military commanders, whatever they did. The war was won at the expense of the enormous effort and sacrifices of the gigantic number of people's lives", said Medvedev. "The question is not about Stalin's role but about our overall rating of him, and it is clear: he committed a mass of crimes against his people. This cannot be forgiven regardless of what was achieved under his rule"

"We should not talk about bringing Stalin back into our everyday life, intending to re-introduce Stalinist symbols, to use some placards, to do something else. It is not and will not happen. It is absolutely out of order. You can consider this the current State's ideology, and my position as the President of Russian Federation."

Medvedev's interview to Izvestiya was his response to request of some public organizations and politicians about plans of Moscow administration to place on May 9, 2010 placards with Stalin's portraits across the city.

Putin has different views on Stalin and the period of his rule. During his second electoral campaign he called the disintegration of the USSR "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century"

On TV in December, he suggested to divide Stalin's era into "positive" and "negative" and to emphasize positive not forgetting negative, while with many "but".

A member of the Bureau of the leading Russian opposition party opined that differences between Medvedev's and Putin's views on Stalinism are "stylistic". Words should be followed by deeds. Archived should be wide open, and historical science should be freed from political expediency.

Medvedev agreed with the necessity of opening archives for Russians and foreigners making possible for anyone to freely reach any declassified document. He even said that time already came to do this practically with all documents.

What is this?

Is it a usual "good cop — bad cop" game?

Or is it a reluctance of the new powerful secret services to restore a full-fledged Stalinism, because too many of their predecessors were also murdered by Stalin, and they do not want to be in their parents and grandparents shoes?

Do we have to answer "yes" or "no" to questions in the Dolutsky's history textbook which led to its ban?
There were no Stalin's portraits on May 9 of 2010 in Moscow, but there were his statues and portraits on that day in Kirov and some other cities. There are people suffering from Stalinist nostalgia in Russia and all over the world.

The scales of history have not settled yet. Were they will end up might depend on which side each of us will put his own weight.

37 percent of the people asked by the Yuri Levada Center were against the idea of erecting Stalin's monument; 29 percent viewed it positively, while 28 percent were indifferent.

Russian Minister of Culture Avdeev was strongly opposed to any Stalin portraits in Russian cities on the Victory Day. (Interfax). He said that "Stalin was an executioner who is guilty in forcing Russia to lose almost a century in its development, and destroyed millions of lives in repressions and his conduct of war. He carries the full responsibility for the first two years of defeats in WWll" (Infors.ru)
"Our Nuremberg" is still possible, said in Basmanny Court and Moscow City Court the lawyer of Memorial at the trial brought by Stalin's grandson to defend Stalin's honor and virtue. Basmanny Court recognized the right of the defendants to call Stalin a "criminal", and Moscow City Court rejected Stalin's grandson appeal. During the Day of the Memory for Repressed, Russian President Medvedev in his blog spoke about Stalin's crimes. Thus the trial is on, while not a Nuremberg style yet.<

UNIT VIII
Activities
DISCUSSION & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. After the Krhuschev speech at the 20th Party Congress what signs of a change were seen by Russians?
2. How and why did Soviet Communism finally collapse?
3. Was American resistance to the spread of Communism as led by President Reagan a factor?
4. How important were Gorbachev's reforms?
5. Describe the situation when Yeltsin became President?

Student Research: Use the Russian website, RT (Russia Today) to describe and analyze Russian life, government and culture now. This is the first 24/7 Russian news program which brings the Russian view to the world. Most broadcasts are available in the US in English.

They cover: Russian and world news, politics, community the economy, US News (their perspective) podcasts, blogs, videos, opinion columns, and many other areas. Students should work in small groups to answer the following questions in a group report:

1. What is Russia like today?
2. Is there any kind of democracy?
3. Do they have elections?
4. Is communism still around?
5. How about the Gulads?
6. Is the news of the US fairly reported?
7. What about the economy?
8. Who is really in charge?
LEGACY OF STALIN’S RULE

Focus:

Discuss with the students the evolution and collapse of Communism under the pressure of dissident movements, un-resolvable economic and political problems, and an unsustainable arms race, as well as the threat of re-Stalinization.

