

Dimitri A. PISSARENKO

MACRO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
POST-SOVIET RUSSIA FROM 1991 TO 2002

2002–2004

DRAFT

## ATTENTION!

This is a draft version of the dissertation. The reader is not allowed to reference this version of the document. Contact the author for information about the availability of final version (which can be referenced).

# Contents

<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>List of figures</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 General information about Russia</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 The origin of the word "Russia" . . . . .	4
1.2 Overview of the Russian history . . . . .	5
1.2.1 Periods of Russian history . . . . .	5
1.2.2 The Pre-Slavs . . . . .	5
1.2.3 Grand Duchy Kiev Rus' (9th century – 1169) . . . . .	6
1.2.4 The Appanage period (1169 – 1462) . . . . .	8
1.2.5 The Moscow Empire (1462 – approx. 1700) . . . . .	12
1.2.6 St. Petersburg empire (approx. 1700 – 1917) . . . . .	17
1.2.7 Soviet Republic (1917 – 1991) . . . . .	30
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Glossary</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>A The Library of Congress system</b>	<b>49</b>

# List of Figures

A.1	Substitution table for The Library of Congress system (without diacritics, University of Exeter (2002)) . . . . .	50
-----	--	----

# Chapter 1

## General information about Russia

This chapter will provide the reader with basic information about the Russian Federation.

### 1.1 The origin of the word "Russia"

Around the 4th century A. D., near Kiev, on the right bank of Dnepr lived the tribe of poliane, whose land was called at that time *Rus'*. One of the explanations of the origin of this name is given by the annals. According to them, "Rus'" comes from "Ros'", the name of a tributary of Dnepr located near the territory of poliane (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 5–6).

Another explanation of the origin of the word *Rus'* provides Schramm (1981). According to this source, the word *Rus'* is a slavicized version of the Finnish word *ruotsi*, with which the Finns designated the Normans (Vikings) who sailed to the Eastern Europe over the Baltic sea. Literally, *ruotsi* means *rower*. After the Normans established their rule in the Eastern Europe, this name was transferred to the name of their sphere of control (Kiev *Rus'*) and later also on its inhabitants (Torke, 1997).

The word *Rossia* (Россия), which is used today and designates the state of Russian federation, has been used since the 16th century as a replacement of term *Rus'* and *Moscow Empire*. In the late 17th century, the term *Rossia* became the official name of the Russian state. From this term, the adjective "rossiiskii" (российский in Russian, russländisch in German) is derived, which means "belonging to Russia". In contrast, the term derived from "Rus'", "russkii" (russisch in German) means "Russian" in an ethnical and linguistic sense. *Rossiiskii* refers to the citizens of the Russian state, irrespective of the ethnical affiliation, while *russkii* means Russians in the narrower, ethnical sense. Hence, the politically correct term for a Russian is *Rossiianin* or *Rossiianka* (the nouns derived from *Rossia*). (Kappeler, 1997).

## 1.2 Overview of the Russian history

### 1.2.1 Periods of Russian history

In partitioning the eleven centuries of the history of Russia, the author employs the periodisation scheme provided by (Torke, 1997, p. 22), who divides the Russian history into following five parts:

1. Grand Duchy Kiev Rus' (9th century – 1169)
2. The appanage period (1169 – 1462)
3. Moscow empire (1462 – approx. 1700)
4. St. Petersburg empire (approx. 1700 – 1917)
5. Soviet Republic (1917 – 1991)

These sections of Russian history will be explained in greater detail in subsequent sections. Note that the period of Russian history from 1985 to 1991 is presented in chapter ???. The post-Soviet period will be discussed later in this work from the economic point of view. The intent of this section is to acquaint the reader with the most important events in the history of Russia, not to provide an in-depth explanation of it. Reader interested in a detailed presentation of Russian history should refer to the work Stöckl (1997). The overview over Russian history provided in this section is a highly compressed and simplified translation of Orlov et al. (1997). The focus is made on political and economic events in the history, while cultural and scientific development is not presented (as it is of little importance for the topic of the work).

### 1.2.2 The Pre-Slavs

According to archeological data, the ancestors of Slavs (pre-Slavs) populated the territory of central and eastern Europe since approx. 1500 B.C. Linguistically, the languages of the Slavs belong to the Indo-European language family. The frontiers of the region populated by the pre-Slav tribes were the river Elba in the west, Baltic Sea in the North and the rivers Seim and Oka in the east. This territory was inhabited by several hundreds of pre-Slav tribes ((Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 4–5)).

From the 6th century A. D. on, the eastern Slav branch of the Slav population can be traced. These eastern Slavs were ancestors of future Russian, Ukrainian and Belarussian peoples. In this time, big tribal alliances are formed among the Slavs. The annals contain a legend of the rule of brothers Kii, Shchek and Khoriv and their sister Lybed' in the region of the river Dnepr. According to the annals, they founded the city of Kiev (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 5).

Main occupations of the pre-Slavs were agriculture, hunt, fishing and collecting of honey of wild bees (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 6–7).

In the 7th and 8th centuries A. D., pre-Slav workmen with several specialisations emerges. The artificers are concentrated in tribal centers. At the same time, many of these tribal centers, which originally were military fortifications, become centers of trade and craft - cities (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 7–8).

As already mentioned, the primary occupation of the pre-Slavs was agriculture. At those time, this craft was highly labour-intensive, that is, significant agricultural work could only be performed in community with other farmers. This caused the *peasants'*

*community* (община) to become an important social element of the pre-Slav tribes. In later periods, the importance of the community ceased due to improved methods of agriculture (because then, a single family was able to perform agricultural work without alone, thus the exclusion from the commune had less severe consequences). The defense functions were executed by the so-called *druzhina*, an organisation of professional soldiers, normally lead by princes and hereditary nobility. Apart from the professional "army", there also existed a popular militia which consisted of civilian members of the tribe and was collected during wars. Important decisions in the life of the community were made in scope of people's "assemblies" (*Veche*) ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 8–9)).

### 1.2.3 Grand Duchy Kiev Rus' (9th century – 1169)

Gradually, the community-oriented society of pre-Slavs became a class-oriented society. The "new" rulers, which crystallized out of the most wealthy members of the community required state structures in order to maintain their power. First forms of the Slav state constituted short-lived inter-tribal alliances (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 11).

According to a legend reported in *Povest' vremennykh let* (Повесть временных лет), the Russian sovereign dynasty roots in the city of Novgorod. In 859 A. D., northern Slav tribes drove away the Normans from their regions, to whom they previously paid tribute. But shortly afterwards, a struggle for power has begun among the Slav rulers. In order to make an end to this inner unrest, the Novgorodians invited the Norman princes as mediators (that is, as a neutral power not belonging to any of the groups struggling for power). In 862 A. D., prince Rurik and his two brothers were invited by the Novgorodians and thus became the founders of Russian sovereign dynasty ((Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 11–12)).

Most historians assume that this legend is true. It should be noted, that this fact only implies that the first rules of the Russian state were Normans. It does *not* imply, that the Russian state itself was founded by the Normans. In other words, the Russian state was already formed at the time, Norman princes were invited to Novgorod ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 12)).

In 882 A. D., prince Oleg undertakes an expedition to Kiev. Upon killing Kiev's rulers Askold and Dir, he united the northern and southern Slavic territories in scope of a single state. The capital was moved from Novgorod to Kiev. The year 882 marks the beginning of the Kiev Rus', called so after its capital city ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 12)).

After Oleg's death, prince Igor' became the ruler of Kiev Rus'. He was killed in 945 while collecting tribute and leaved son Sviatoslav, who at that time was four years old. His regent became Igor's widow Olga. In 955, Olga visited Constantinople and adopted Christian confession. Upon her return to Kiev, she officially transferred the rule to Sviatoslav (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 17).

Sviatoslav's rule is marked by several important military victories. He defeated the state of Khazars, defeated the Pechenegs near Kiev and performed two expeditions to the Balkan (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 17).

Sviatoslav was followed by his son Iaropolk. In scope of a war with his brother Oleg, a Drevlian<sup>1</sup> prince, Yaropolk incorporated Drevlian territories into Kiev Rus'. Oleg was killed in action (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 17).

---

<sup>1</sup> drevlian = belonging to Drevlians, a Slav tribe

In 980 Iaropolk was killed during a war with his brother Vladimir (third son of Sviatoslav; formerly ruler of Novgorod), and Vladimir took over the rule over the entire Kiev Rus' (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 17–18).

Main achievement of Vladimir's rule was the incorporation of several regions into Kiev Rus' and the adoption of the orthodox form of the Christian religion as the official religion of the Kiev Rus'. The adoption of Christianity improved the image of Kiev Rus' in the eyes of other countries. Formerly being a pagan state, Kiev Rus' was often regarded as a barbarious nation by them ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 18)).

Vladimir's rule followed several wars among the sons of Vladimir. The last of them resulted in partition of the Kiev Rus' between Iaroslav and Mstislav Tmutarakanskii in 1024. After the death of Mstislav in 1035, Iaroslav became the single ruler of Kiev Rus'. Under Iaroslav, Kiev Rus' became one of the most powerful countries in Europe. His rule marks the heyday of Kiev Rus' ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 19)).

After the death of Iaroslav, the period of inner unrests has begun which eventually led to the dissolution of Kiev Rus'. Iaroslav divided the empire among his three sons Iziaslav, Sviatoslav and Vsevolod. There were several wars between them. Also, the Polovts<sup>2</sup> often attacked Russian territories. After the rule of Sviatopolk II. Iziaslavich, who was an unsuccessful military leader and an irresolute diplomat, the boiars' дума invited Vladimir Vsevolodovich Monomakh to take over the rule over the Kiev Rus'. The annals characterize Vladimir Monomach as a highly talented prince. He was successful at the prevention of collapse of the Kiev Rus'. His son, Mstislav the Great, also succeeded in ruling the Kiev Rus' as a single state. Afterwards, the final dissolution of the Kiev Rus' into several principalities began ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 20 – 21)).

The final dissolution of the Kiev Rus' happened in the year 1169, when Kiev was destroyed by Andrei Bogoliubskii and his son Mstislav in scope of a war ((Torke, 1997, p. 38)).

The government form of the Kiev Rus' was an early feudal monarchy. The head of state was the Grand Duke (великий князь) of Kiev. Parts of the empire were led by the relatives of the Grand Duke. The boiars' дума (боярская дума) played the role of a consulting organ to the Grand Duke. It consisted mainly of younger princes, representatives of tribal nobility as well as the members of družhina. Military forces of the Kiev Rus' consisted of professional soldiers (družhina) and troops of ordinary people, which was collected in particularly important cases. Veche (gathering, in scope of which higher social classes discussed and made decisions in a "democratic" way) was also an important political factor in the Kiev Rus'. In Novgorod, it took place on a regular basis, while in other cities it was collected only in especially important cases. The population of the Kiev Rus' was obliged to pay tribute to the prince. Originally, the amount of tribute to be paid was not fixed and was determined by a custom. Grand Duke Igor' was killed while collecting tribute upon an attempt to raise the amount of tribute. His widow Olga introduced a uniform, fixed scheme for the determination of the amount of tribute to pay. Almost all of the tribute collected by the Grand Duke was subject to export to Byzantium. Almost all of the military expeditions of Russian princes to Byzantium served the purpose of ensuring safety on the trade routes from Russia to Constantinople (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 21–24).

Main goals of the policy of the foreign policy of Kiev Rus' were the defense against nomadic tribes, securing the trade routes and maintaining advantageous trade connections with Byzantium. Kiev Rus' was among the most powerful European states of that time. By defending the territory of Kiev Rus' from nomads, western European coun-

---

<sup>2</sup>Name of a people

tries were enabled to trade with the countries of the near and middle east as well as with Byzantium. This ability depended to a high degree on military successes of the Kiev Rus'. The high international importance of Kiev Rus' is confirmed by marital connections of the princes of Kiev Rus'. Many of them were married to representatives of Norwegian, French, Hungarian, Polish, Byzantine and Anglo-Saxon ruling dynasties ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 24–29)).

#### 1.2.4 The Appanage period (1169 – 1462)

The dissolution of Kiev Rus' into several principalities had several reasons. Firstly, in the Kiev Rus' there were many princes, who possessed vast agricultural territories. Economically, these "farms" were only connected to their immediate vicinity. In many cases this were cities, whose number and size grew due to economic growth. Under these circumstances the local princes were socially and economically independent from the central Grand Duke of Kiev. Also, the local boiars supported the princes in their struggle for independence ((Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 33–34)).

The collapse of Kiev Rus' was thus inevitable and brought the advantage of strengthening the developing feudal system in Russia. The main negative consequence of the disappearance of a united Slav state was a higher vulnerability to external enemies ((Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 34–35)).

In the Appanage period, there was not a single Slav state, but several independent "countries". The Appanage period continued till the end of 15th century, when the greatest part of the Slav principalities was incorporated into the Moscow empire ((Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 34–35)).

Main players of that age were the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality (Владими́ро-Росто́во-Сузда́льское кня́жество), Galich-Volynian principality (Галицко-Волы́нское кня́жество) and the feudal republic of Novgorod ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 35)).

Vladimir-Suzdal' principality (of which the cities Rostov, Suzdal' and Murom were parts; the capital was originally Rostov) became independent under one of the sons of Vladimir Monomakh, Iurii Vladimirovich Dolgorukii (Юрий Владимирович Долгорукий). He transferred his capital to Suzdal'. Under his rule, a number of cities was founded, among them the future centre and capital of the Russian state Moscow, which is first mentioned in the annals in 1147. Iurii Dolgorukii also tried to become the Grand Duke of Kiev, which eventually happened (although he did not enjoy popularity among the inhabitants of Kiev). The principality was further strengthened under the rule of Iurii Dolgorukii's son, Andrey Bogoliubskii, who transferred his capital from Rostov to Vladimir-on-Kliaz'ma (Владимир-на-Клязьме). His actions were often authoritarian, which led to a conspiracy against him. As a result of this conspiracy, Andrey Bogoliubskii was killed in 1174 in his residence Bogoliubovo near Vladimir. Andrey Bogoliubskii was followed by his younger brother Vsevolod Big Nest<sup>3</sup> (Всеволод Большое Гнездо). Vsevolod's rule marks the climax of the power of Vladimir-Suzdal' principality. At this time, Vladimir-Suzdal' controlled Novgorod as well as the Murom-Ryazan' country. At the turn of 12th and 13th centuries, Vsevolod Big Nest was the most powerful Russian prince. After his death, the struggle for power among his children lead to the collapse of Vladimir-Suzdal' principality (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 35–37).

Galich-Volynian principality was a region of the southern Rus'. Most important cities of this principality were Galich (Галич), Peremyshl' (Перемышль) and Vladimir-

<sup>3</sup>The by-name "big nest" refers to the numerous children of Vsevolod (Torke (1997)).

Volynskii (Владимир-волинский). In this principality, local boiars played an important role, and the entire history of this principality is marked by a continuous struggle between the prince and the boiars. The region was also subject to the influence of Poland and Hungary, whom princes as well as boiars occasionally contacted either for help or for "political asylum". The rise of principality of Galich (Галицкое княжество) began under Iaroslav Osmomysl' (Ярослав Осмомысль). After his death, Roman Mstislavich (Роман Мстиславич) united the lands of Galich and the greater part of Volynia into a single principality. He also tried to incorporate other parts of the southern Rus'. After his death in 1205, a long period of inner unrests has began, during which Poland and Hungary tried to occupy Galich and Volynia. In 1238, the son of Roman Mstislavich, Daniil finally established himself in Galih. After the conquest of Rus' by the Mongol-Tatars, he became vassal of the Golden Horde. Possessing a strong diplomatic talent, he took advantage of conflicts between the Mongolian state and the western-European countries. The Mongols were interested in Galich-Volynian principality as a buffer zone to the West, while Vatican hoped to get control over Russian church with the help of Daniil. He was even promised support in fight with the Mongols and making him king. He was coronated in 1253 or 1255, but he did not adopt Catholicism, and did not get actual military support of Vatican. After Daniil's death, his successors could not prevent the collapse of Galich-Volynian principality. By the middle of 14th century, the land of Galich was occupied by Poland and Volynia by Lithuania (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 37–38).

