

OBJECTIVE REASONS OF DISINTEGRATION OF THE USSR

Boris Ikhlov

Perm State University

Foreword

The history of this work is strange to say the least. In it, the author used the fact of the deconcentration (the author's term) of labor in the USSR, the fictitious socialization of production, which he also discovered. The magazine "Alternatives" published an article by Ikhlov, which points out this fact. Ten years passed, and MSU professor A. Buzgalin, in the next issue of the same magazine "Alternatives" in 2001, appropriated the authorship of the discovery and, accordingly, the term, which made Ikhlov publicly appear with the article "Globalization in Russian".

This article was first partially published in the materials of the interuniversity conference "National issue: history and modernity" (Perm, PSU, 1996). However, the university scientific community did not notice this work.

In 2001, the author presented this article at the international conference of the "Alternatives" movement in Moscow, organized by the Buzgalin group. But even after that, this article remained unknown to the general reader. It is understandable that scientists holding the positions of the CPSU or the CPRF "do not notice" the article: it crosses out all the works that have been written on this topic by S.G. Kara-Murza, S.V. Cheshko, M.G. Suslov and others who believe that the main reasons were either external or external, together with the activities of Khrushchev.

Liberal-democratic analysts do not see this work either.

It is even more surprising that Ikhlov's article is not accepted in an environment that considers itself Marxist-Leninist, even in circles close to the Samara Marxist philosopher E. V. Nikishina. Although the above principled position (in its modern form) was formulated by Nikishina (Ikhlov refers to her in the article). Moreover, this provision was formulated by Lenin, arguing that even 1000 Marx in the government will not be able to manage the country's economy.

Even after the author included this article in his book "Lessons of the Revolution", the scientific community tried not to notice either the article in the book or (with rare exceptions) the book itself.

To this day, there is not a single link to the article in the texts on the Internet, and various researchers continue to explain the collapse of the USSR either by the activity of the CIA and its agent Matthias Rust, or by the subjective moods of the population of the Union republics, or by the betrayal of the CPSU Secretary General, or by the Declaration of Sovereignty. signed by three people in Bialowieza.

Sergey Otdelny, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Perm

Part of the material is presented in [1].

Let us list the points of view on the collapse of the USSR.

1) Liberal democrats believe that the origins of national enmity and the collapse of the USSR are in totalitarianism, in the monopolization of the economy, in ideological pressure. It is widely believed that the basis of national enmity is Soviet poverty. The version is doubtful, since national, national-religious and racial conflicts have occurred and are occurring also in developed countries.

The continuation of conflicts after the collapse of the USSR-CPSU is viewed in official journalism as a residual phenomenon of the same totalitarianism.

The liberal point of view appeals to the myth that the USSR stood on the brink of an abyss, "sat on an oil needle," and oil prices collapsed, the external debt reached 80 billion dollars, with gold reserves of \$ 20 billion, thus there is another way out. there was no way to destroy the USSR and bring down the economy.

They point to poverty, misery, unemployment, the war in Afghanistan, the decrepitude of the leadership, the cultural influence from outside, the lack of freedom of speech, free elections, the extensiveness of the economy; allegedly in the USSR, the economy was put in the service of the military.

However, in the USSR in 1986 there were only 1.7 million unemployed per 140 million active population, 1.2%, there was no talk of hunger, if workers received 3-4 times less on hand than in the West, they had subsidies from the factory, free medicine, education, owned country houses and land, etc. The decline in oil prices turned out to be a myth. The sale of oil and oil products accounted for only 6% of the USSR budget.

The wars in Vietnam or Iraq did not lead to the disintegration of the United States, the leadership in the person of Biden is just as decrepit, the cultural influence of the USSR was no less, the US military budget is now over 770 billion dollars (Russia is 42 billion), the US national debt has exceeded 20 trillion dollars, there is no freedom of speech and free elections either in the United States or in any other country in the world, in all countries of the world the actions of the authorities are contrary to their declarations. The economy of the USA, Germany or France is no less extensive - in view of the export of capital.

Disinterest in work, apathy are especially highlighted, as if the overwhelming majority of the population was in no way interested in the results of their work.

However, in any country in the world there is a time-based job, and it dominates in comparison with piece-work.

Former head of the Central Bank Gerashchenko claims that "the patient had just a slight runny nose."

2) Almost all the communist parties in the Russian Federation adhere to the position that the collapse of the USSR was due to the influence of the leading capitalist powers (the Zionist conspiracy), and to a greater extent ideological. It is believed that two people are guilty of liquidating the Union - Gorbachev and Yeltsin. Obviously, this point of view is traditional and is caused by the exaggeration of the role of the individual in history.