Discussion:

Suggested questions:

1. What do you think about the fight for power between Communist Party leaders after Stalin's death? Did any one of them even think about elections?
2. Why Soviet Union leaders were so afraid of withdrawal of any country from "Warsaw Pact"?
3. What are the essence and the major result of the famous Khrushchev's "secret speech" on the "Cult of Personality and its consequences"? Did it play any role in his removal from the power? Is it still relevant now in modern Russia?
4. What do you think about the tragedy in Novocherkassk? Was it the result of Soviet leaders' inability to satisfy even some of people's demands? Do you think that Khrushchev was unable or unwilling to completely break away from the USSR's bloody past?
5. What differentiate dissidents from other Soviet regime opponents?
6. What were the greatest achievements of Mikhail Gorbachev? Why did his attempts to modernize and improve communism fail?
7. Why did Eastern European countries change their course almost immediately after the announcement they can freely determine their fate?
8. What do you think about "Moscow Coup"? Was it ill-conceived, badly prepared and executed or was it just impossible to prevail?

Additional Study:

1. Soviet Army was one of the most powerful in the world. Soviet sportsmen dominated the Olympics. Why the Communist Regime was so economically ineffective?
2. Why did the Soviet Union collapse? Was it really "The Union"? Were all the attempts of forced "russification" one of the major reasons of the collapse?
3. During resent nationwide election of "The Face of Russia" Lenin came the second and Stalin — the third. What is it: nostalgia, propaganda or an attempt to restore totalitarian regime? Do you think that Medvedev — Putin combination is a "good cop — bad cop" game?
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ANALYZING

Knowing the history of Stalin and what is occurring today, what do you predict the future for Russia? Use facts from the past, current information and personal reflections to make your prediction.
UNIT IX
Pictures & Documents
This collage of pictures and documents with descriptions gives the teachers a wonderful opportunity to instruct the students visually. The discussion and questions about the pictures and documents should raise issues and provide the impetus for more study for the students.

The pictures all represent the “Bydgoszcz” (It's like saying “bid ghost” except with a "z" sound instead of an "s" and with a "ch" sound instead of a "t") called the Valley of Death located 300 miles north of the city of Magadan. The camp was an industrial complex where over 380 thousand people were murdered and many more injured for life and where Dr.'s performed inhumane experiments on thousands of prisoners. Hitler’s special units were trained there in the mid 1930’s. You can also see bodies of corpses with their head sawed apart and where humans were exposed to uranium radiation. A hidden cemetery was located in a secret area of the camp.

The document (deportation order) is an excellent vehicle for student discussion as are the pictures and information about President Clinton's visit.
DEPORTATION ORDER

This order impacted hundreds of thousands of people. The deportees were given only two hours to collect personal belongings and documents that they were able to carry in their hands into the deportation and were packed into the cattle trains often with only a standing room per person. Everything was done under the constant control of the guards.
DEPORTATION ORDER
Translated by Dr. Alex Rassim

#13.8.

Copies of the secret MVD/NKVD documents concerning 1941 deportation from Moldova. Received from the daughter of the deported on 13.06.41 Ruhly M. Kozhushner.

The secret folder of instructions, letter exchanges and lists of the deported (original). Dates on the cover show that it is 1950's compilation of old secret documents.
List from the secret folder of those deported in the same freight car with R. Kozhushner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ванька Черноярович Козюкович</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Афия Раймоновна Брага</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Елена Чернояровича Козюкович</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Сем Козюковича Гердин</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Семен Семенович Брага</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Семён Брага</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Илья Александрович Брага</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Яков Ильич Брага</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Яков Ильич Брага</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Любовь Ильина Брага</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Николай Ильич Брага</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Руза Ильинича Брага</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Катерина Гердина Брага</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Владимир Гердин</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that the documentation of deportations and exterminations in the USSR was not any worse than in Nazi Germany. (Note also that neither Nazis nor communists compiled detailed reports on victims of random shootings which both practiced.)