The third major player in the Appanage period was the land of Novgorod. Novgorod has been special with respect to the rest of Rus' since the oldest times. One of its greatest differences to the rest of Rus' was the fact, that agriculture did not play an important role here and most of the income was earned by trade with honey of wild bees, furs as well as products of hunt on sea animals. Contrary to other parts of Rus', the land of Novgorod was marked by a small population density and absence of large cities apart from Velikii Novgorod. The second largest city of that region, Pskov, was incomparably smaller than Novgorod. Special was also the government form of Novgorod. By 1136, Novgorod became a boiar republic. The prince executed only certain functions like leading the military, was subject to permanent control of boiars, was not allowed to buy land in Novgorod and to perform the functions of a judge. Further, the income the prince earned for "serving" in Novgorod were strictly specified and fixed. The Veche was the highest decision making organ, real power was concentrated in the hands of boiars. With a sophisticated policy, they held the power over the most wealthy and large Russian land of that time. Although there were numerous national uprisings, they did not lead to principal changes in the Novgorod's policy. In spite of its ability to be one, Novgorod never became a centre of Rus' uniting the various Russian principalities. The boiars resisted any attempt to "reform" the traditional Novgorod's order. At the beginning of 15th century, principality of Moscow increased its influence on Novgorod, which led to a decrease in its formerly great independence. Novgorod's elites either supported Moscow or became politically passive ((Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 38–40)).

The Appanage period is marked by the struggle against Western invasion, the rule of the Mongols and the rise of the principality of Moscow. In following, a more detailed explanation of each of these factors will be presented.

By the beginning of the 13th century, Novgorod's and Polotsk (Полоцкая) principalities established strong economic, political and cultural connections to the Slav, Finno-Ugric and Baltic tribes populating the south-eastern coast of the Baltic Sea. These tribes did not have an own state, and were subject to the influence of Russian

principalities. The beginning of the 13th century coincides with the eastward expansion of western-European countries and religious organizations. This activity was a threat to Russian interests in that region and led to a conflict between Russians and the various orders of knights. The Russians were also supported by the population of the regions in question because the tribute to Russian princes was an incomparably lesser loss than the results of suppression by the knights. In the summer of the year 1240, a Swedish flotilla came to the Gulf of Finland, and went over the river Neva up to the mouth of the river Izhora. There the Swedes set up a temporary camp. Novgorod's prince Aleksander Iarsoslavich (Александр Ярославич) decided to attack the Swedes. In July 1240, the Swedish army was defeated in spite of its advantage in terms of the number of soldiers. For his important victory on the Neva and the prevention of the loss of the access to Baltic sea (thus interruption of trade with western European countries), Aleksander Iarsoslavich was given the by-name Nevskii (Невский) (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 42–43).

At the same time, the Livonian Order (Ливонский орден) attacked Russian lands and conquered many of them (among them the city of Pskov, Izborskoe, Kopr'e). Due to a conflict with the boiars, Alexander Nevskii temporarily left Novgorod. The Novgorod's inhabitants invited him to lead the army against Western invaders. In April 1242, on the ice of lake Peipsi (Chudskoe ozero, Чудское озеро), the German knights were defeated. This was one of the most important battles of the Russian middle-age. It is commonly known under the name Ledovoe Poboishche (Ледовое побоище) and set an end to Western invasion against Rus'. The danger of future attacks from the West was, however, by no means banned (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 42–44).

At the beginning of 13th century, in the steppes of central Asia, a Mongolian state was formed, which is best known by its military successes. In 1206, Genghis Khan (Чингисхан) became the great Khan of Mongols and proclaimed a war of conquest as the main task of the Mongolian state. During the numerous wars, Genghis Khan conquered different peoples and exploited their scientific and technological achievements for the purpose of war (many peoples conquered by the Mongols were culturally superior to them, but they were torn by inner conflicts at that time). As the time passed, the Mongols became superior to most peoples in the power of their military primarily because of adopted technology and their high mobility. Military conquests were preserved partially because of the religious tolerance of Mongols, which prevented resistance to their rule from the religious elites. Soon after Genghis Khan becoming the great Khan of Mongols, his forces attacked the peoples of southern Siberia and central Asia. China was first attacked in 1211 and completely conquered by 1276. In 1219 the Mongols conquered the central Asia and moved further to the West. The Mongols attacked and defeated the Polovts (Половцы) in the northern Caucasus. Polovts princes asked the Russians for military help. In 1223, Russian and Polovts forces were defeated by the Mongols on the bank of the river Kalka. This defeat was mainly caused by the fact that Russian princes had almost no information about the fighting "habits" of the Mongols. In 1237, the Mongols continued the conquest of Rus'. By 1240 most of the Russian principalities were conquered by the Mongols (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 44–48).

Mongolian attacks and later Mongolian rule over Rus' was always accompanied by destruction and extreme cruelty towards civilians. Although being completely ruined, the Russians incessantly resisted the Mongolian rule. This resistance forced the Mongols to give up their intents of further conquests in western Europe. It can thus be said, that this Russian resistance prevented the western Europe from Mongolian conquest and the destruction of the western European culture (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 44–48).

After the conquest of Rus' by the Mongols, there were two strategic directions of the policy followed by Russian princes:

- Open military resistance to Golden Horde with the aim of as quick as possible liberation of Rus'
- Moderate policy towards the Mongols accompanied by unification efforts of the Rus'

The strategy mentioned firstly was convicted to failure because of an incomparable advantage of the Mongols in terms of military force. Vladimir's prince Iaroslav Vsevolodovich (Ярослав Всеволодович) and particularly his son Alexander Nevskii (Александр Невский) were supporters of the second political option. They maintained peaceful diplomatic relations with the Golden Horde, taking into account the fact that danger came not only from the East (the Mongols), but also from the West (various orders of knights mentioned above). This strategy was also supported by the church - the conquest by the Western invaders would inevitably lead to "catholizing" the Rus', while the Mongols were tolerant concerning religion. Alexander Nevskii also exploited diplomatic conflicts between the rulers of Golden Horde and other Eastern rulers. At the same time Alexander Nevskii successfully tried to strengthen his power and became the leader among Russian princes. Although his politics towards Mongols was often criticized during his lifetime, it seems to be the only possible strategy, under which Rus' could survive the Mongolian yoke. His successors were less wise and the conflicts among them (struggle for power) had catastrophic results for Rus' and its inhabitants because occasionally, the Russian princes themselves brought Mongolian forces to Rus' in order to push their political interests through. The Mongols fought with their usual cruelty and destructiveness. During this time, the inner conflicts within Rus' increased. Destruction by the Mongols led to a decrease of Russian population, many churches, books and other culturally important works were destroyed by the Mongols. The economy was declining and many cities lost their former wealth. This period seriously slowed the development of Russia compared to the western European countries. As already mentioned above, in spite of the complete devastation of Rus', the resistance of the Russians continued, rendering further movement of the Mongols to western Europe impossible (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 48–51).

The emergence of the Moscow's principality as the political force unifying the Russian principalities into a single state had several causes. One of the major factors was the advantageous geographical location of Moscow: Moscow lies at the intersection of important land and river routes, which could be used both as trade and military routes. On the other side, Moscow was shielded from the invasion of enemies by other Russian principalities. The process of unification of Russian lands begins in 14th century. Two factors encouraged this process, firstly, the interests of boiars whose lands often exceeded the frontiers of their home principality and secondly, the presence of a common enemy - the Golden Horde. First independent ruler of Moscow was the son of Alexander Nevskii, Daniil. He greatly expanded the territory of Moscovian principality by incorporating the cities of Kolomna and Mozhaisk. His successors continued to conquer other Russian regions and incorporate them into the principality of Moscow. At the same time, the unification efforts of Moscovian princes were hindered by the need to be appointed as Grand Duke by the Mongolian Khan as well as by the competition of other Russian princes, who also wanted to become the Grand Duke of Rus'. Unification of Russian lands experienced a serious boost during the rule of Ivan Kalita. In cooperation with Mongolian forces, he undertook a destructive military expedition

against Tver' so that their princes were eliminated as competitors for the title of Grand Duke of Rus' for a long time. At the same time, he made any effort to maintain good relations with the Mongols, which brought Moscow almost 40 years of peace. Ivan Kalita earned respect not only in Rus', but also in the Golden Horde. Therefore, it was predetermined that after his death, one of his sons will become Grand Duke of Rus'. Thus, the Moscovians again gained the Grand Duke title. Dmitrii Ivanovich (Дмитрий Иванович) continued strengthening Moscovian principality. In 1360es, a new competitor for the Grand Duke title appears, namely Mikhail Aleksandrovich (Михаил Александрович) from Tver'. At that time, not a single Russian principality was capable of pursuing a war with Moscow because of its military superiority. Therefore, Mikhail Aleksandrovich undertook a failed military campaign against Moscow in alliance with Lithuania and Mongolians. In 1371, he even was appointed the Grand Duke of Rus' by the Mongolian Khan, but neither Moscovian prince Dmitrii Ivanovich nor other Russians accepted him as such. In 1375, after the conquest of Tver' by various Russian princes, led by Dmitrii Ivanovich, Mikhail Aleksandrovich officially denied his pretensions on the Grand Duke title and accepted Moscovian prince as the Grand Duke of Rus'. Moscow became the driving force of Russian unification and a territorial and national centre of emerging Russian state. Of particular importance was the battle on the Kulikovo Pole (Snipe's field) in 1380, where Russian forces (led by Moscovian prince Dmitrii Ivanovich) defeated the Mongols. Although the final liberation of Rus' from the Mongols happened only 100 years later, this victory had an enormous psychological importance. The Mongols were not seen as invincible any more (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 51–57).

The strength of Moscovian principality was to a great degree caused by a long period of interior peace and the absence of inner conflicts. Beginning from the rule of Daniil (1276) until 1425, there was not a single such conflict. From 1425 to 1453, there was a war for succession as the Moscovian Grand Duke among the relatives of Dmitrii Ivanovich, which ended in 1453 by Vasilii II the Dark<sup>4</sup> (Василий II тёмный) becoming the Grand Duke of Moscow and the adoption of a new "throne-succession" scheme, according to which, the Grand Duke title was passed from the father to the son (as opposed to the formerly used scheme, in which not the oldest son of the ruler became his successor, but the oldest son in the family). This practice aimed at the prevention of inner conflicts in the future (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 56–58).

The death of Vasilii II the Dark in 1462 marks the end of the Appanage period because from this point in time on, the leading role of Moscow in the formation of the Russian state is indisputable. The Appanage period is considered to end at this point in time as the main characteristic of it was the lack of a strong Russian state. The Moscovian principality emerged as such a state (Torke, 1997, p. 57).

### 1.2.5 The Moscow Empire (1462 – approx. 1700)

Unification of Russian lands continued by incorporating (among others) the cities of Novgorod, Pskov and Ryazan'. By 1521 almost all Russian lands were under control of Moscovian principality ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 60)).

But before Rus' could emerge as an independent state, the Mongolian yoke needed to be shaken off. In the second half of the 14th century, the process of dissolution of Golden Horde began. Struggle for power lead to a quick succession of ruling Khans and sometimes to simulanenous rule of several Khans (of whom all demanded tribute).

<sup>4</sup>He was given the by-name "the Dark" after his rival captured and blinded him.

Therefore, the attacks of the Mongols on Rus' increased in that period. As mentioned earlier, the first victory of Russians over Mongols happened in 1380 and is known as Kulikovskaia bitva (Snipe's field battle, Куликовская битва). This success was followed by the Mongolian conquest and burning down Moscow in 1382. The cause of this defeat was primarily the fact that during Kulikovskaia bitva many highly-skilled soldiers and elite military cadres were killed. Final liberation of Rus' from Mongolian yoke happened hundred years after Kulikovskaia bitva. Under Ivan III (1462-1505), Rus' ceased to pay tribute to the Mongols. In 1480, the Mongols (being at that time a collection of several state-like formations) in alliance with Polish-Lithuanian king attacked Rus' in order to force the Russian to pay the tribute again. Making use of the differences among various Mongol groups, Ivan III succeeded at preventing the Polish-Lithuanian ally of the Mongols to come to Russia. Without the help of Polish-Lithuanian king, the Mongol attack on the Russians failed. In order to save the troops from nearing winter, the Mongols decided to withdraw. In this way, Rus' was liberated from Mongol rule. Nevertheless, the struggle with different Khanats (remainders of Golden Horde) was an important part on the agenda of Russian foreign policy for many years ((Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 66–67)).

At the beginning of 16th century, the formation of the Moscovian Rus' was completed. The socio-economic development in Rus' of that period can be described as strengthened feudalism. Contrary to most countries of the western Europe, the economic boom observed in this period did not lead to transition to a bourgeois society. The absence of natural frontiers required a great deal of resources to be allocated for maintaining the military. In spite of all difficulties, Rus' could establish and maintain important trade relations with European as well as with Asian countries. Expansion of Russian territory continued, so that at the end of the rule of Ivan IV the Terrible it was ten times greater than at the time of his grandfather Ivan III ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 70–74)).

After the death of Vladimir III, the Grand Duke of Rus' became his son Ivan IV the Terrible, who was three years old at that time. His mother Elena Glinskaia was his regent until her death in 1538. During her rule and even afterwards, there was a strong struggle for power among boiars' groups (Bel'skie (Бельские), Shuiskie (Шуйские), Glinskie (Глинские)). This caused a weakening of the central power and discontentment among the people, there were revolts in several Russian cities. In January 1547, Ivan IV the Terrible was coronated and officially became the Grand Duke of Rus'. From this point in time on, the Grand Duke was called *Tsar'*. The revolts mentioned above showed that the Russian state required many structural reforms. At the beginning of his rule, many of them were initiated by Ivan IV the Terrible. One of the most important of the reforms was the creation of an Izbrannaia Rada (избранная Рада) in 1549, a new form of government. The novelty of Izbrannaia Rada was the fact that it consisted of representatives of several ruling classes and not only of boiars. Until its dissolution in 1560 it was a driving force of many reforms of the middle of 16th century (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 75–77).

Boiars' дума was always a highly influential organ of government in Rus'. Ivan IV the Terrible greatly expanded the size of boiars' дума in order to reduce the power of the boiars' aristocracy. Another decision-making organ was Zemskii sobor (земский собор), which consisted of representatives of boiars' дума, the Church and aristocracy. Zemskii sobor was primarily concerned with foreign policy problems and finance. Establishing of prikazy (приказы), i.e. departments responsible for a certain branches of state activity (e.g. defense, finance) or regions, made possible a centralisation of Russian government system. Prikazy were usually led by boiars or high rank civil servants.

Legal basis was also adapted to changing needs of a centralizing state. Another reforms were the introduction of Moscow ruble as a state-wide currency and the reform of the defense system (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 77–80).

Foreign policy of that time aimed at getting access to the Baltic Sea in the West, conquest of Khanats of Kazan' and Astrakhan' in the South-East, incorporating of Siberian lands in the East and defense from the Khanat of Crimea in the South ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 80–81)).

Conquest of Khanas of Khanats of Kazan' and Astrakhan' was necessary for three reasons. Firstly, these remainders of Golden Horde were a permanent threat to Russia from a military point of view. Secondly, the lands occupied by them were highly fertile. Thirdly, these Khanats held the important Volga trade route in their hands. Furthermore, the peoples occupied by the "post-Mongols" were interested at the liberation from them. After several unsuccessful attempts to gain control over the Khanat of Kazan' diplomatically, in 1552 Ivan IV the Terrible besieged Kazan' with an army counting 150,000 men. At that time Kazan' was a highly very modern and well equipped fortress. It required the detonation of 48 gallons barrels of gunpowder to destroy a part of fortress' wall and allow Russian forces to enter Kazan'. Four years later, Astrakhan' was also incorporated into Russian state. The regions of Chuvashiia (Чувашия), greatest part of Bashkiriia (Башкирия) voluntarily became part of Russia. Nogai Horde (Ногайская орда) declared itself dependent from Russia. The conquest of these regions made incorporation of large parts of Siberia possible. Incorporation of the conquered regions was advantageous for the peoples populating them because Russia was a higher developed state. The local ruling classes gradually became parts of the Russian ones (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 80–82).