CPSU ideologists also point to external and internal reasons for the collapse of the USSR. External reasons are Western intelligence services.

Internal - these are agents of influence, "revisionists-anti-Stalinists" who "rocked the boat", the bourgeoisie of the CPSU (mainly under Khrushchev) and the bourgeois working class, betraying the ideals of socialism for the sake of Western goods, the shadow economy (shopkeepers, black-market speculators and others, accumulated capital). In addition, by 1991, ordinary citizens had over 5 billion rubles "in stockings" and on savings books, which played a role in voucherisation and corporatization.

However, in developed countries, instead of the "hand of the CIA" there are much more powerful agents of influence, the Communist Party.

Without a doubt, the influence of Western intelligence services played a large role. But, as the representatives of these special services themselves noted, in order for the provocation to be successful, the ground, the prerequisite underlying the basis, is needed. Moreover, this applies to such an independent state as the USSR.

Of course, it is impossible to ignore external influence and the presence of a "fifth column" in the USSR. However, the influence of the Soviet special services in the "capitalist camp" was no less.²²

The shadow economy also played a role. But in the collapse of the industry, the young elite of the CPSU played a major role. Thus, one member of the Perm regional committee of the CPSU privatized 4 large stores on the central street of the city, Komsomolsky Prospect, for 50 thousand rubles, at a price of 1 million rubles for each store.

The sons of the leaders of the aircraft industry, the Mikrodin firm, by unknown means acquired 32% of the shares of Perm Motors. In general, the shares fell into the hands of the management of the factories, the general directors - 5% by the order of Yeltsin, the heads of the shops were given privileges for the purchase of shares. Then the workers were delayed in wages and shares were bought for nothing.

) Many left-wing groups believe that the main reason for the "collapse of the empire" is the class struggle, and specifically the working class, against oppression by the CPSU elite.

Anarchists and Trotskyists put the main emphasis on Stalin's undemocratic character and say that there was a workers' state in the USSR under Lenin, but it was reborn, Stalin with his national policy created the basis for disintegration, as Trotsky had predicted.

However, Argentina and the United States are also multinational states, Argentina is dominated by the Spaniards. In the USA, Negroes and Indians are oppressed.

In 1987, subsidies from the budget of the USSR for one Georgian, Armenian accounted for about 700 rubles, for a resident of the Baltic republics - 1000-1200 rubles, for a resident of the RSFSR - 89 rubles 67 kopecks. About the same for a Ukrainian, a Belarusian, a Tajik, a Kyrgyz, a Turkmen, a Kazakh. At the same time, anti-Russian activity was mainly in Georgia and the Baltic States (however, the demonstrations of the 60s-70s under the slogan "get the Russians out" soon faded away). At the same time, the RSFSR dominated the CPSU leadership in percentage terms.

Undoubtedly, the Stalinist policy of indigenization (including Ukrainization) served as one of the powerful pushing springs, like the Stalinist plan for autonomization, carried out by Stalin after the death of the enemy of this plan, Lenin, the plan implied strengthening the subordination of the republics to the center, in particular, the mandatory presence of Russians at the very top of the republican administrative apparatus. By the time of the collapse of the USSR, Russians were despised and even hated by the Udmurts, Komi, Tuvinians.

However, the centrifugal tendency that Trotsky highlighted worked only after the sectoral chains within each of the republics and between the republics disintegrated - in view of the liberalization of prices, the invasion of the dollar and a sharp depreciation of the ruble. All three moments were planned even before Yeltsin and Gaidar. But not in the Politburo (after Gorbachev became president, it lost its second role), but in the government document (which received this second role), signed by Petrakov in April 1990.

During the war, relations with Chechnya were extremely tense, the rebels tried to reunite with the Wehrmacht. Crimean Tatars fought on Hitler's side. According to the directive of the State Committee for Defense, men from the Turkic republics were not called up in the Red Army, that is, relations with the center of these republics were also tense.

After Stalin's death, Khrushchev returned the evicted Chechens and Tatars to their homeland and continued the "divide and rule" policy, populating the Stavropol region with Chechens. "Autonomization" continued to operate: for every 1st secretary of the CPSU Republic Committee, a Russian was to be his deputy.

By the time of the collapse of the USSR, Russians were despised and even hated by the Udmurts, Komi, Tuvinians.

Of course, the provocation of foreign special services with a television center in Vilnius, the organization of the conflict by the Georgian KGB with the use of sapper shovels, and the participation of the MOSSAD in the Moscow events in October 1993 also played a role.