NKVD registration cards list names, birth dates and destinations for the deportation of the members of the Kozhushner family:

- Kozhushner: Ruhly Mihailovna, 1907 06.13.41 South Kazakhstan (S/K)
- Kozhushner: Feiga Abramovna, 1932 06.13.41 South Kazakhstan(S/K)
- Kozhushner: Asia Abramovna, 1938 06.13.41 South Kazakhstan(S/K)
- Kozhushner: Abram Haimovich 1905 06.13.41 Kozelchanskiy Camp(K/L)

According to these documents, Abram was sent to the Kozelshchansky camp in Siberia, and his wife Ruhly Kozhushner to Southern Kazakhstan with her two children, nine and two years old. (Ruhly Kozhushner's aged mother did not want to remain without a family, and voluntary went into exile together with her daughter and grandchildren.)

According to the rehabilitation letter of 1993 (see the original below), Abram Kozhushner, Jewish supply manager in the cooperative "Red wine-maker" in Kishinev, was arrested (and as above cited documents show – deported) for political reasons on 6.13.41 and sentenced to 3 years of imprisonment by the NKVD of the USSR on 6.01.42. He was detained at a labor camp near the town of Ivel in the Sverdlovsk region, where he died for unknown causes on 9.24.43. The place of his burial is unknown. According to information obtained through a chain of camp prisoners ("camp wire") he was murdered by criminal inmates, likely on NKVD orders, while working in tree-felling.
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PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON’S VISIT

President Bill Clinton came on an official visit to Belorussia on January 15, 1994. During that time Bill Clinton saw the Kuropatskoye urochishche (natural landmark), well known in the world like KUROPATE which is located not far from Minsk in Belorussia. This is the place where over 250,000 innocent victims of Stalinist’s terror were executed.

To remember this tragic time, President Clinton put a marble bench, which was named “Clinton Bench.” On the bench was carved the words: “To the Belarusians from the Americans.” This bench was attacked and broken 12 times by those who supported Stalin. The famous Belarusian sculptor, Alex Shaternik using his own expenses fixed it. For this great job Alex Shaternik got a thank you note from Bill Clinton himself.
PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON
The Bench Broken Again
Alex Shaternik
The bench after restoration
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 5, 1994

PERSONAL

Ales Shternik
Starovilenskaya, 14-5
Minsk, 220029
BELARUS

Dear Ales:

Thank you for the sculpture. I'm sorry this note is late, but I only recently learned that you were the donor of the piece. It was so generous of you to share your artwork with me.

I appreciate your thoughtful gesture and wish you the best.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
The Prakhin International Literary Foundation

and

Remember

The New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education

Annual Student Literary Award

“The Truth about the Holocaust & Stalinist Repression”

The Prakhin Foundation presents an award for the best literary work on last Sunday of January at the Museum of Jewish Heritage A Living Memorial to the Holocaust in New York City

Any aspect of Holocaust & Stalin’s’ repressive regime may be presented by student (or group of students) in prose, poetry, art or drama (play), survivor’s testimonies (including photo documents)

The submittal with the attached form should be sent to:

Dr. Paul B. Winkler
Executive Director
New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education
P.O. Box 500
Trenton, NJ 08625

Entries should be submitted by December of every year
The Prakhin International Literary Foundation

and

The New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education

Annual Student Literary Award
"The Truth about the Holocaust & Stalinist Repression"

Name of Student: ___________________________ Grade: __________

School Name: ____________________________________________

District: ________________ County: ________________________

Contact Information for Student:

Address: ________________________________________________

Phone #: __________________ E-Mail Address: ________________

Contact Information for School:

Address: ________________________________________________

Phone #: __________________ E-Mail Address: ________________

Principal’s Name: _________________________________________

Principal’s Signature: ____________________________________

Presentation except for art should be attached.