The war with Livonia (Livonian war) lasted for years and was caused by objective demands of Russia. These were the need for defense of western borders of Russia and the need for the access to the Baltic Sea as a trade route to western Europe. The war started as 1558, when Livonia did not allow passage of more than hundred western European specialists invited to Russia. Until approximately 1563, Russian forces were successful in their battle against Livonian Order and even lead to its collapse in 1561 (its territories were divided between Poland, Denmark and Sweden). As the war appeared to become a long campaign, inner-Russian contradictions concerning it increased. These contradictions led Ivan IV the Terrible to the conclusion that a strong, autocratic rule could solve the problem. In 1560, Izbrannaia Rada was dissolved. High treason of prince Kurbskii (Курбский), who took the side of Poles, further increased the autocratic temptations of Ivan IV the Terrible. In 1565, oprichnina (опричнина) (see below) was introduced. Eventually, the Livonian war was lost. Successful defence of the city of Pskov prevented further attacks of Russian enemies and allowed Russia to sign a peace treaty with Sweden in 1583. Military success at Pskov reduced the concessions of Russia to Sweden ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 82–83)).

Oprichnina was present in Russia from 1565 to 1572. Basically, it meant a division of the country into a "military zone" (oprichnina) and a "civil zone" (zemshchina, земщина). Military zone was populated by soldiers of a special military troop who were under direct control of Tsar'. They lived on the territory, which formerly belonged to boiars, who were deported to the civil zone. To the military zone belonged the most strategically important and/or economically strong cities. The civil zone had the task of providing the military zone with all the resources it required. The purpose of this strategy taken by Ivan IV the Terrible was the elimination of feudal separatism of some boiars. It did not reach its goal fully, but the political power of boiars was seriously lessened (this was important because most boiars did not support Ivan's cen-

tralisation policy). At the same time, destruction of many highly developed regions by the oprichnina soldiers (oprichniki, опричники) weakened the economic strength of Russia. Together with the consequences of Livonian war, it led to the socio-economic crisis of Russia at the turn of 16th and 17th centuries. The end of the oprichnina policy in 1572 was caused by its inability to efficiently protect the country against Crimea Tatars and separatism within the oprichniki. The centralisation of Russia (elimination of separatism) was necessary for strengthening the Russian state. Hence, Ivan IV the Terrible pursued a policy in the right direction, but apparently by inappropriate means. The most cruel repressions of oprichniki could not change the laws of feudalism, which governed Russian economy at that time ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 84–86)).

The period after the rule of Ivan IV the Terrible is generally known as *Smuta* (Troubled Times) and marked by a socio-economic decline and serious social tensions. These were caused by the results of Livonian war and oprichnina. They caused an economic crisis, which led to migration of peasants from central regions to peripheral areas of Russia. In order to prevent this movement of work force (and tax-payers), several laws were issued, restricting or eliminating the movement freedom of peasants. In this way, the serfdom was institutionalized and the peasants lost their freedom. This led to the above mentioned social tensions ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 90–91)).

The successor of Ivan IV the Terrible on the Russian throne was Fedor Ivanovich (Фёдор Иоанович), but the land was actually governed by Boris Godunov, who later was elected Tsar' of Russia. As Ivan IV the Terrible, Boris Godunov continued the policy aiming at strengthening the state power and autocratic rule. Some of the territories lost in Livonian war were returned to Russia. He also signed a peace treaty with Poland for a duration of 20 years and repulsed the attack of Crimean Khan. Social tensions and economic crisis increased the instability within Russia. There were attempts of aristocracy to use these social tensions in order to overthrow Boris Godunov. The instability was further increased in 1591, when tsarevitch Dmitrii died in the city of Uglich. There were rumors that he was killed by Boris Godunov's people or that he escaped them and was living ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 90–92)).

Polish elites decided to exploit the weakness of Russian state and conquer Russia. In 1604, a person pretending to be the survived tsarevitch Dmitrii, entered Russia with his Polish military forces and usurped Russian throne in 1605. His rule was not supported by the public. A revolt in 1606 led to the election of Vasilii Shuiskii (Василий Шуйский) as Tsar'. He promised to issue laws which would preserve the privileges of boiars. This measure was very unpopular and led to a further uprising, which later resulted into a peasants' war (first peasants' war). In 1607 the revolt was put down. Nevertheless, smaller peasants' revolts occurred in Russia until 1615 ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 92–95)).

In 1607, another usurper appeared, who pretended to be the tsarevitch Dmitrii (False Dmitrii II). Supported by a part of Polish lower nobility, he undertook a military expedition and was successful at gaining support from some cities. His attempt to conquer Moscow failed, and his troops were defeated in 1609 by Russian and Swedish military forces. The military support was given by Sweden in exchange for some territorial and economic concessions. After the help in the battle against False Dmitrii II, the Swedes denied to support the Russians further, because a part of the agreement with them was not fulfilled by the Russians. At the same time, Poland (which was in the state of war with Sweden) attacked Russia and in 1610 the ruling boiars allowed the Polish to occupy Moscow and invited a Polish prince Vladislav to become Russian Tsar'. The boiars did not want to co-operate with the masses of Russian people, and without them a liberation from the Polish was not possible. The first popular militia

was formed in the winter of the year 1611. It did not fulfill its goal of the liberation from Poland. The second popular militia was formed in the autumn of the same year. In October 1612, it forced the Polish rulers in Moscow to surrender (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 92–95). The role of this militia was considered so important, that for the memory of its leaders, Koz'ma Minin and Dmitrii Pozharskii, a monument was built on the Red Square (near St. Basil's cathedral) in Moscow. In 1613, Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov was elected Czar at the Zemskii Sobor. In 1617 and 1618 peace treaties were signed with Sweden and Poland respectively. Russia preserved its independence at a high price in terms of territorial concessions (to Poland and Sweden), monetary compensations (to Sweden) and economic devastation ((Orlov et al., 1997, p. 97–98)). These peace treaties mark the end of age of the Troubled Times.

Beginning from 1620, the process of recovery after the Troubled Times has begun. By 1640, it was to a large degree completed. Agriculture remained the main branch of Russian economy. In spite of damage to many agricultural areas during the war with the Poles, the aggregate agricultural production was higher in the 17th century than in the 16th, because new areas in the Volga region and Siberia were now used for agriculture. The workmen began to play a greater role in Russian economy. Factory-like production units emerged in the 17th century in order to satisfy growing demands of the Russian state (crucial difference between Western and Russian factories is the fact that in Russia the work force in the factories were serf peasants, while in the West they were free workers). In the 17th century there were 30 factories in Russia. Trade also developed rapidly, even though the absence of access to the Baltic Sea was a big hindrance. Foreign companies intended to take Russian markets under their control, which led to the creation of several protectionist laws. Generally, in the 17th century, the feudal economic system in Russia underwent a serious change towards capitalism (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 101–103).

In 17th century, the Russian state required large financial means for returning regions conquered by Poland and Sweden to Russia. Primary source of them were taxes. Most of the tax burden was carried by the lower classes of Russian society, which led to numerous revolts in 1647–1648. Social tensions were further increased by the law of *Sobornoe ulozhenie* of 1649, which introduced the highest form of serfdom. From this point in time on, the peasants were not allowed to change from one estate owner to another. The peasant, his family *and* his property were now the property of the estate owner. This law had severe consequences in terms of uprisings in 1650 and in the later peasants' war led by Stepan Razin. In 1654 Russian government started to coin copper money instead of and officially of the same value as silver money. This caused an inflation and a subsequent famine. In 1662 the practice of coining of copper money was discontinued after a revolt in Moscow called *Mednyi bunt* (copper revolt). After 1662 the situation remained highly tensed. In 1666 a peasants' war began, in scope of which a Cossacks' unit and sympathizing peasants took several regions near the river Don under their control. Government troops forced the rebels to withdraw. In 1667–1668 the Cossacks and peasants undertook a military expedition against Persia, defeated Persian army and fleet, battled with Russian and Persian government troops. In 1669–1670 Stepan Razin, one of the leaders of rebellious peasants and Cossacks started to prepare a war against Russian ruling classes. They succeeded in taking several strategically important regions under their control. This revolt was suppressed only in spring 1671, when Stepan Razin was defeated and put to death. Some rebellious military units were active in the Volga region until 1673–1675 (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 103–109).

With respect to the interior politics, the 17th century is marked by the emergence of an absolute autocratic rule of the Tsar'. Further, the military was modernized, several

troops of "new order" were formed (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 109–111).

Primary goals of the foreign policy was the return of regions conquered by Rech Pospolita during the wars of Smuta period. In the years 1632–1634 Russia led a war with Rech Pospolita in order to achieve this. Due to economic devastation and an underdeveloped military and state structure, the war was lost. Rech Pospolita returned only one region and recognized Tsar' Mikhail as ruler over entire Rus'. Polish prince Vladislav discontinued to pretend to become a Russian ruler. Another reason for the defeat in that war was the attack of Crimean Tatars during its crucial phase. In the subsequent years, military facilities were built in southern regions of Russia in order to be able to better defend from Crimean Tatars (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 111–112).

Since the second half of the 16th century, Ukraine has been controlled by Rech Pospolita. The Ukrainians were subject to suppression in feudal, national and religions ways. There were numerous revolts and efforts to liberate Ukraine from the control of Rech Pospolita. The liberation war of the Ukrainians was led by statesman and military leader Bogdan Khmel'nitskii. The Ukrainian military forces had some successes, but the final liberation from the Polish rule was not possible without the support of Russia. In 1653 upon a call of Bogdan Khmel'nitskii, Russian government decided to incorporate Ukraine into the Russian state and a delegation was sent to Ukraine. In 1654 Ukrainian government agreed to the decision of the Russians. Ukraine became a part of Russia, but was autonomous with respect to numerous state activities. In 1686, after a war with Rech Pospolita (1654–1667), a peace treaty was signed, according to which, left-bank Ukraine was recognized by Rech Pospolita as part of Russia. Several regions were returned to Russia. Right-bank Ukraine and Belarus' remained in the hand of Rech Pospolita and Zaporozhskaia Sech' were controlled by Russia and Rech Pospolita. Russia and Rech Pospolita also formed an alliance for the defense from Turkish and Tatar aggression (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 112–114).

In 1656–1658 Russia led a war with Sweden in order to regain control over Baltic coast. The war was lost and those regions remained in Swedish hand (Orlov et al., 1997, p.115).

### **1.2.6 St. Petersburg empire (approx. 1700 – 1917)**

In 1689, Peter I the Great became Czar of Russia. Before, during the regency of Tsarevna (Tsar's daughter) Sof'ia two failed military expeditions against the Crimean Khanat were undertaken in 1687 and 1689. After becoming the ruler of Russia, Peter I the Great continued the policy of his predecessors. Due to the lack of a fleet, the fortress Azov was besieged in 1695, but could not be conquered because Russians could not cut off its sea connection to the outer world. One year later, 30 military ships were built and transported into the region of Azov. 1696, Azov was conquered and the fortress Taganrog was built. In 1697 Peter I the Great travelled to Europe in order to get support from other (apart from Russia) members of the anti-Turkish coalition, namely Austria and Venice (this delegation was called *velikoe posol'stvo*). They refused, but at the same time Peter I the Great found allies (Denmark, Rech Pospolita and Saxony) in the struggle with Sweden. Soon thereafter (August 1700) a peace treaty was signed with Turkey, and war declared to Sweden (July 1700). In September 1700, Russian troops started the siege of the fortress Narva. First large battle between Russian and Swedish troops in November 1700 ended with the victory of Swedes. Russia lost 6000 soldiers, the complete artillery and highest military cadres. Swedish King did not continue the war with Russia, but led his forces towards Poland. Peter I the Great used this time in order to recover the losses. A regular army was created and the artillery was

rebuilt. In 1702 Russian forces gained control over several fortresses in that region, but these victories did not impress Swedish king, who continued the war with Poland. After a Sweden-friendly king was installed in Poland, the Swedish king led his troops to Moscow in 1706, but was forced to change the direction towards Ukraine because of a strong resistance at the Russian frontier. Swedish forces lacked rations, artillery and ammunition, so that a large baggage and 16,000 soldiers were sent to support the troop of Swedish king. Led by Peter I the Great, the Swedish troop was defeated, losing 8,000 soldiers and entire baggage. Swedish king did not get the expected support. Soon thereafter, Ukrainian ruler Getman Ivan Mazepa promised the Swedish king to support him with artillery, rations and 50,000 Cossacks. But he did not get anything from the Ukrainians because in 1708 the residence of Mazepa was taken by Russian forces. The Swedes decided to conquer the fortress Poltava. Poltava was important for two reasons. Firstly, there were reserves of food and ammunition there, secondly, from Poltava the troops could move either to Moscow or to Russian south via militarily unprotected roads. The fortress Poltava sustained a 3-month siege and in 1709 Swedish forces were completely destroyed in scope of the Poltava battle (Poltavskaia bitva). Sweden lost its ground forces, but possessed a navy using which it continued the war with Russia. The series of Russian military successes was interrupted in 1710, when Turkey declared war to Russia in order to regain Azov. Peter I the Great hoped to win the war with the support of the Balkan peoples, which were oppressed by the Turks, but they did not support him. Russia signed a peace treaty with Turkey, returning to it Azov and destroying the fortress Taganrog. At the same time Russia continued to prepare for a sea war with Sweden. Baltic fleet was created and its staff intensively trained. In 1714 Russians defeated the Swedes in a sea battle, in 1720 Russian ground troops landed in Sweden. In the same year, Swedish fleet was destroyed. Russian ground troops continued their victorious expedition and 1721 a peace treaty was signed between Sweden and Russia. Russia gained access to the Baltic Sea as well as some territories in that region (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 118–121).

Due to the war with Sweden, Russian demand for several goods, primarily for metals increased. Prior to this war, most of the metals was imported to Russia from Sweden. Afterwards, this import was interrupted and Russia faced the necessity to create its own metallurgical production facilities. In this period, many factories were created (in the period from 1700 to 1708 alone 30 factories were built). Often, they were built by the state and then transferred to private owners. By the middle of the 18th century, there were 75 metallurgical works, mostly in the region of Ural, and about 100 factories distributed over many regions of Russia. The workmen also played an important role in the Russian economy of that time because not all products demanded could be produced in works and factories (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 122–124).

Inner-Russian trade was facilitated in the first half of the 18th century by the abolition of inner-Russian customs duties as well as by improving the trade routes by creating canals such as Vyshnevolotskii (Вышневолоцкий) and Ladozhskii (Ладужский). Agricultural economy also experienced a development, but at a slower rate. Contrary to the "industry", this sector was not reformed and feudal relationships dominated there (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 124).

During the rule of Peter I the Great, many administrative reforms were implemented, which aimed at a further centralisation of Russian government system. Local government organs were reformed and the territory of Russia was divided into 8 regions (gubernii). The country was governed by the *Pravitel'stvennyi Senat* which consisted of ten members appointed by the Tsar'. This government organ coordinated activities of all other administrative bodies and replaced boiarskaia дума. Prikazy (see page 13)

were replaced by so-called *kollegii*, which were responsible for defense, foreign policy, finance, trade and industry (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 125–127).

Another important reforms implemented by Peter I the Great were the formation of a regular army and creation of a fleet. The government system established by Peter I the Great was marked by a central, autocratic rule, trying to regulate almost any part of social life remained, to the greatest part, unchanged also after his death. It was changed only partially, and these changes did not affect the principles of it (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 127).

Peter I the Great died in 1725. It was not clearly defined, who should become the next ruler of Russia because Peter's sons died early and he did not leave a will specifying his successor on the Russian throne. Therefore, the period from 1725 (death of Peter I the Great) to 1762 (Catherine II the Great becoming ruler of Russia) is characterized by struggle for power among several groups and, as a consequence, many palace revolts. Reforms, which Peter I the Great began, were not continued in this period, because the rule of most rulers of Russia lasted only for a short time. The actions taken by them aimed solely at the solution of current problems (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 127–129).

In the agricultural sector of the economy, capitalism slowly began to replace feudalism. Many landowners tried to introduce new technological and scientific achievements into the practice of agricultural activities. But the presence and strengthening of serfdom hindered the development of purely capitalist relations in rural regions (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 127–129).