The influence of such factors as the dominance of the Russian nationality in the governing bodies of the CPSU and in the CPSU as a whole (see GSE, article "CPSU"), whipping up anti-Russian sentiments in Georgia or the Baltic states, etc. - was secondary. Thus, conflicts on ethnic grounds did not spill over into broad popular movements; the national Popular Fronts, RUKH, Sayudis and others were too weak and almost disappeared immediately after the collapse of the USSR.

Rallies of many thousands, agents of influence, informal groups, etc. almost did not influence the course of events. It was foam for water, information support, extras. The rallies soon came to naught, and the informals were not supported by their actions either by labor collectives or by the population as a whole.

Likewise, it is difficult to call the division of property across the republics the result of the struggle of the working class: the national theme barely affected workers' associations, and the national Workers' Unions disappeared even faster than the Fronts. Although the labor movement for some time went side by side with the democratic movement, until the developed class conflict within a republic, the movement did not grow until the collapse of the USSR.

4) Engineers and scientists believe that the key role was played by the artificial freezing of technologies, agreed by the top leadership of the United States, Europe and the USSR.

The technology freeze did indeed take place: the world's first computers (first analog) were created in the USSR. However, one can hardly believe that Stalin reached an agreement with Roosevelt and Daladier that genetics would be oppressed in the USSR, and Khrushchev - with Kennedy and De Gaulle on the oppression of cybernetics. In addition, by 1985, in one of the institutes of Moscow State University, a method for creating large integrated circuits, LSI, was discovered by the method of sputtering with a laser, which made it possible to overcome the 15-year lag behind Japan. But perestroika prevented its implementation.

The specificity of the USSR, expressed in the size of the area, of course, leaves an imprint on management, but it cannot be an essential reason. In North America, attempts by several states to secede led to the Civil War. Tibet's desire to secede prompted military action. Centrifugal forces operate in the EU as well, Great Britain left the union, Greece left the union even before the introduction of the euro currency. Scotland tried to secede from Great Britain, Catalonia voted to secede from Spain.

There were also subjective reasons. If it were not for the actions of the top of the SEC, the USSR might have followed the path of China.

The SEC arose long before 19.8.1991, and at the meetings of Yeltsin's team, people asked for time off: "Now the SEC is in session, I want to listen!" Conversely, people from the SEC were present at the meetings of Yeltsin's team.

Even in 1993 there was an opportunity to prevent the collapse of the economy, if Yeltsin had not dissolved the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

On July 4, a joint meeting was held in Moscow, organized by the government and the RF Armed Forces, at which the head of the Armed Forces, Khasbulatov, announced: "Everyone must obey the laws. We write the laws. So we need to obey. "

Among the documents of the Meeting was the Agreement on Cooperation, signed behind Yeltsin's back by Travkin, Gaidar, Yavlinsky, Gerashchenko and others, that is, representatives of both opposing sides, which could not please Yeltsin.

In 1993, Yeltsin fired Zakharov as head of the Pension Fund (PFR), Berezovsky became his treasurer, an association of 6 Solidarity banks arose on the basis of the PFR (Mamut, Khodorkovsky, Abramovich, etc.) Chernomyrdin took 21 billion rubles from the PFR, returned only 6 billion rubles. Komsomol leader 25

Chubais became the head of the State Property Committee, the young party-industrial elite seized oil and gas. However, all subjective reasons are due to the objective, which was the administrative apparatus of the USSR. Thus, all of the above reasons operate in many countries of the world without causing disintegration.

Competition

Nevertheless, the external impact on the USSR was significant.

Obviously, developed countries could exert a direct influence of a massive nature, and by no means through special services, samizdat or Radio Liberty, on the humanitarian and scientific and technical intelligentsia, which had much greater access to legal information about the West than the working class. Why is information so scary?

"Capitalist production," writes E. Preobrazhensky, "is not scary for subsistence farming when the latter has no points of contact with it ... Subsistence farming simply does not accept battle, since it is not involved in monetary exchange ... And only when this weaker enemy is being dragged out into the capitalist arena by the development of commodity exchange, it is being put on both shoulder blades in the process of free competition. ... For the victory of the capitalist mode of production over the natural or petty-bourgeois mode of production, those economic advantages that each capitalist enterprise had over more primitive forms of economy were quite enough. Violence played mainly an auxiliary role ... The outcome of the battle was decided by the consumer, who, buying a cheaper (or higher quality, B.I.) product, thereby voted for the capitalist mode of production (or for a more developed production, B.I.) and supported it against the craft (or against less developed production), becoming a buyer (or appraiser, B.I.) of capitalist products" [2].