The situation was better in the industrial sector. By the middle of the 18th century there were approx. 2,000 factories. While those of them owned by the state and landlords used serfs as the workforce, factories founded by businessmen (купцы) and farmers employed free workers (that is, these workers were *not* serfs). This led to the formation of a labour market in Russia. In the second half of the 18th century, trade developed rapidly. Abolition of certain trade restrictions provided the basis for the formation of capitalism in Russia in the 19th century (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 131–132).

In 1762, Catherine II the Great became ruler of Russia. The first action of this highly autocratic person was the division of *pravitel'stvennyi* senat (see 18) into six departments, which led to its loss of legislative power. In this way, Catherine II the Great concentrated in her hands almost all legislative and administrative power. Further measures of Catherine II the Great were the expansion of rights of aristocracy, nationalization of land possessions of the church land further strengthening of the serfdom. The dependance of peasants upon their landowners reached its highest point during Catherine's rule. Her greatest project was the attempt of creation of new laws by the so-called *Ulozhennaia kommissiia* (1767–1768). Most of the members of this commission were aristocrats, who did not want to lose any of their privileges. Avoiding a direct confrontation with them, the work of *Ulozhennaia kommissiia* was ended in 1768 (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 132–134).

In the years 1774–1775 there was a peasants' war under the leadership of E. I. Pugachev, who claimed to be the Tsar' Peter III and issued several orders which reflected objective needs of peasants of that time, primarily the abolition of serfdom. Therefore, he was supported by many of them and succeeded in taking under his control several important cities. In 1775, the war was ended with the victory of government troops and execution of E. I. Pugachev. The Pugachevian war led to reform of local government (November 1775) by Catherine II the Great, which aimed at maintaining "law and order" and prevention of large revolts (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 137–138).

The successor of Catherine II the Great was Pavel I. He also tried to strengthen the

aristocrats. In spite of the suppression of the peasants' war of Pugachev, there were numerous uprisings of peasants in several regions of Russia. Pavel I took a number of contradictory measures and was often characterized as unpredictable. This led to a conspiracy in 1801, in scope of which Pavel I was killed. His son Alexander I became the Tsar' (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 138–139).

In the 18th century, the foreign policy of Russia aimed at solving two problems. Firstly, the battle with Crimean Khanat, which led an aggressive policy towards Russia, threatened its southern regions and prevented the use of Azov and Black Sea as trade routes. The second task of the foreign policy was the integration of right-bank Ukraine and Belarus into the Russian state (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 139–140).

Crimean Khanat was destroyed in 1783 in scope of a war between Russia and Turkey, which began in 1768 by a sudden attack of Turkey. The Crimea peninsula was integrated into Russia and Georgian Czar Iraklii II (Ираклий II) signed a treaty according to which a Russian protectorate was established in Georgia. Russia guaranteed a territorial integrity and protection of Georgian borders. Another war for control over Black Sea was started by Turkey in 1787 and ended with its defeat. Russia acquired the regions of Novorossia and Krym-Tavrida (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 141–142).

The solution of the second problem was achieved by conquest of Poland (Rech Pospolita) in alliance with Austria and Prussia and three divisions of Poland between 1772 and 1795. Russia gained several territories, among them Belarus' and right-bank Ukraine (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 142).

Other important aspects of Russian foreign policy in the 18th century include the war with Prussia (1756–1763) in alliance with Austria, France, Sweden and Saxony, which ended with the abolition of Prussian threat for many decades, as well as the war with revolutionary France in alliance with England, Prussia and Austria (1793–1799). The latter is marked by several military successes of brilliant Russian military leader A. V. Suvorov (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 139–143).

In the 19th century, the agriculture played the greatest role in Russian economy and serf peasants were the most numerous social class. The transition from feudalism to capitalism intensified in the 19th century, but was slowed by the presence of institutionalized serfdom. The serfs were a cheap labour force without rights, which the landowners tried to exploit to the highest possible degree. This led to numerous revolts as well as to hidden forms of protest such as low productivity and damage to equipment. Several landowners tried to apply newest technological achievements in order to raise the productivity, but they could not function in the framework of serfdom. Serfdom was the main hindrance to economic development in Russia. The loss of Crimean war showed that economically, Russia was inferior to other European state. The economy needed to be restructured and as the first step, serfdom was abolished in 1861 (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 149–151).

The industry also developed at a slow rate in Russia of the 19th century. In the 1830's a technological revolution began in Russian industry, which was completed by approx. 1880 and meant a more intensive use of machines in Russian factories and works. Purely private enterprises (as opposed to those founded by the state) are emerging in this time as a completely new type of company (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 149–151).

The 19th century is often characterized as the period of *primary accumulation* in Russia. A higher economic growth and development was slowed by the presence of serfdom (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 149–151).

The rule of Alexander I from 1801 to 1822 can be characterized as liberal, progressive at the beginning and reactionary at the end. In the years 1803 to 1805 he issued

several decrees which aimed at lessening the burden of serfdom, but their effect was negligible. During the same period a number of liberal reforms was implemented, such as foundation of additional five universities, autonomy of universities, liberal law on censorship as well as highest religious tolerance. During the same time, the reform of the government system was by no means liberal – the kollegii were replaced by ministries, wherein the minister was the autocratic chief and was responsible only to the Emperor (Tsar'). The government system established by Alexander I in the years 1810 – 1811 remained without large changes until 1917. Many of the reforms (including the reform of the government system) implemented by Alexander I were designed by M. M. Speranskii. As the restructuring of the government system proceeded, it became clear, that deeper reforms were necessary. M. M. Speranskii was given the task to develop a concept of such a reform. He proposed a sort of a democracy, in which higher classes of the society would elect representatives into legislative bodies at local as well as state level. Courts should become independent from administrative organs. The ideas of M. M. Speranskii were criticized by the higher classes of Russian society, as many representatives of them believed that Russia could be governed only by an autocratic ruler. Alexander I also was not interested in a reform which would reduce his power. Speranskii was removed from office and exiled. The reformation attempts of Alexander I did not end with this step. In 1815, a constitution was created for Poland (which became part of Russia). A constitution for Russia (*gosudarstvennaia ustavnaia gramota*) was also being developed. The abolition of serfdom was planned but not implemented. During the last years of the rule of Alexander I, he takes actions, which are more and more reactionary. In 1817, a ministry was created, which should control the education and religious life of Russians. In 1821 several professors of the Moscow and Kazan' universities were dismissed and sued. Alexander I died in 1825 in Taganrog (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 154–160).

During the rule of the Alexander I several regions were incorporated into Russian empire. After the Russo-Turkish war (1806–1812), Russia achieved Bessarabia and some regions of Transcaucasia. In 1801–1804, greatest part of Georgia was integrated into Russia. This contradicted the interests of England, which effected the declaration of war against Russia by the Iranian Shah. France also supported Iran in the war against Russia. This Russo-Iranian war (1804–1813) resulted in the achievement of several territories by Russia and complete incorporation of Georgia and Azerbaijan (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 160–161).

At the beginning of the 19th century, Russia signed peace treaties with England and France (both in 1801). But since 1804 the relationships between Russia and France aggravated due to a number of contradictions. In scope of the battle at Friedland in 1807, Russian troops were defeated by the French. Russia signed a disadvantageous peace treaty and was forced to join France in its war against England, including economic isolation of England. This was particularly problematical for Russia, because in this way it lost its most important trade partner. Armistice between Russia and France lasted until June 1812. At this time, economic losses due to siege of England became catastrophic. Napoleon Buonaparte, ruler of France of that time, regarded Russia as an obstacle on the way to world domination. In June 1812 French troops passed Russian frontier. Attempts of the Russian side to effect the withdrawal of Napoleon from Russia by diplomatic means failed. The so-called *Patriotic war of 1812*<sup>5</sup> began. In August 1812, M. I. Kutuzov was appointed appointed commander-in-chief. His sophisticated

---

<sup>5</sup>It is called *partiotic* because not only professional army was involved in the war, but almost the entire population of the country

strategy led to the victory of Russian army over Napoleon in the same year (1812). In 1813–1814 Russian troops liberated central and western Europe from Napoleon's forces. The Europe-wide victory over Napoleon was followed by the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815, in scope of which a so-called *Holy Alliance* was formed by Austria, Prussia and Russia. Its main purpose was suppression of revolutions in European countries. Russia played the leading role in this alliance. In this way, Russia became reactionary with respect to both interior and foreign policy (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 160–166).

In 1825, after the death of Alexander I, a large group (3,000 persons) of revolutionary oriented army officers attempted to publicly present their manifest (proposal of transformation of Russia into a democratic republic) to the members of Senat during the coronation ceremony of the new Tsar'. Due to a number of reasons (bad organisation and coordination, unrealistic demands etc. ), the intended revolution did not succeed and was suppressed. This revolt, known as Dekabrist Revolt (Vosstanie dekabristov) because it happened on December 14, 1825, did not lead to any changes in the Russian government system, but is important as the first expression of independent public opinion in Russia (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 166–171).

The successor of Alexander I on the Russian throne was Nikolai I, who ruled Russia in the years 1825–1855. According to his opinion, liberal policy was not suitable for Russia and regarded the Dekabrist Revolt as a result of the liberal policy pursued by Alexander I. Therefore, Nikolai I considered regimentation of the public life as well as its total control by the state as a basis for the well-being of the country. In 1826, several central government organs were formed, which should develop concepts of the reform of Russian government, codify Russian laws and control all aspects of public life. This over-centralisation was a failure because those central organs eventually lost control because of their overload. A reform of serfdom was considered, but the reform which was actually implemented did not lead to crucial changes. Minister S. S. Uvarov was responsible for the cultural policy during the rule of Nikolai I. This highly intelligent person tried to preserve some of the liberal achievements of Alexander I in the cultural life. In this way, he always balanced between the reactionary intentions of Nikolai I and his own liberal ones. He issued laws restricting the autonomy of universities (1835) and strengthening the censorship (1826 and 1828), at the same time he encourage the Enlightenment. In the Moscow university, several brilliant professors could realize their talent at that time. This balancing policy was set an end in 1848, when a series of revolutions swept over Europe. Uvarov was removed from office, censorship strengthened even more and access to universities was restricted (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 172–176).

Nikolai I further expanded the territory of Russian empire in scope of the wars with Iran (1826–1828) and Turkey (1828–1829). These wars resulted in incorporation of Transcaucasia into Russian empire. The conquest of the Caucasus region was more difficult. There, in Dagestan and Chechnya a strong religious state was formed. In the 1830es and 1840es, its inhabitants won several battles with Russians. But the enormous cruelty towards the own "citizens" within that religious state led to its weakening. Eventually, Caucasus was incorporated into Russian empire in 1864 (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 176).

With respect to the relations to Western Europe, Nikolai I continued the policy of his predecessor Alexander I, founder of the Holy Alliance. In 1849, Russian troops suppressed an uprising in Austrian Hungary. In Russia itself, a revolution occurred in 1830 in Poland. It was suppressed and the autonomy of Poland, established in 1815, was abolished. In 1850, due to conflicts of orthodox and catholic churches on "holy

places" in Jerusalem, the *Crimea war* broke out. It ended in 1856. Russia lost this war, primarily because of a lack of infrastructure (railroads for the transportation of troops) and a low level of economic development (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 176–179).

In 1855, Alexander II the Liberator<sup>6</sup> became the Emperor of Russia. He was a conservatively thinking politician and agreed with the views of his father, Nikolai I. At the same time, he was aware of objective needs of Russia and took measures which can be described as liberal. The most important action of Alexander II was the abolition of the serfdom in 1861. It was abolished primarily because it was a hindrance to economic growth and threatened the ability of Russia to remain an economically powerful nation. This agricultural reform triggered several other reforms in the years 1863–1874, such as administrative reform (creation of administrative organs, which consisted of functionaries elected by representatives of all social classes), legal reform (the processes now became public as opposed to previously present courts where controversies were solved in a closed, administrative way), universities regained autonomy, education reform (all social classes gained access to primary and secondary education), censorship was reduced, army was reformed. At the same time, many non-governmental political organisations were formed. They all wanted to reform Russia, but they differed by the means they intended to use (ranging from political, non-violent struggle to terrorism). These organisations became more active in the period of reforms, and even more afterwards. Beginning from 1875, the government became reactionary because many officials thought that the reforms already implemented were sufficient. Several liberal ministers were removed from office, restrictions on press and education raised, and the power of newly created, elected administrative organs was not allowed to grow (they could make only administrative, but not political decisions). Non-governmental political organisations answered to this reaction with terrorism. In 1880, general M. T. Loris-Melikov gained power and began to plan constructive reforms. In 1881 a concept of all-Russian elected government organ (kind of all-Russian parliament) was developed by him. Alexander II agreed with this concept, but was not able to actually implement it because he was killed a few hours afterwards by an act of terrorism. The death of Alexander II completely buried the hopes for a soon finalizing of reforms he began. The government became even more reactionary (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 190–198).

In the foreign policy of Russia in the second half the 19th century there were three major directions - gaining military access to the Black Sea, support of Slavic peoples under the Turkish rule and colonization of the central Asia (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 205–208).

According to the peace treaty of Paris of 1856, which was signed after the end of Crimea war, Russia and Turkey were not allowed to possess a navy and supporting military infrastructure in the region of the Black Sea. This constellation threatened the security of Russia. Russia supported Prussia in its war against France and during the German unification process. Making use of the alliance with Germans and French defeat in a war with Prussia, in 1870 Russia declared that it abolishes the neutrality of the Black Sea. One year later, this decision was officially confirmed in scope of the London Conference (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 205–206).

In 1875 and 1876 there were revolts on the Balkan peninsula in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Bulgaria. At that time, these regions were part of the Turkish empire. Turkey suppressed these uprisings and refused the demands of European states for reforms in order to improve the situation of Balkan peoples. In 1877 Russia declared war to

---

<sup>6</sup>Alexander II was given the by-name *Liberator* because during his reign the serfdom was abolished.

Turkey, conquered several regions and declared that Serbia, Montenegro and Rumania became independent states, while Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina gained autonomy. In 1878, due to the pressure from several European states Russia was forced to give up some of the achievements of that war. Nevertheless, Russian victory over Turkey was very important for the Slavic peoples (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 206–207).

At the end of the 19th century Russia, together with other European countries, intensified its colonisation efforts. Russian industry required new sources of raw materials and access to new markets. Central Asia was suitable for both of these tasks (the raw material present in Central Asia was primarily cotton). In 1858 and 1860, Russia signed pacts with China upon which it bought the Ussuriiskii krai from China. Pact with Japan in 1875 brought Russia the island of Sakhalin in exchange for the Kurile Islands. In 1867 Russia sold Alaska to the United States. In 1864 Russia began to conquer Central Asia. In 1865 Russian troops conquered Tashkent. In 1868 Khanat of Kokand (Kokandskoe khanstvo) and Bukhara emirat (Bukharskii emirat) declared themselves dependent upon Russia. The conquest of Central Asia was completed in 1884, when Turkmen tribes were conquered. Some of the conquered regions became part of Russian empire, others preserved interior autonomy. For the conquered regions, the conquest by Russia brought a step forward in their socio-economic development. Slavery was abolished, feudal land possession was restricted. Education and economy were given new impetus. For Russia itself, incorporation of Central Asian regions in the first time brought mainly costs and political advantages outweighed economic ones. By the beginning of the 19th century, central Asia highly important for Russian industry as it was the main source of cotton (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 207–208).

In the second half of the 19th century, agriculture remained the main branch of Russian economy. In the agricultural sector, capitalist principles began to establish themselves, although the remaindes of serfdom were not overcome yet. A class of rich peasants (kulaks) emerged, which was highly productive and employed primarily paid work of other peasants as opposed to landowners, whose workers were de facto serfs. At the end of 19th century, kulaki produced two times more bread than did landowners. Most landowners could not adapt to new, capitalist order and went to rack and ruin. Agricultural products were an important export good - 20 % of produced bread were exported in the years 1880–1890. At the end of 19th century, it became clear, that new reforms were necessary in order for the agricultural sector to grow further (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 208–210).

In the industry, light industry was dominant (primarily textile and food production). By the beginning of the 1880es, the transition from manual to machine work was completed in Russia. The industrialisation (quick development of heavy industry) began in 1880es. Quickly growing production of metals and building railroads were the driving forces of Russian industrialisation process. French, English and German investors began to acquire and build production facilities in Russia (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 211–212).

Alexander III became Russian Tsar' after his father, Alexander II the Liberator was killed in a terrorist attack in 1881. His rule can be described as highly reactionary. The years 1881–1882 are characterized by a struggle of reformist and reactionary tendencies in the Russian government. Alexander III did not strip of political power liberal ministers immediately, as he wanted to prevent further uprisings of revolutionary minded groups. Several measures were taken by the minister of interior affairs, N. P. Ignat'ev (Н. П. Игнатъев) in order to ease the life of peasants and workers (e.g. measures allowing peasants to buy more land, child labour was restricted, laws regulating relationships between employers and employees etc. ). Being reactionary in

form, but liberal in content, Ignat'ev tried to create a Zemskii sobor (Земский собор), some kind of representative (elected) government. Eventually Ignat'ev was removed from office in 1882 because some influential reactionary consultants of Alexander III got to know about his intentions. From 1882, the government pursued a pure reactionary policy. The most powerful revolutionary group *Narodnaia volia* (Народная воля) was dissolved. A legal act issued in 1881 (Положение о мерах к сохранению государственной безопасности и общественного спокойствия) enabled any area to proclaim state of emergency, head of gubernia (see p. 18) was allowed to forbid assemblies, close publishing and education facilities, imprison and extradict disagreeable persons without a conviction of a court. Censorship was strengthened in 1882, in 1884, universities were robbed their autonomy concerning election of professors, deans etc. At the same time, the government tried to restrict the access to education by raising tuition fees as well as by means of a legal act of 1887, which did not allow children from lower classes to attend secondary education facilities. Governing organs in the country and in the cities were also reformed, as a result, aristocrats became more powerful and the number of persons, who elected the members of local governments was reduced. The government also tried to "attack" the legal system in Russia, but these attempts failed and no serious changes were implemented. The policy of Alexander III led also to discrimination of ethnically non-Russian peoples and religious minorities. In general, the *counter-reforms* of Alexander III, as the measures are termed by Russian historians, did not reach their goal, but at the same time increased social tensions. Being politically reactionary, Alexander III's government was forced to support and encourage the development of economy. This contradiction (flourishing economy without political power) brought Russia many problems at the beginning of 20th century (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 214–218).

At the end of 19th and the beginning of 20th century, Russian economy experiences a strong growth. The greatest part of the working class was employed in giant enterprises, having many thousands of workers. The government supported the creation of such large companies, which were able to implement the most difficult state projects, primarily military ones. The government supported them by large credits, subsidies as well as taxation benefits. The presence of large companies led to the emergence of monopolies in many branches of the economy and to the formation of syndicates (end of the 19th century) and trusts (20th century). Formation of trusts meant the integration of all the merged enterprises into a single one, this required huge amounts of capital. Thus, the banking system became more important. As in the industry, large banks were dominant (at the beginning of the 20th century, five largest banks controlled most of the financial means present in Russia). These financial means the banks invested into the industry, gradually acquiring control over it. The emerging financial oligarchy slowly but steady took control over main capitals and production facilities. All these factors (monopolies, concentration of capital in the hands of a few banks, emergence of financial oligarchy) were responsible for Russia stepping in into imperialism, a new stage of the development of capitalism. Although this historical period in Russia coincided with European imperialism, there are crucial differences between Russian and European imperialism (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 230–232).

One of the differences between the European and Russian imperialism was the fact that financial oligarchy was closely connected to the government, as it provided state large scale orders, subsidied, credits etc. . On the other hand, state bank also provided support to those enterprises, in which the government was interested. The dependence upon the state led to a contradictory situation concerning the relations between the state and financial oligarchy. The financial oligarchy wanted to acquire political power

as its economic strength grew, thus it should theoretically oppose the autocratic rule and strive for a democratic government system. But it could not do so, because it continuously got support from the government both financially and in terms of state large scale orders. Another speciality of Russian imperialism was the presence of large amounts of foreign capital. Investment from other countries was supported by Russian government, on the other side, the profits, which foreign investors made in Russia were much higher than they could in their home countries (France, England, Belgium). Presence of foreign investment did not mean a *dependence* upon foreign investors as they did not found own enterprises but invested into existing ones. Nevertheless, the fact that foreign capital was dominant in some sectors led to several negative results. Most profits earned in Russia were transferred into the home countries of the investors, where they allowed to lower social tensions by reducing the working times, raising the wages, creation of social security system etc. All these measures created a social class of highly qualified and well-paid workers, which made the worker movement in Europe more peaceful. In Russia, these measures could not be taken because of the lack of financial means (as already said, they were transferred outside Russia). Therefore, Russian workers were more open to revolutionary political agitation. The development of agriculture also proceeded, but much more slowly than did the industry. Due to a number of reasons, the remains of serfdom did not completely disappear even at the beginning of the 20th century. Impoverished peasants often worked for landlords at terms comparable to those of the age of serfdom (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 232–235).

The situation of the working class became even worse during and after the economic crisis of 1900–1903, when approx. 3,000 large and middle-sized enterprises went bankrupt. Prior to this crisis, the owners of large production facilities could prevent serious strikes by fulfilling some of the workers' demands because of the presence of high profits. During and after the crisis, the owners and managers of the survived production facilities began to exploit their working force to an even higher degree. As a consequence, the popularity of socialist theories grows among the proletariat in this period. At the strikes they demand political changes more often (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 235–236).

Nikolai II, who became Czar of Russia in 1894 and was a son of Alexander III, tried to follow the reactionary policy pursued by his father. At the same time, socio-economic and political problems in Russia of that time, could not be solved by reactionary means any more. Therefore, some reforms were inevitable in spite of Nikolai II's reluctancy towards them. Nikolai II tried to eliminate revolutionary groups, but also those groups, which intended to achieve their goals in a peaceful way, being a legal opposition to the government. In order to provide support for the autocratic rule, Nikolai II tried to strengthen aristocracy by several, primarily economical and financial, means. The industrial elite was treated by the government twofold, on the one side, it prevented any attempt of bourgeoisie gaining political power, on the other side, it supported the industry economically. The minister of finance, who mainly was responsible for this policy was S. Iu. Vitte. To his greatest achievement the introduction of the golden currency (1897) and the initiation of creating the Trans-Siberian railroad can be counted. His attempt to reform the agricultural sector, which should allow peasants to acquire private arable land and leave the peasants' community (община) failed in 1903 due to resistance of representatives of landowners (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 236–238).

In order to lower revolutionary tendencies among the workers, in 1901–1903 Moscow's police chief S. V. Zubatov initiated the creation of societies, in which the workers should be educated about legal ways of achieving their objective goals (higher wages, reduction of working times etc. ). But the main purpose of these societies was solving

the conflicts between workers and employers. The employers - supported by S. Iu. Vitte - complained about the interventions of police into inner-company conflicts, which led to the restriction of the activity of those societies to purely ideological aspect. The workers soon lost their interest in these societies as they saw that legal, non-revolutionary solution of their problems was not possible (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 238–239).

Foreign policy of the beginning of the 20th century is marked by the Russo-Japanese war, which ended with the defeat of Russia due to a number of reasons. Russia avoided high concessions only due to the diplomatic talent of S. Iu. Vitte, who led the peace negotiations. Main cause of the war was the fact that Russia competed for influence in this region with USA, England and Japan (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 239–241).

At the beginning of the 20th century a group was formed, which decided the future of Russia in the subsequent decades - *RSDRP*, Russian social democratic party. Its formation was greatly supported by the illegal newspaper *Iskra* (Искра). In 1903, during its second party conference, two different blocks crystallized - "soft" social democrats (future *men'sheviki*), led by L. Martov and "hard" social democrats (figure *bol'sheviki*) led by V. I. Lenin. *Men'sheviki* represented the view that bourgeoisie should be the main carrier of revolution, supported by the proletariat. Should the revolution succeed, a long period of rapid capitalistic development would follow. This growth as well as the presence of democratic government facilities (parliament) would allow the proletariat to achieve socialist demands (higher wages, less working times, social security system etc.) in scope of a peaceful, legal way. Contrary, *Bol'sheviki* thought that the driving force of the revolution should be the proletariat, supported by peasants. Bourgeoisie was not regarded by the *bol'sheviki* as a revolutionary class because of its (economic) connections to the government. At the party conference in 1903, *bol'sheviki* gained the majority of the places in the governing organ of *RSDRP*, the *central committee*. Under the influence of *bol'sheviki*, *RSDRP* became an extremist party, not interested in compromises. Later, in 1905, the both blocks fell apart, each founding its own party. In the end, *bol'sheviki* became a small, but highly organized and active party. *Men'sheviki* could not gain any significant power (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 244–246).

In the years 1905–1907 social tensions reached a climax and resulted into a revolution, which forced Nikolai II to create a representative legislative organ, state Duma. This revolution began with the so-called *Bloody Sunday* (Кровавое воскресенье). During a strike in St. Petersburg, priest Georgii Gapon proposed to undertake a peaceful parade to the Winter Palace and to hand over to the Tsar' a petition about the needs of the worker class. On January 9th, 1905 thousands of workers with their families actually went to the Winter Palace. The peaceful demonstration was "dissolved" by troops who started to fire at the workers, killing more than 1,200 and injuring about 5,000 people. This started the revolution, which caused revolts to flare up in many regions of Russia and involving peasants, workers and even the military (revolt on the armoured cruiser "Potemkin"). At the peak of the revolution in October 1905, when the *All-Russian political strike* (Всероссийская политическая стачка) paralyzed 120 Russian cities, Nikolai II was forced to make concessions to revolutionary forces. The *October 17 manifest* (манифест 17 октября) introduced the freedom of press, publishing, assembly etc. A Duma, possessing *real* legislative power should be established according to this manifest. This manifest set an end to the revolution. Uprisings of peasants, workers and in the military troops flickered here and there, but the possibility of an all-Russian revolution was banned. The government regained control over the country. The first Duma was elected in 1906. According to the voting scheme used, one vote of a landowner was equal to 3 bourgeois' votes, 15 peasants' votes and 45 workers' votes. The first Duma started its work on April 27, 1906. Left wing Duma

members proposed confiscation of lands from landowners and its distribution among peasants. The government was not satisfied with such a solution and dissolved the Duma on July 9, 1906. The second Duma started the work in February 1907, but it was elected according to the same voting scheme, thus, left wing parties dominated it again. During the debates about the agricultural question, most Duma members supported the solution already proposed in the first Duma. The second Duma was also dissolved and the voting scheme changed (one vote of a landowner was equal to 4 votes of the higher bourgeoisie, 68 votes of urban lower bourgeoisie, 260 votes of peasants and 543 votes of workers), so that the third Duma became an organ which could be easily controlled by the government (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 246–252).

The period after the revolution of 1905 is marked by the reforms of P. A. Stolypin. He took a variety of measures, of which some can be categorized as reactionary and others as reformist. Although he did not have a stable majority in the third Duma, he could implement most of his intentions (because the most powerful, centrist party formed coalitions in voting either with right-wing or left-wing parties, depending on whether the action in question was reactionary or reformist). Stolypin fought revolutionary groups tooth and nail, thousands of people were imprisoned and/or exiled, application of death penalty increased (in 1907–1909 more than 3,500 people were put to death). Stolypin planned to implement many reforms, but his attempts often failed as the government saw the revolution of 1905 disappear in the past and the fear of it ceased in the government. The only reform, which Stolypin *could* implement, was the agricultural reform. The greatest problem of the peasants of that time (which was the main cause of peasants' revolts) was the lack of arable land. If they could get more land, the number of wealthy peasants would increase, thus lessening their revolutionary potential. Stolypin tried to resolve this problem, but at the same time he did not want to confiscate the possessions of landlords. Such a compromise was definitely not possible, and Stolypin's reform failed. Stolypin was killed in 1911 by a terrorist. Even before his death, it was clear that his reforms could calm down revolutionary groups only temporarily, as the objective needs and demands of proletariat and peasants were not fulfilled. Beginning from 1910, uprisings intensified and weakened Russia, which entered the World War I in 1914 (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 252–256).

Russia's participation in the World War I helped the Allies several times, as it diverted the troops of the Central Powers and prevented their conquest, which - if they actually would happen - may cause catastrophic results for the entente. At the same time, Russia did *not* get support, when it required it (e.g. in May 1915, when German troops forced Russia to give up conquered regions of Galicia, Poland, Lithuania, part of Latvia and Belarus'). So, in August 1914 Russian attack on Eastern Prussia forced the Germans to move a part from their troops from the western direction (towards Paris) to the East. Thanks to the Russian successes in Eastern Prussia, Paris was not conquered by the Germans. In June 1916, Russia prevented the destruction of Italy (which originally was the ally of Germany and Austria-Hungary, but later became one of the Allies) by a successful battle in Galicia, which forced Austria-Hungary to move its troops not to Italy, but to the East, to Galicia. For Russia's interior affairs the war brought mainly an economic destruction (as most resources were sacrificed for the military) and continuous uprisings in cities and in the country. Russia was de-stabilized even more (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 256–261).

In February 1917, general dissatisfaction of the population with the government led to a revolution. At the end of February 1917, more than 80 % of all workers in St. Petersburg (renamed to Petrograd at that time) participated in a strike. There were huge demonstrations against tsarist rule in Russia's capital city. Any attempts to sup-

press them failed as the soldiers began to take the side of rebels. On February 28, 1917, the last soldiers who defended the old regime were given the order to lay down weapons. After the revolution, the country was governed by two competing organs, *temporary committee* (временный комитет) and *Petrograd's Council of Workers' representatives* (Петроградский Совет рабочих депутатов). The temporary committee was formed by the members of Duma, and led by the chairman of the Duma. This organ was not supported by the population and must seek support by the Petrograd's Council of Workers' representatives. After the elections to this council, men'sheviki dominated this organ. The Council transferred the power to the bourgeoisie. At the same time, the Council was planned to control the activities of bourgeois government. On March 2, 1917, Nikolai II abdicated after he became aware of his inability to control the revolution. Formally, his brother Mikhail became the Tsar', but he also abdicated on March 3, 1917. Afterwards, the temporary committee was transformed into a *temporary government*. But this temporary government did not rule Russia alone, most of its decisions must be coordinated with Petrograd's Council of Workers' representatives. These two organs ruled Russia simultaneously, but, due to their different compositions (bourgeoisie in the temporary government, proletariat in the Council), conflicts between them were pre-programmed (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 261–263).

Shortly after the revolution, the political power was transferred to the bourgeoisie, represented by the temporary government. The freedom of this organ was restricted by the presence of the Petrograd's Council of Workers' representatives. The council, in turn, could not implement any serious reforms as most of its members were moderate social democrats (men'sheviki), who thought that Russia was not prepared for a direct transition to socialism as proposed by bol'sheviki. The moderate social democrats were already overwhelmed by the changes, Russia has undergone in past months. So, neither of the two ruling organs could initiate any change and thus could not solve the most important problems of Russia. In April 1917, the leader of bol'sheviki, V. I. Lenin outlined the intentions of his party, namely, Russia's exit from World War I, nationalization of landowners' arable lands and propaganda among the proletariat and peasants that these tasks can only be achieved by transferring all the government power to councils (советы) like Petrograd's Council of Workers' representatives. Lenin thought, that passivity of both government organs would de-stabilize the country even more. In September 1917, the situation changed in favor of bol'sheviks. The temporary government lost its allies in most parties, at the same time councils were founded in throughout Russia. Most of them were dominated by bol'sheviks. On October 25, 1917, during the party conference of Russian social democratic party, its participants got to know that Winter Palace was taken by bol'shevist troops and the temporary government was arrested. On the next day, two important legal acts were issued - *Dekret o mire* (Декрет о мире), which contained an appeal to the countries participating in World War I to sign a peace treaty without annexations and contributions, *Dekret o zemle* (Декрет о земле), which meant a nationalization of landowners' lands possession. On that party conference a new government organ was created - *Council of people's commissars* (Совет народных комиссаров). This organ was meant a temporary solution, and should govern Russia until convening of *Uchreditel'noie sobranie* (Учредительное собрание). Uchreditel'noie sobranie should be a parliament elected by *all* social classes. October 25, 1917 marks the end of the St. Petersburg empire and the beginning of the Soviet rule (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 269–278).