That is, a similar conclusion about the collision of a developed capitalist economy with a less developed one is quite legitimate. The fact that production from the USSR was less developed than in the USA, Europe or Japan is indicated not only by the level of GDP per capita [3], but also by the weak development of computer technologies as the basis of modern production, and the quality of consumer goods, and quality of vehicles. For example, the export of aircraft to the USA in 1985 exceeded the analogous export of the USSR by more than 20 times (see, for example, [4]).

Secondly, we are talking about the comparison of working conditions and wages - as you know, in developed countries the ratio of the incomes of clerks and engineers is inverse than in the CMEA countries (see, for example, [5]).

Third, on the direct exchange of scientific and technical information. Suffice it to mention that the once scientific direction of creating high-temperature superconductors in the USSR was criticized from a high rostrum, at the same time Ronald Reagan declared in his first presidential term: "High-temperature superconductors are the nails with which we will hammer the coffin of socialism."

So, it is obvious that the points of contact between Western-level industry and the so-called "closed society" were mostly in the sphere of intellectual work. Thus, the debates, unfolded in due time by the Communist Parties, about the "betrayal of the ideas of socialism by the intelligentsia" are doubtful.

Thus, it was worth introducing greater independence of factories in the "Law on State Enterprise" and then abolishing the state monopoly on foreign trade introduced by Lenin, as more developed countries began to oust local producers from the market.

Three main reasons

In fact, each republic disintegrated even before the Belovezhskaya Agreement. The latter was only a legal confirmation of the actual disintegration. For example, the textile workers of Ivanovo, "polarized" by the external dollar field, are tearing up the technological chain, selling textiles abroad and leaving Glazov's weavers without raw materials. Short-term interest realized - profit; the rate of profit (reduction in price, modernization of the means of production), as well as long-term interests, remained in the shadows.

It is not common, but the IDENTITY of the reaction to the "field" on the part of managers, intelligentsia, and workers. Why is this happening? In order for the "field" to work, there must be a "charge". Namely.

The construction of the economic system by the state-owner included the centralization of financial capital and management. Thus, the state has "expropriated" all planning functions. Consequently, together with them, it concentrated all long-term interests in itself, removing them from the consciousness of ordinary workers. The exclusion of art workers, workers of creative (dominant concrete) labor, who are both performers and planners of their own labor during the labor process, is not significant, because they are embroiled in a dominant alienation from general management.

At the same time, the concentration of labor was only extensive, quantitative in nature, with the internal fragmentation of production ("atomization of the proletariat"). Since not only technological chains instantly disintegrated, but in the absence of closed cycles fell apart into separate workshops and giant factories, inside the workshops, various forms of payment provoked a confrontation between pieceworkers and time workers, and capitalist leveling, i.e. payment for materialized labor, created tension between the members of the labor collective within the brigades.

That is, socialization was fictitious. As an example, we can cite the implementation of the synthesis of a certain chemical compound in Perm, for which components were supplied from a dozen cities of the USSR up to Khabarovsk in the presence of the same components in Perm itself. Or the supply for the Perm "bicycle" defense plant (JSC "Velta") steel grades from 35 cities of the USSR, including distant Yerevan, Krasnoyarsk, etc., when metallurgical plants in the Perm region are not loaded (Lysvensky, Chusovsky, Nytvensky), in the presence of metallurgical plants in Perm itself at the factories named after Lenin and named after Sverdlov.

To this must be added the oncoming traffic, the supply of timber from the Baltics to Siberia, cement to Gornozavodsk, where the cement plant is located, etc.

That is, roughly speaking, the Baltic nuts were "socialized" with Khabarovsk bolts, the extensive consolidation of production was accompanied by the deconcentration of labor [6].

Thus, the privatization process is PRIMARY in relation to the process of the collapse of the USSR.

Why does the administrative apparatus need such a structure of the economic system? It is obvious that the transfer of the chief executive to the center from the provinces makes it difficult to strike. Secondly, the unification of workers according to professional interests, according to the "interests" of the technological chain is also difficult due to the scattered production. This means that if the manager loses on the increase in production costs, he gains due to the absence of workers' performances and, consequently, the absence of redistribution of profits to the workers' wages.

The same method of organizing production is observed in the developed capitalist countries [7]. So, the exorbitant costs of production in fictitious socialization are one of the main political and economic springs of the collapse of the USSR.

The second objective reason is the growth of productive forces.

As already mentioned, planning functions, management functions are concentrated in the capital. That is, the management apparatus mediates all intra-economic ties. As indicated by Nikishina in 1988 [8] and in 1992 by Fukuyama [9], the development of production leads to an increase in the number of economic ties, and hence to the growth of the administrative apparatus. In the end, the administrative apparatus is faced with a dilemma - either to increase its size even more and lose its privileged position (with Lenin, to make EVERYONE bureaucrats), or to maintain the status quo. That is, a situation when the apparatus is no longer able to cover the entire wealth of economic ties. This means that it is not able to manage.