### 1.2.7 Soviet Republic (1917 – 1991)

After overthrow of the temporary government, bol'sheviki began to establish the Soviet rule in all regions of Russia, by March 1918 the greatest part of Russian territory was under their control. Population supported bol'sheviki primarily because of their first legal acts issued by them. In terms of votes, however, bol'sheviki gained much less support than men'shevist parties - at the election of Uchreditel'noe sobranie 76 % of seats belonged to the men'shevist parties and only 24 % to the bol'sheviki. Due to an advantageous distribution of these number of votes (e.g. in Moscow in St. Petersburg the bol'sheviki had more votes than all other parties), the bol'sheviki could preserve their power. Formation of new government organs begun: *Congress of Councils* (S'ezd Sovetov, (Съезд советов), the *All-Russian Central Executive Committee* (VTsIK, Всероссийский центральный исполнительный комитет, ВЦИК) and the *Council of people's commissars* (SNK, Совет народных комиссаров, СНК). Although there was no strict separation of powers in the Soviet state, the Congress of Councils and VTsIK mostly represented the legislative and SNK the executive power (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 278–281).

In January 1918, the Uchreditel'noe sobranie was called. The majority of its members did not accept the first legal acts issued by the bol'sheviki. It also denied the results of the overthrow of the temporary government on October 25, 1917. The conflict between the Uchreditel'noe sobranie (which represented the interests of all social classes) and the bol'sheviki (which represented the interests of proletariat and poor peasants) was "solved" by the dissolution of Uchreditel'noe sobranie by bol'sheviki. A few days afterwards, third Congress of Councils was called. Russia was proclaimed RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic). The first elections to local Soviets (councils) took place in winter and summer 1918. The new Russian government structure was officially embodied in the Constitution of RSFSR, ratified on the fifth Congress of Councils in July 1918 (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 282–283).

The rebuilding of the political system was accompanied by the rebuilding of the economy. Bol'sheviki wanted to (and, unfortunately, succeeded at it) transform Russian economy into a socialist one. Main characteristic of a socialist (command) economy is the fact that decisions about what, how and for whom to produce are made not by means of a market, but by government planning office (Begg et al., 1997, p. 9). In 1917, the bol'sheviki began to nationalize the largest enterprises of Russia. The nationalization of all other production facilities continued, until almost entire economy was led by the state (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 283–284).

In the country, there were conflicts after issuing the *Dekret o zemle* as every social class - kulaki (кулаки - wealthy peasants) and poor peasants - wanted to implement the division of landowners' land possessions in the way most beneficial for that particular group. Bol'sheviki took the side of the poor. Kulaki responded with the denial to deliver food to the government. After first failed attempts to exchange other goods for food, the government decided to take control over kulaki by means of force. Land possessions of the greatest part of them were confiscated, which led to the destruction of the most productive part of agricultural sector (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 284–286).

Main task of the foreign policy in the years 1917–1918 was the exit of Russia from the World War I. Of all participating countries, only Germany responded to the *Dekret o mire* (see p. 29). In order to preserve their power, the bol'sheviki accepted enormous concessions to Germany (territory of Baltic countries, Belarus', Poland, parts of Transcaucasia, as well as a large contribution, demobilization of the army etc.) in scope of the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918. In the regions, which bol'sheviki

gave to Germans, more than 70 % of Russian iron and about 90 % of Russian coal was produced. So, at a price unprecedented in the history of mankind, the bol'sheviki could again preserve power over Russia (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 286–288).

The Brest-Litovsk peace treaty gave the bol'sheviki a short period of peace. It was interrupted by the outbreak (intensification) of civil war in late 1918. The factors, which triggered an all-Russian civil war between the *red* (bol'sheviki) and *white* (any non-bol'shevist parties like moderate socialists, monarchists etc. ) include

- Violent loss of power of the temporary government on October 25, 1917
- Breaking-up of the Uchreditel'noe Sobranie in 1918
- Signing of humiliating Brest-Litovsk peace treaty
- Nationalization of the industry and infrastructure
- Violent confiscation of food from the peasants

Local revolts and fightings were present in Russia since February 1917, but only in 1918 they became an all-Russian civil war. Foreign countries, primarily the Allies (but also Japan, USA; Ukraine was de facto under German occupation for a long time) supported the white, firstly by directly sending Allies troops to Russia, later (as Allies' troops refused to fight with the red or revolted; this was primarily caused by the bol'shevist propaganda) by providing whites with weapons, ammunition etc. With its support of the white, the Allies tried to weaken Russia to the highest degree possible as well as to gain some Russian regions. German defeat in World War I in November 1918 led to Russia declaring null and void the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty (German troops were forced to withdraw). In November 1920, the civil war ended with the defeat of the last white army on the European territory of Russia (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 288–300).

The economic order of the civil war is called *military communism* (Kriegskommunismus, военный коммунизм). In the Marxist-Leninist ideology, communism designates the highest developed form of socialism. During the civil war, bol'shevist government was forced to take several measures, which caused the Soviet economy to acquire some of the features of communism, namely: many products and services (e.g. food for children, workers, railroad employees; accommodation, transportation) were free (one didn't need to pay for them), the wages was almost equal among all parts of the society, all social classes were forced to work. The presence of all these factors, led many bol'shevists to the idea that socialism *can* work and one can live in the same way also after the war is over. In fact, many measures of *military communism* were taken in 1920, at the end of the war. The appearances deceived – the "success" of military communism was caused not by its advantage over capitalism, but by the concentration of *all* resources into achieving one goal (in this case, winning the civil war). This is a remarkable characteristic of the Soviet system – highly inefficient under normal circumstances, it became efficient under extreme conditions (e.g. war). The absence of money (ideologically, in the communism there would not be the "institution" of money) as the main means of trade was caused by inflation, not by a miracle of economy (an industrialized economy without the institution of money *would* be a miracle<sup>7</sup>). Money disappeared from the society mainly because barter relationships replaced it for a moment (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 288–300).

<sup>7</sup>as would a properly functioning socialist economy

The civil war was won by the bol'sheviki due to several reasons. One of the most important of them was the fact that the peasants, firstly opposing the bol'sheviki, later took their side. All the white parties proclaimed that they would, in case of their victory, undo the results of *Dekret o zemle*, that is, the lands of landowners would return from peasants to the landowners. The red confiscated all the excess (and sometimes necessary) food from the peasants, but this was a much less burden for the peasants than a return of landowners' past power in the country. So, the peasants chose the (from the point of view of *their* time) lesser evil. In this way, the red army was strengthened in terms of the number of soldiers (the red army was organized better than all white armies) and it also was supported by peasants' partisans. The end of intervention of foreign countries into the Russian civil war was caused by public protests against the targeted destruction of Soviet rule in Allies' countries (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 288–300).

Russia was completely destroyed at the end of the civil war. The industrial production in 1920 was seven times smaller than in 1913, the agricultural production decreased by 40 %. Human losses amounted to 8 million people. Almost the entire political, economic and (to a lesser degree) scientific and cultural elite, 2 million people, emigrated from Russia (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 288–300).

In 1921, the peasants, which were obliged by the Soviet government to deliver any excess food to the state, organized several revolts in different parts of Russia. These revolts reached their peak when the seamen and soldiers of *Kronstadt* (the largest military base of the Baltic fleet) protested against the bol'sheviki. The Soviet government was forced to make a concession to the peasants, this concession was called NEP and ratified on the tenth party conference in March 1921. The amount of surplus food, which the peasants had to deliver to the state was reduced, and everything what remained after this "tax" the peasants could sell on the free market. Some forms of individual profit-oriented business activity was allowed. Thus, NEP was a socialism with several elements of a healthy, capitalist economy. The results were promising: individual peasants (as opposed to collective farms, *kolkhoz*) produced 98,5 % of all agricultural products, 20 % of production facilities, producing 5 % of all goods were capitalistic, 53 % of sales in the retail trade were made by capitalistic enterprises. State enterprises also got more freedom. The sectors owned by the state were mid-sized and large industry, transportation, foreign trade, banking. Development of large enterprises and industrialization (proclaimed at the 14th party conference in December 1925 as the main goal) became the main task on the economic agenda of the Soviet government. Soviet government required large enterprises and an industrialized Russia primarily for the purpose of defense, as the country had many enemies. NEP has encouraged the recovery of the Russian economy seriously, macro-economically, Russia reached the level of 1913 by the mid-1920es (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 301–305).

After Lenin's death in 1924, a struggle for power has begun within the communist party. I. V. Stalin, L. B. Kamenev and G. E. Zinov'ev were its main players. At that time, the communist party already became a non-democratic formation, where the bureaucrats (or *apparachiks*, аппаратчики, as they are called in Russia) made the most important decisions concerning all aspects of life in Russia (this "leading role of the party" later was even taken into the constitution of the USSR). On the 10th party conference in 1921, any "fraction activity" (фракционная деятельность), that is any opposition to the official party line, within the communist party was forbidden. This meant emergence of an autocratic regime, very much like one Russia has experienced for centuries prior to 1917. The communist party founded by Lenin, was quickly transformed into such an apparatus primarily by incorporation of new members. The

approx. 10,000 "Old communists" became a small minority among 2,000,000 party members (at the end of 1920es). From the interregnum after Lenin's death, I. V. Stalin emerged as a victor. On December 30, 1922 the USSR was founded. The main difference triggered by the foundation of USSR was the fact that ethnically non-Russian peoples either gained autonomy within RSFSR or became republics of the USSR (as became the RSFSR). At the foundation, the USSR contained following republics: RSFSR, Ukrainian SSR (Украинская ССР), Belorussian SSR (Белорусская ССР), Transcaucasian SSR (Закавказская ССР). In 1924, Uzbek SSR (Узбекская ССР) and Turkmen SSR (Туркменская ССР). In 1936, Kazakh SSR (Казахская ССР) and Kyrgyz SSR were formed (Киргизская ССР). In 1936, Transcaucasian SSR was dissolved as its member states (Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan) joined the USSR directly (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 308–313).

In 1925, when the Soviet economy slowly regenerated from the ruin of the civil war, the CPSU decided to begin the industrialization of the Soviet Union. As all the resources were directed to building up the heavy industry, there were few production facilities producing consumer goods, which led to shortages of them. The peasants were discouraged to sell their food reserves to the state, as they could not buy any goods for the money they earned. At the end of 1920es, food shortages occurred and the government decided to use the old means of violent confiscation of food from the peasants, as it already did at the beginning of the 1920es. Rural revolts flared up again (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 313–314).

There were two possible solutions for this problem considered by the CPSU. The group represented by N. I. Bukharin, A. I. Rykov and M. P. Tomskii proposed to postpone the development of the heavy industry until the economy is fully regenerated, and, most important, the agriculture experiences economic growth. I. V. Stalin, as well as the majority of the members of CPSU thought that if the NEP economy fails to enable the USSR to become an industrialized nation in foreseeable future, then economic system has to be changed. At the same time, the kulaks should be "eliminated as class" by converting many small agricultural enterprises into large, industrialized kolkhoz farms. These fewer kolkhoz enterprises could be put under administrative control with lesser effort than approx. 2,500,000 individual farms. Thus, the NEP has to be discontinued and replaced by an economic policy allowing to concentrate all available resources towards achieving the primary goal of industrialization targeted at a better defense ability. Finally, the position of I. V. Stalin triumphed, primarily because of its support by the majority of members of CPSU and the well-known fact that industrialization in Western European countries took decades to complete, even under the influence of many advantageous factors not present in the USSR (domestic stability, foreign credits, large investments of domestic capitalists, exploitation of colonies) (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 313–316).

The agricultural reform undertaken at the end of 1920es is known as collectivization. It meant the elimination of individual agricultural enterprises and creation of kolkhoz farms, which were large, industrialized agricultural enterprises, where most production facilities (including cattle, poultry, work equipment etc. ) did not belong to individual members of kolkhoz, but were common (state) property. Membership in kolkhoz was de facto mandatory, most kulaki and their families were sent to work camps. From the CPSU point of view, kolkhoz was a form of agricultural enterprise better suited for the needs of the Soviet economy, as it can be easier put under party control and would free large human resources (these emerged as a synergetic effect of "merging" many individual farms into one large kolkhoz). In spite of decrease in agricultural production through collectivization, millions of people dying from starvation

in the country and kulaks from the conditions in the work camps, state food reserves increased, the independence from import of cotton and several other raw materials was established and the entire agricultural sector was centralized and put under control of the CPSU. Several goals aimed at by CPSU were actually achieved (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 316–318).

The industrialization of the USSR began in 1925 and was implemented by using exclusively domestic financial resources, namely

- incomes of the agricultural sector, which were distributed to the industry
- hard currency incomes due to monopoly of foreign trade with grain, gold, wood, furs
- de facto confiscation of urban entrepreneurs' property (by 1933 there was no more private sector in the Soviet economy)
- decreasing standard of living of the population through increased retail prices and mandatory state bonds<sup>8</sup>

Human resources for achieving the high-flown goals of an all-Union industrialisation were – apart from workers – also the prisoners of work camps, whose number increased in the 1930es as the repressions were intensified. Another factor for the growth of the industry was the high enthusiasm of the workers (Stakhanovist movement). Although no reliable economic statistics exist for this period, it can be said that by 1937 the USSR achieved an industrial sector with an output comparable to one in Western countries (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 316–318).

The relationships of the USSR with the Western countries were highly controversial in the 1920es and 1930es. At the beginning, hostility against the USSR prevailed as it officially proclaimed the world revolution (establishing socialism in the entire world) as its goal (it supported these words with actions by providing help to communist parties in other countries). Russia, in turn, was not only interested in abstract communist ideals, but also in pragmatic economic co-operation with the West. But gradually, the USSR strengthened its diplomatic power, mainly because the ideal of world revolution slowly but steady faded away and the West was interested in trade with the USSR, mostly because of its rich natural resources and a large domestic market. Being after the end of civil war in international isolation, USSR put an end to it in the end of 1920es by signing peace treaties with Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland. Relations with southern neighbors (Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Mongolia) were normalized in 1921. Several countries refused to re-establish diplomatic relations with USSR prior to paying the pre-1917 debts as well as losses incurred by nationalisation of production facilities owned by foreign investors. In scope of an international conference in Rapallo, Italy in 1922, USSR proposed to pay a part of the debts in exchange for the compensation of the losses due to Western intervention in the Russian civil war, political recognition of the USSR and providing credits to it. Soviet diplomats further proposed the creation of a disarmament treaty. All Soviet proposal were refused, but USSR succeeded at establishing diplomatic relations and mutual renunciation of all claims (contribution, territorial concessions etc. ) in scope of a Soviet-German treaty (Rapallo, Italy 1922). Germany was the first country to recognize the USSR judicially. While politically the USSR lacked recognition of Western countries, trade relationships

<sup>8</sup>These bonds are called mandatory because de facto Soviet citizens were obliged to buy these bonds and so to support industrialization.

were established with several countries (England, Germany, Norway, Austria, Italy, Denmark, Czechoslovakia). By mid-1920es, the USSR has established diplomatic relations with more than twenty countries including England, France, Italy, Japan and China. USA happened to be the last great power recognizing the USSR in 1933 (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 326–328).

In the mid-1930es the behavior towards European fascist countries Germany and Italy started to dominate the foreign policy agenda in entire Europe. Being member of the League of Nations since 1934, the USSR used it to attempt the creation of an anti-fascist coalition in Europe. It resulted in the USSR signing treaties with France and Czechoslovakia, according to which support (including restricted military support) should be provided in case of an aggression. At the same time, the USSR secretly tried to achieve some political guarantees that Germany will not attack the USSR, for the case that its attempt in formation of an anti-fascist coalition fails. The secret diplomacy was also employed by Western nations, especially England, who tried to ensure that potential German aggression will be directed against the USSR. The result of such a policy was the conference in Munich, Germany between the representatives of Germany, Italy, England and France. It was decided to "give" Germany those parts of Czechoslovakia, which it demanded. The failure of the formation of an anti-fascist coalition was finally marked by the negotiations between USSR, England and France in 1939 in Moscow, as both sides knew of the secret diplomacy undertaken by each other. On August 23, 1939 a nonaggression pact, also known as *Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact* as well as additional secret agreements (mostly concerning the division of influence spheres in Eastern Europe) between Germany and USSR were signed. German attack on Poland one week later marked the beginning of World War II (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 328–330).

By the end of 1940, Germany occupied most of the Western Europe including France and its only enemy became England. In spite of intensive attacks of German airforce, England did not surrender. It became clear to German leaders that the aim of German world domination can not be attained as long as the USSR exists. At the beginning of 1941, the military plan of the conquest of the USSR (the so-called *operation Barbarossa*) was worked out. The attack on the USSR became only a matter of time (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 330–332).

In spite of all the peace treaties, it was always clear to Soviet leadership, that USSR is encircled by potential enemies. Therefore, highest efforts were undertaken in order to achieve a modern economy capable of providing the army with all the necessary equipment and weapons. This has been done in the pre-war years, so that one can say that Soviet economy, society and army has been adapted for military needs by 1940. Most harmful to the Soviet defense system were the repressions (which were continuously undertaken until 1956). Best cadres landed in work camps and prisons, which resulted in several mistakes with respect to military planning as well as to the diplomatic front (failure to form an anti-German coalition and international isolation of USSR in 1941). In spite of signals about German preparations for invasion into USSR, the army was not mobilized prior to German attack because Soviet leaders did not want to give Germans a formal reason for withdrawal from the Molotov-Ribbentrop nonaggression pact (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 330–332).

The course of the Great Patriotic War, as the Soviet defense from the Nazi invaders and its allies is called, can be divided into several phases namely,

**June 22, 1941 – December 1941** On June 22, 1941 the Nazi Germany and the troops of countries supporting the Nazi regime (Hungary, Italy, Romania, Finland) in-

vaded the USSR without formally declaring war. Originally, it was planned that Nazi troops will conquer most important regions of the USSR before winter 1941, rendering further resistance of the Soviet Union difficult. This strategy of a quick war is known as *blitzkrieg*. The resistance of the Red Army (which was not mobilized before the invasion) could not prevent that by November 1941 the enemy besieged Leningrad (formerly Petrograd; the siege lasted until January 1944) and located its troops approx. 30 km from Moscow (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 334–335).

This first phase is characterized by actual fulfillment of the blitzkrieg plan and Germans possessing control of the course of the war.

**December 1941 – November 19, 1942** By December 1941, the measures taken by the Soviet government (mobilization of the army) began to work. Russian offensive on the Germans began with the successful defense of Moscow on December 5–6, 1941 and continued until April 1942. The enemy was thrown back to approx. 250 km from Moscow. German defeat at the gates of Moscow buried their plans of a quick conquest of the Soviet Union. Until May 1942, the Germans were superior to the Red Army, nevertheless, I. V. Stalin demanded the continuation of the offensive, which led to several lost battles (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 335).

The second phase is characterized by the failure of the blitzkrieg plan, at the same time, during this phase Germans preserve their military superiority over Red Army.

**November 19, 1942 – August 1944** In June 1942, the Germans began the attack on the city of Stalingrad (today Volgograd). This city was strategically important, as it was a harbour on one of the most important transportation routes in USSR – the river Volga. On the other side, the Germans moved to Northern Caucasus and tried to conquer it in order to achieve its oil reserves. On November 19, 1942 the Red Army liberated Stalingrad, Germans were driven away from Northern Caucasus. The Red Army started an offensive on the entire front. In July 1943 the German army attacked Soviet troops at *Kurskaia duga* (Kursk Bulge), a "ledge" in the front line caused by Soviet offensive. This attack ended with German defeat and a successful counter-attack of the Red Army. The battles at Stalingrad and Kurskaia duga exhausted enemy's resources, the Nazis lost military initiative. From now on, it were the Soviet troops, who determined the further course of the war. Until August 1944, the entire territory of USSR was liberated (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 336–337).

This phase is characterized by domination of Soviet troops and military inferiority of Germans.

**August 1944 – September 1945** After the expulsion of Nazis from the USSR, Soviet troops moved to Eastern Europe, liberating Romania (August 1944), Bulgaria (September 1944), Yugoslavia (October 1944), Poland (January 1945), Hungary (February 1945), Austria (April 1945), Czechoslovakia (May 1945). On May 2, 1945 Soviet troops conquered the capital of the Nazi Germany, Berlin. On May 8, 1945, Germany signed the *Act for unconditional capitulation of the German Armed Forces* (Акт о безоговорочной капитуляции) (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 337).

The last phase of the Great Patriotic War equals to liberation of European countries from Nazi occupation.

World War II is called Great Patriotic War in Russia because of the fact that not only the army was involved in the defense of the country, but the *entire* population of the Soviet Union. On the one hand, there were approx. 1,000,000 partisans who fought the Nazis in the regions occupied by them, getting rid of approx. 1,500,000 Nazi soldiers and officers and diverting up to 10 % of Nazi troops. In 1941 – 1942 several regions of Belarus' as well as Leningrad, Smolensk and Orel oblasts were liberated by the forces of partisans. Partisans also supported the Red Army in its large military operations, e.g. at the Kurskaia duga (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 339–342).

On the other hand, the victory over Nazis and liberation of Europe would not be possible without a strong economy. During the first phase of the war, in 1941, Germans occupied the most productive regions of Soviet Union, which increased German economic power even more (in those regions 40 % of Soviet population lived, 40 % of electricity, 70 % of cast iron, 60 % of steel and 63 % of coal were produced in pre-war times, (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 339–342)).

In these extremely critical circumstances the Soviet society worked highly efficient due to a number of factors, namely

- Overcentralised command economy, which allowed to evacuate approx. 2,500 works and factories into safe regions and to transform civil production facilities into military ones. In mid-1942 all evacuated production facilities began to work and over-compensated the production losses due to occupation (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 339–342).
- Efficiency of Soviet economy in the war period was marked by the fact that in spite of industrial superiority of Germans, from June 1941 to May 1945 the Soviet Union produced almost the double amount of weapons and equipment than Germany did. Any resource (metal, cement, coal, electricity, production facility) were employed in the Soviet war economy more efficiently than in Germany (as well as in England and USA). E.g. , per 1,000 tons of steel, Soviet economy produced five times more tanks and weapons than Germany (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 339–342).
- Huge natural resources
- Huge human resources
- Concentration of all the people's efforts toward supply of the military with all required goods
- Highest motivation of working people
- Support of the Soviet government by major religious confessions of the Soviet Union
- Patriotism of the peoples of the Soviet Union and awareness that German conquest of USSR would lead to elimination and/or enslavement of most of the Soviet peoples<sup>9</sup>(Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 339–342).

The participation of the USSR in World War II was the most important factor in the liberation of the world from the threat of Nazi world dominance. In its struggle with USSR, Nazi Germany lost 73 % of its soldiers and officers, 75 % of tanks, artillery

<sup>9</sup>For this reason, Nazi collaborators, e.g. general Vlasov, did not get any support from ordinary population.

and aviation. The liberation of the world from the nazis was achieved at a high price: the direct material losses amounted to a third of all Soviet property, human losses of 27,000,000 people killed in action, captivity and regions occupied by the Germans (human losses of Germany amount to 14,000,000; England and USA had human losses of several hundred thousands). This extraordinary destruction was caused primarily by German policy, aiming at annihilation of Soviet peoples to the highest possible extent. Another factor were the repressions of the security organs, which did not cease during the war, significantly weakening the Soviet defense system (Orlov et al., 1997, p. 344).

The main task of the Soviet foreign policy during the war was the formation of an anti-Hitler coalition. Officially, the support of the Soviet Union began in July 1941 by signing the treaty concerning common actions against Germany by USSR and England. In 1941 and 1942 treaties with England and USA were signed, which effected support of USSR with military equipment in exchange for raw materials. While the Western nations provided economic help, they postponed their involvement into main World War II battles until the moment, when the ability of the USSR to liberate whole Europe *alone* became evident (June 1944), in order to restrict the power of the Soviet Union after the war. In scope of the conferences of USSR, USA and England in Yalta, Russia (February 1945) and Potsdam, Germany (July and August 1945) the division of spheres of influence after the war was agreed upon. For the USSR this meant that the Western countries were forced to accept the fact that Soviet Union extended its influence on Central and Southern Europe (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 342–343).

The apparent strength of the USSR after the end of World War II frightened Western politicians. Approx. one year after the end of the war, British ex-prime minister W. Churchill triggered the outbreak of so-called cold war by his speech held in Fulton, USA in March 1946. Churchill appealed the Western world to isolate Soviet Union to the largest extent possible by a variety of means such as putting European countries under the economic dependence upon USA (by means of the European Recovery Program, commonly known as Marshall Plan), formation of an anti-Soviet military alliance (NATO) and potential use of nuclear weapons for preventing further expansion of the Soviet Union. The USSR responded with creation of organizations for analogous purposes (COMECON, Warsaw Pact) as well as development of nuclear weapons, which was completed in 1949. In this way, Western politicians (Churchill and Truman, US president at those time, who widely agreed with Churchill's views in scope of the so-called *Truman Doctrine*) buried the hopes of the possibility of co-operation among the members of anti-Hitler coalition. The so-called cold war triggered by them lasted for 45 years (1946–1991) and resulted into separation of the whole world into socialist, USSR-led and capitalist, USA-led camps as well as several hot (real) wars in several parts of the world (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 344–347).

After the war, the Soviet government was primarily concerned with the repairing and rebuilding destroyed and damaged Soviet economy. Contrary to a comparable period after the end of civil war, I. V. Stalin started the reconstruction not with agricultural sector, but with the heavy industry and it was given the highest priority to the disadvantage of agriculture and consumer goods production. The reconstruction began already in 1943, after the Nazi invaders were driven away from USSR, but it was greatly intensified after 1945, as resources formerly used for defence were freed. In the years 1946–1950 most of the destroyed and damaged production facilities were repaired and/or rebuilt. According to official statistics, the economy was to a large degree recovered in 1947, when the production reached pre-war 1940 levels. It should be noted that the development of the economy proceeded unevenly as industry and VPK were encouraged at the cost of consumer goods production, agriculture and industries

dependent upon agricultural products (food, light industry). After the end of the war, government expenditure on military did not decrease, as the Soviet government required huge financial resources for the arms race with its potential enemies, primarily the USA. The development of high-tech weapons (nuclear weapons, rocketry etc. ) was given much higher priority than the material well-being of Soviet citizens. The high economical achievements (quick recovery after the war) were partially attained by means of repressions (the Stalinist repressions against virtually any group and potentially any single citizen of the Soviet society did not cease until the abolition of Stalin' cult of personality in 1956). The effect of the outbreak of the cold war in the interior affairs of the Soviet Union was - among others - the intensification of repressions and show-case lawsuits against alleged public enemies of all ranks. I. V. Stalin died on March 5, 1953, but the system he has established continued to work and swallow up millions of human lives in work camps and exiles (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 347–357).

A major political event after the death of I. V. Stalin was the 20th party conference held in 1956, in scope of which N. S. Khrushchev (who was elected the first secretary of CPSU in 1953 and in 1957 became factual head of state of the USSR with unrestricted power) convicted the Stalinist repressions, showing that most of its victims were honest people and not public enemies. Khrushchev's secret speech (its text was published in the Soviet Union only in 1989) triggered amnesty and restoration of high repute of many people imprisoned in prisons and work camps beginning from 1956. This led to a short period of "thaw" both in terms of interior and foreign affairs. In the interior affairs, the repressions were almost discontinued and the censorship lessened. In the foreign affairs, the thaw was marked by the efforts of USSR to restrict the production and proliferation of nuclear weapons. In 1963, a treaty on prohibition of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in the space and under water were signed in Moscow. In 1968, a nuclear weapons non-proliferation treaty was signed. The climax of the thaw policy of the USSR was the visit of N. S. Khrushchev to the USA in 1959. In scope of this visit, Khrushchev presented his ideas on the international disarmament and proposals on their implementation at the UNO. The UNO did not accept the proposed plan, but agreed to Khrushchev's views on disarmament. Due to the presence of forces in USSR and US, who (successfully) tried to undermine the normalisation of Soviet-American relationships, the thaw was only a short-term phenomenon. In 1962, one of the most dangerous conflict of the cold war occurred, which is termed the Cuban crisis in 1962. The US established a military base in Turkey close to the Soviet border, where missiles with nuclear warheads were installed. Thus technically the USA could attack the Soviet Union very efficiently from this military base. In 1962, the USSR started to create a military base on Cuba, aiming at exactly the same strategical advantage as the US. The American intelligence revealed these Soviet intentions, which led to mutual threats of application of nuclear weapons in order to "solve" this conflict. Also, the US imposed air and sea siege of Cuba. Finally the crisis was solved by USSR discontinuing the construction of the military base on Cuba and US removing nuclear missiles from Cuba and abolition of its siege of Cuba. Another major foreign policy event of the Khrushchev era was the conflict with socialist China, whose leaders did not accept the abolition of Stalinism in the Soviet Union. The conflict resulted in USSR reducing its financial and technical help to China and a schism in the socialist bloc (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 357–373).

In the years 1953–1960 a number of reforms were undertaken in the Soviet Union, which aimed at strengthening the agricultural sector and light industry. These reforms (increasing regulated prices for agricultural products, forgiving of old debts, increasing government expenditure on agricultural sector, legalisation of small private farms, is-

suing passports for kolkhoz members, establishing of pensions for the peasants) were partially successful, as the growth of agricultural production reached the NEP levels. But their success was limited as they were stopped (or reversed) and replaced by administrative pressure on the agricultural enterprises and individual peasants. Several failed measures led to food shortages and they in turn led to protests among the population. The Soviet government solved this problem by importing grain from the United States<sup>10</sup> As in previous years, low-growth sectors (light industry, consumer goods production, agriculture) co-existed in the Soviet Union with quickly growing heavy industry and a strong VPK. The latter was developed to the same (and often higher) extent as the military sector of the potential enemy. To the greatest achievements of Soviet defence and space industry (and the society as a whole, who sacrificed material well-being for the achievement of these goals) the successful launching of the first artificial satellite *Sputnik* in October 1957 and the first manned space flight in April 1961 can be counted. Soviet cosmonauts (Iuri Gagarin, German Titov, Andrian Nikolaev, Valentina Tereshkova) became national heroes for several decades (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 357–373).

Politically, the CPSU adopted a programme in October 1961, which aimed at significant improvement of the standard of living of Soviet population in 20 years. These goals were not achieved because of increasing defence expenditure in the continuing arms and space race (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 357–373).

In 1964, N. S. Khrushchev was removed from office, lost all his power and was pensioned off. His many reforms, which always were accompanied by personal changes, as well as the fact that some of them were highly controversial (e.g. in the intellectuals supported him at the beginning due to his efforts to increase the freedom (lessening the censorship), but this support ended as the reforms were continued to the lesser extent than the intellectuals expected; the military officials were afraid of reduction of defence expenditure due to thaw policy towards the USA) led to Khrushchev's political isolation in 1964, as there were virtually no political forces supporting him. L. I. Brezhnev became the head of state, his rule is termed in Russia as period of stagnation. This period, which ranges from 1964 to Brezhnev's death in 1982, can be regarded as the beginning of the end of socialism in Soviet union and CMEA. The beginning of this period began with a highly promising reform of agriculture and industry in 1965, which led to a temporary growth as well as building of approx. 1,900 large industrial enterprises and creation of large, region-wide production complexes called TPK. At the same time, Siberian oil and gas deposits were tapped. These raw materials were exported and due to high world prices for these goods, Soviet national income greatly benefited from these natural resources. At the same time, high-tech industries (apart from defence and space industries) developed barely and the greatest part of high-tech equipment was imported by the Soviet Union. Productivity and efficiency also were much lower than in Western countries. Having the solution of the problem of food shortages in mind, Soviet leaders tried several measures (further centralisation of agricultural sector, elimination of "hopeless" villages, attempted tapping of Nechernozemn'e) in order to reform the agricultural sector. As became evident in the 1980s these measures at least did not attain its goal, at worst aggravated the situation. The growth indicators continuously fell, and in the period 1981–1985 (10th piatiletka), not a single indicator achieved the planned level, which was unprecedented

<sup>10</sup>*If Egypt were socialist, there would be shortage of sand*, says a popular Russian joke. The truth of this statement can be observed in the Soviet Russia – being primarily agricultural country in the pre-1917 period, socialism harmed this sector so much that it could not support the Soviet Union with food any more. Before the outbreak of socialist catastrophe in 1917, grain was one of the most important Russian export goods.

since the introduction of the five year planning in 1928. The situation was aggravated by the dominance of conservative communists since the Prague spring in 1968 (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 373–391). Thus, economy became the main problem of the USSR and the inability to solve it within the socialist framework the main cause of the dissolution of the USSR at the beginning of 1990es.