Therefore, in the conditions of suppression of the economic "creativity of the masses", attempts to form a plan "from below", the administrative apparatus collapses regardless of the desire of the layer of managers, ceases its functions, entrusts them to the capitalist class, where property relations have been reduced from management to ownership (hence the rentier and the export of capital abroad), but, for the most part, forms this class itself.

A number of smaller-scale administrative apparatus are emerging in accordance with the scale of economic structures that each specific apparatus is able to control.

Since the common interest in the newly formed class has not matured, the bourgeoisie appears as a class-in-itself, but not a class-for-itself, insofar as each economic structure declares only a short-term interest, and not a long-term one (previously "expropriated" by the capital). Consequently, these structures do not need the state as a tool for realizing a common interest. Therefore, state property is disintegrating. Because even 1000 Marxes couldn't manage the entire economy.

The same tendencies are valid in the United States, the collapse of which was predicted by Harriman back in the 40s. In the process of the third round of globalization (if we consider the 1st world war as the first, the 2nd world war as the second, and the USSR as a relatively peaceful globalization of the economy in a limited space). Centrifugal trends are being detected today not only by Texas, but also by 17 states that voted for Trump.

As has been shown, centralization of management and the concentration of financial capital has nothing to do with the socialization of production. Thus, globalization cannot be the basis for uniting workers and, as Savas titled his article, "The Transition to Socialism" [10]. There is nothing to applaud for in globalization. On the contrary, instead of uniting the workers, it leads to their disunity.

Thus, the contradiction of capitalism, expressed in the social nature of production and the private form of appropriation, is only a side of the contradiction between the growth of production and the usurpation of production management by a narrow social stratum, no matter if it is a bourgeois class or a class of state officials.²⁹

Consequently, the contradiction between labor and capital is not reduced to the withdrawal of surplus value, since the owner does not use the lion's share for his personal consumption, for luxury goods, etc., he is obliged to pay taxes, invest in depreciation and development of production: as in the USA or Germany, and in the USSR. This contradiction mainly lies in the usurpation of the management of this surplus value (development fund or accumulation fund).

Consequently, the content of the oppression of the class by the class is not so much a cut in income, as the reduction of the worker to the role of a cog in the mechanism, his depersonalization through alienation from management.

The basis for such alienation is the social division of labor, first of all, into physical and mental labor. Monotonous, hard, depersonalizing (dominant abstract) labor is oppressive, and not just low wages to restore the workforce. The hired character of labor is generated by the abstract content of labor.

The third objective reason for the collapse is the contradiction between the bourgeois content and the socialist form of classes in the USSR.

Indeed, the working class cannot be both socialist and "bourgeois" at the same time.

On the other hand, management, disposal is the essence of property relations, the manager of the means of production is a capitalist by definition.

A higher place in the social hierarchy, in the production management system, also determines a higher share of social wealth, in accordance with the definition of classes given by Lenin in the article "The Great Initiative".

Since social existence determines social consciousness, the privileged social existence of the managerial class gave rise to their bourgeois consciousness, of course, not in 1956, but immediately after 1917. Therefore, it makes no sense to involve conspiracy theories of the leadership's "betrayal".

Thus, the driving force behind the reforms that led to the collapse of the USSR was the interest of the managerial elite to legalize their position as owners (to "convert" power into money).

References

1. Ikhlov B.L. *Collapse of the USSR: 10 years later. For the International Conference in Moscow 2001*
2. Preobrazhensky E. *The Basic Law of Socialist Accumulation. In the book "Development Ways: Discussions of the 20s." L., 1990.30*

3. *The World In 198...*, The Economist Publications, Tokyo, 198 ..., *Issues of the 80s*.
4. *The World Almanac (and book of facts)*. New York, 1990.
5. Tanko Z. *Distribution. Analysis of the experience of self-government in Yugoslavia*. M.: Economics.1990.
6. Ikhlov B.L. *The upper classes cannot, the lower classes do not want to*. *Alternatives*. Iss. 1, 1991. P. 102-106.
7. Prais S. J. *The Evolution of Giant Firms in Britain*. Cambridge, 1976.
8. Nikishina E. V. *About economic romanticism*. *Look*, № 1, Perm-Sverdlovsk, 1989.
9. Fukuyama F. *The End of History and the Last Man*. Free Press. 1992.
10. Savas M.M. *Alternatives*. Iss. 3, 2000.