On the foreign policy front, the situation was much better. In the 1970es a number of treaties were signed, which de facto officially accepted the power of the Soviet Union. (American) West-Germany and (Soviet) East-Germany accepted each other as sovereign states (1972), both Germanies entered the UNO as two independent states (1973), West-Berlin was recognized as part of East-Germany (1971), West-Germany discontinued its demand concerning the return of Kaliningrad oblast' to Germany (it was conquered by the Soviet Union in the World War II and was formerly part of Germany, East-Prussia) etc. All these diplomatic achievements of the Soviet Union were concluded by the 1973–1975 CSCE conference in Helsinki (Helsinki conference). It was an official recognition of the Soviet sphere of influence. A further recognition of Soviet achievements happened at the beginning of the 1970es by USA recognizing military-strategical parity of USSR and USA, that is, approx. the same military potential of both super-powers. Various disarmament treaties followed<sup>11</sup> (1972, 1974, 1979). A further victory of the USSR was signing the treaty about the end of American intervention in the Vietnam war in Paris in 1973. Vietnam was united (1976) into a single socialist country under Soviet protection (1978). According to this regulation, Soviet Union prevented the Chinese occupation of Vietnam in 1979. China was forced to give up its occupation of Vietnam. The relationships with China became worse as it provoked about 500 incidents on the Soviet-Chinese border in 1969. The Chinese leaders wanted to obtain some of Russian regions. The negotiations started in 1969, but only at the end of 1980es a realistic hope of the solution of this diplomatic problem emerged. Further concern of Soviet government was the attempted exit of Czechoslovakia from the socialist community in 1968, which was prevented by the military force of the Warsaw pact. Soviet military intervention into the war in Afghanistan (whose leaders asked the Soviet Union for military help in order to preserve socialist achievements in that country and protection from a possible military intervention of other states) in 1979 led to Soviet international isolation and high human and material losses. Afghanistan became for Soviet Union what Vietnam was for the United States, a guerilla war without the possibility to win it. The Afghanistan war ended in 1989 with the withdrawal of Soviet forces from that country (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 373–391).

After the death of L. I. Brezhnev in 1982, the need for reformation of the Soviet Union became evident. Iu. V. Andropov and K. U. Chernenko, who were head of state in 1983–1984 and 1984–1985 respectively were both of high age, their careers ended due to their deaths. Hence, they were unable to implement any significant reforms. The situation changed in 1985 with M. S. Gorbachev becoming Secretary General of CPSU (Orlov et al., 1997, pp. 373–391).

---

<sup>11</sup>It should be noted that years after the end of cold war, the US get out of different restrictions concerning nuclear weapons.

# Bibliography

- R. Allen, M. Lee, and A. MacDougal, editors. *Chambers Encyclopedic English Dictionary*. Chambers, Edinburgh, 1994. ISBN 0-550-11000-3.
- D. Begg, S. Fischer, and R. Dornbusch. *Economics*. McGraw-Hill, 5th edition, 1997. ISBN 0-07-709412-3.
- A. Kappeler. *Russische Geschichte*. Beck'sche Reihe. Verlag C. H. Beck, München, 1997. ISBN 3-406-41876-7.
- A. S. Orlov, A. Iu. Polunov, and Iu. A. Shchetinov. *Posobie po istorii Otechestva dlia postupaushchikh v VUZy*. Prostor, Moscow, 1997. ISBN 5-900451-05-4. (Textbook on the history of motherland for prospective students of higher education facilities, Russian title: А. С. Орлов, А. Ю. Полунов, Ю. А. Щетинов; Пособие по истории Отечества для поступающих в ВУЗы, Простор).
- K. Rooney, editor. *Encarta World English Dictionary*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, London, 1999. ISBN 0-7475-4371-2.
- G. Schramm. Die Herkunft des Namens Rus'. *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte*, 30:7–49, 1981. (Reference found in Torke (1997)).
- G. Stöckl. *Russische Geschichte; Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Alfred Kröner Verlag, Stuttgart, 6th edition, 1997. ISBN 3-520-24406-3.
- H.-J. Torke. *Einführung in die Geschichte Russlands*. Verlag C. H. Beck, München, 1997. ISBN 3-406-42304-3.
- D. T. Twining. *Guide to the Republics of the Former Soviet Union*. Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 1993.
- University of Exeter. Transliterating from Russian to English, 2002. URL <http://www.ex.ac.uk/russian/translit.html>. (URL accessed on October 23, 2002).

# Glossary

## A

**Allies** The term generally applied to nations that fought the Axis powers during World War II. By 1942 the combatant countries included the USSR, Great Britain and the British Commonwealth, the USA, France and China, while Costa Rica, Cuba, Brazil, and Mexico had also declared war on Germany and Japan. By March 1945 they had been joined by Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Italy and Turkey (Allen et al., 1994, p. 34). In World War I, the Allies (Russia, France, Great Britain, Japan, Italy) fought against the Central Powers (Austria-Hungary, Germany, Turkey, Bulgaria) (Allen et al., 1994, p. 34)).

**Axis** The military and political alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan that fought the Allies in World War II (Rooney, 1999, p. 123).

## B

**barter** To exchange goods or services in return for other goods or services (Rooney, 1999, p. 149).

**bourgeoisie** The social class that, according to Marxist theory owns the means of producing wealth and exploits the working class. Affluent middle-class people characterized as conventional, conservative, or materialistic in outlook (Rooney, 1999, p. 216).

## C

**CIS** Commonwealth of Independent States. Union of several republics of the former Soviet Union with the capital in Minsk, proclaimed on December 8, 1991 by the leaders of the three Slavic Soviet republics Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. The responsibilities of the CIS organization lie in co-ordinating military, strategic, and nuclear issues as well as foreign and economic affairs, customs and immigration policy, transportation, communications, environmental affairs and crime control (Twining, 1993, pp. 7–8). Moldova, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan joined the CIS on December 21, 1991 (Alma-Ata declaration). Thus, the CIS includes all the republics of the former Soviet Union except Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) and Georgia, which was in a state of civil war at the formation of the CIS and later obtained an observer status (Twining, 1993, p. 120).

- CMEA** Council of Mutual Economic Assistance. See **COMECON**.
- cold war** A relationship between two people or groups that is unfriendly or hostile, but does not involve actual fighting or military combat (from the fact that the antagonism stops short of military conflict and so never heats up into an actual war). The hostile yet nonviolent relations between the former Soviet Union and the United States from around 1946 to 1989 (Rooney, 1999, p. 373, terms *cold war* and *Cold war*).
- collectivization** Running or organizing something such as a farm according to principles of collective control (Rooney, 1999, p. 375, term *collectivize*).
- COMECON** Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Russian name СЭВ (Совет Экономической Взаимопомощи)). A body founded in 1949 by I. V. Stalin, dominated by the USSR. Its purpose was ostensibly the economic integration of the Eastern bloc as a means of counteracting the economic power of the West. The 10 member states were eventually the USSR, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Eastern Germany, Mongolia and Vietnam (Allen et al., 1994, p. 305). The COMECON was dissolved in 1991.
- communism** The political theory or system in which all property and wealth is owned in a classless society by all the members of a community (Rooney, 1999, p. 385).
- CPSU** Communist party of the Soviet Union.
- CSCE** Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

## E

- entrepreneur** Somebody who sets up and finances new commercial enterprises to make a profit (Rooney, 1999, p. 627).
- ERP** European Recovery Program. See **Marshall plan**.

## G

- Great Patriotic War** Russian name Великая Отечественная Война. War of liberation of the Soviet Union from the invasion of Nazi Germany and its allies (primarily Japan) from June 22, 1941 (German invasion into Soviet Union) to September 2, 1945 (capitulation of Japan).

## I

- imperialism** The policy of extending the rule or influence of a country over other countries or colonies. The political, military or economic domination of one country over another. The extension of power or authority over others in the interests of domination (Rooney, 1999, p. 944).
- interregnum** The time between two reigns when the throne is unoccupied, e.g. between the death of one monarch and the coronation of the next. The period between the end of rule of by one government and the beginning of rule by the next (Allen et al., 1994, p. 651).

**intervention** An act of intervening, especially in the affairs of other people or other countries (Allen et al., 1994, p. 651).

## K

**kolkhoz** A large-scale collective farm in the former Soviet Union (Allen et al., 1994, p. 704).

**kulak** A wealthy, property-owning Russian farmer (Allen et al., 1994, p. 707).

## L

**League of Nations** A former international organization, the construction of which was drafted at the Paris Peace Conference (1919) and incorporated into the Treaty of Versailles. The main aims were to preserve international peace and security by the prevention or swift settlement of disputes and the promotion of disarmament. It had its quarters in Geneva, Switzerland and operated through a Council, which met several times a year, and an annual Assembly. Its original members included the victorious Allies of World War I, except the USA, which refused to join, and most of the neutral nations. Germany joined in 1926, and the USSR in 1934, but Germany and Japan withdrew in 1933, and Italy in 1936. The League became increasingly ineffective in the later 1930es, when it failed to stop major act of aggression by Japan, Italy and Germany, and in 1946 transferred its functions to the United Nations (Allen et al., 1994, p. 725).

## M

**Marshall plan** The popular name for the European Recovery Program, a scheme for large-scale, medium-term US aid to war-ravaged Europe, announced in 1947 by US Secretary of State George Marshall. "Marshall Aid" was rejected by the USSR and the Eastern bloc, but it materially assisted Western Europe's economic revival in 1948–1950 (Allen et al., 1994, p. 790).

## N

**NATO** North Atlantic Treaty Organization. An organization established by a treaty signed in 1949 by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the UK and the USA; Greece and Turkey acceded in 1952, West Germany in 1955, and Spain in 1982. In 1966 France under Charles de Gaulle withdrew all its forces from NATO command, but it remains a member. NATO was a permanent military alliance to defend Western Europe against Soviet aggression. The treaty commits the members to consider an armed attack on one of them as an attack on all of them, and for all to assist the country attacked by such actions as are deemed necessary. The alliance forces are based on contributions from the member countries' armed services and operate under a multinational command. Its institutions include a Council, an International Secretariat, the Supreme Headquarters Allied

Powers in Europe (SHAPE) and various committees to formulate common policies. In the 1970es and 1980es, the NATO policy of a first-strike nuclear attack to fend off a Soviet conventional attack became controversial in Western Europe. After the 1989 changes in Eastern Europe, a NATO summit in London (July 1990) began the process of redefining NATO's military and political goals (Allen et al., 1994, p. 861).

**Nomenklatura** A list of the highest posts within the local, regional, republican or all-union party organization of the CPSU, as well as the holders of these posts.(Orlov et al., 1997, p. 323).

## O

**oblast'** An administrative district in some republics of the former Soviet Union (Allen et al., 1994, p. 894).

**oligarchy** A small group of people who together govern a nation or control an organization, often for their own purposes. Government or control by a small group of people (Rooney, 1999, p. 1317).

## P

**proletariat** The working class, especially unskilled labourers and industrial workers (Allen et al., 1994, p. 1014).

## R

**RSFSR** Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

## S

**schism** The division of a group into mutually antagonistic fractions (Rooney, 1999, p. 1677).

**socialism** A political doctrine or system which aims to create a classless society by removing the nation's wealth (land, industries, transport systems etc. ) out of private and into public hands. Socialist ideas appeared in classical times, but it was not systemized as a political doctrine in Europe until industrialization in 18th and 19th century (Allen et al., 1994, p. 1179).

**Soviet Union** See **USSR**.

**stagnation** A condition of no movement, activity, development or progress, or the process of becoming like this (Rooney, 1999, p. 123).

**Stakhanovist movement** Movement among Soviet workers with the goal of maximizing the output of their factory, works or construction company, mostly by improving the production processes and the discipline. The emergence of this movement was triggered by the miner A. V. Stakhanov, who overfulfilled the daily norm of coal production 14fold in 1935.

**syndicate** Any association of people or groups of working together on a single project. A group of business organizations jointly managing or financing a single venture (Allen et al., 1994, p. 1242).

## T

**trust** A group of business firms working together to control the market in a particular commodity, beat down competition and maximise profits (Allen et al., 1994, p. 1309).

## U

**UNO** United Nations Organization. An organization formed to maintain world peace and foster international co-operation, formally established on October 24, 1945 with 51 founder countries (178 members in 1992). The UN Charter, which was drafted during World War II by the USSR, USA and UK, remains virtually unaltered despite the growth in membership and activities. There are six principal organs: the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Secretariat, the International Court of Justice, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council. In addition to the organs established under the Charter, there is a range of subsidiary agencies, many with their own constitutions and membership, and some pre-dating the UN. The main agencies are the Food and Agriculture Organization; the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization; the International Atomic Energy Authority; the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank); the International Civil Aviation Organization; the International Development Association; the International Finance Corporation; the International Fund for Agricultural Development; the International Labour Organization; the International Monetary Fund; the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; the Universal Postal Union; the International Telecommunication Union; the World Meteorological Organization and the World Health Organization. It is generally seen as a forum where states pursue their national interest, rather than as an institution of world government, but it has considerable impact (Allen et al., 1994, p. 1329).

**USSR** Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A former federation of 15 Union Republics, formed in 1922, which, until its dissolution in 1991, jointly formed the world's largest sovereign state. In addition to the Union Republics (Soviet Socialist Republics (SSR)) there were twenty Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics (ASSR), and several smaller divisions (krai, oblast', autonomous oblast' and autonomous okrug). The area of the Soviet Union amounted to 22,402,076 km<sup>2</sup>. The capital of the Soviet Union was Moscow. The area occupied by the USSR was bordered in the West by Romania, Turkey, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland and Norway, in the South by Iran, Afghanistan, China, Mongolia, and North Korea; it was divided by the Ural Mountain into European and Asian sectors (Allen et al., 1994, p. 1191).

**V**

**VPK** Military-industrial complex (Военно-промышленный комплекс).

**W**

**Warsaw Pact** The name for the East European Mutual Assistance Treaty, signed in 1955 in Warsaw, Poland by Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the USSR. Albania withdrew in 1968. The pact established a unified military command for the armed forces of all the signatories, who were committed to giving immediate assistance to one another in the event of an attack in Europe (Allen et al., 1994, p. 1372). The Warsaw Pact was created by the Soviet bloc as a response to the formation of NATO in the West. The Warsaw Pact ceased to exist in 1991, when it was dissolved due to revolutions in the socialist countries.

## Appendix A

# The Library of Congress system

Russian names and terms are written in this paper using the transliteration system known as *The Library of Congress system (without diacritics)*. At the first occurrence of a particular Russian word, it is given both in Cyrillic characters and in a transliterated form. Subsequent references to the word are always written in transliterated form.

The transliteration system used works on a letter-to-letter basis, that is, a particular letter in a Russian text to be transliterated is substituted by a certain English character sequence (University of Exeter (2002)).

The substitution table of the Library of Congress system is given in figure A.1.

Russian	English transliteration	Russian	English transliteration
а	a	р	г
б	b	с	s
в	v	т	t
г	g	у	u
д	d	ф	f
е / ё	e	х	kh
ж	zh	ц	ts
з	z	ч	ch
и / й	i	ш	sh
к	k	щ	shch
л	l	ъ	''
м	m	ы	y
н	n	ь	'
о	o	э	e
п	p	ю	iu
		я	ia

Figure A.1: Substitution table for The Library of Congress system (without diacritics, University of Exeter (2002))