



r/DebateCommunism

Posts

Posted by u/Bomb_Tombadil 8 months ago

Why do so many communists defend Stalin?

Stale

I am starting to explore Marxist thought more and more, and I keep coming across something that I find disturbing. Not universally, but there seems to be a significant contingent that defends the actions of Stalin.

I'm still new to marxism, but I am a huge history buff. One of my favorite eras that I've read about is the Russian revolution and the rise of the Soviet Union between WW1 and WW2. By almost all accounts, Stalin was a brutal, evil man. He was a literal enforcer thug that other party members did not want to gain power (Lennin in particular called him out before his death). He was a power hungry, paranoid despot who was responsible for many deaths around him.

Furthermore, his policies of growth resulted in more deaths and suffering for the people of Russia and the USSR. I don't see how you can excuse the sacrifice of the people in order to further national interests for communism and condemn it in capitalism.

From what I've read, Stalin abandoned the ideals of communism and a global workers movement (Trotsky's plan) in favor of a more nationalistic, militaristic plan. He was a flawed implementer of communism by the most charitable interpretation of him and a egotistical despot who hijacked the communist movement for personal power at worst.

I see the value of Marx, but Stalin and other 20th century communist leaders seem very problematic in many ways. If nothing else, it's very bad optics if there is to be a modern Marxist movement. I see the value of invoking the imagery of the Russian or Chinese communist revolutions, but given their complicated legacy, isn't it better to focus on a more modern, multicultural and multi-gendered approach as opposed to a bunch of dead Russian dudes?

61 Comments ...

89% Upvoted



This thread is archived

New comments cannot be posted and votes cannot be cast

SORT BY

BEST



↓ I agree with you on a lot of that, but I think the image of Stalin as an uneducated thug who hijacked the revolution for personal power is not accurate -- and not one shared even by liberal, bourgeois historians today. I see him almost as like a Robespierre-like guy who found himself leading a revolution that from day one was isolated and under siege by the capitalist world, and so he sought to control it from the center and protect it through micromanagement and terror. He was certainly extremely paranoid as well, which could have been in part due to his experiences in Tsarist Russia, which was a highly authoritarian police and surveillance state that he spent most of his early life running from as a fugitive (in a Marxist movement ridden with police informants).

He was very much a true, committed communist; and knew the material thoroughly, writing volumes of books on Marxist theory. I do not think Lenin intended Trotsky to be his successor (there's a plausible theory that Lenin's last will was forged by his widow), and Trotsky himself was not politically popular in the USSR or particularly adept at it.

All that being said, this is a hell of a problem because Stalin murdered a lot of people in cold blood. I'm not justifying it. What I am saying is that Stalinist terror is within the Marxist tradition. I also believe that a big part of this arose because of the circumstances the USSR was in at the time, which was followed by an insane, genocidal Nazi invasion that killed millions of communists. I don't believe it's very likely that if a revolution were to occur today that you would get another Stalin. I also think that a lot of communists at the time outside of the USSR thought of Stalin as like a Bashar Al-Assad-type figure: he might be a bastard, but he's our bastard, and the alternative is probably worse.

People who still defend Stalin today... I think they have a variety of reasons. You end up arguing with anti-communists a lot who will bring up Stalin. There's a tendency to either deny Stalin had anything to do with communism at all, or alternatively they just batten down the hatches and defend everything about him. I think both approaches are reflections of a kind of defensive crouch by socialists that resulted from the restoration of capitalism around the world and the retreat of socialism. You get into these bodycount debates: I'll point out that the CIA assisted in the murder (with garrote wire and machetes) of more people in Indonesia in the 1960s than the number of people who died in Stalin's purges, but most Americans at least couldn't point out Indonesia on a map and those people won anyways so it doesn't matter.

I see the value of evoking the imagery of the Russian or Chinese communist revolutions, but given their complicated legacy, isn't it better to focus on a more modern, multicultural and multi-gendered approach as opposed to a bunch of dead Russian dudes?

Yes. Today's conditions are different from 20th century socialism so we will have to create new heroes. But that's what Marxism is all about, comrade: we choose our own champions.

↑ dorian_gray11 25 points · 8 months ago

↓ > He was certainly extremely paranoid as well, which could have been in part due to his experiences in Tsarist Russia, which was a highly authoritarian police and surveillance state that he spent most of his early life running from as a fugitive

His paranoia saw a significant uptick after his wife committed suicide, which was a total surprise to him and emotionally crushing. I don't think he could truly trust anyone after that, and the worst of the purges within the Soviet government and military occurred after her death.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ [deleted] 12 points · 8 months ago

↓ Yeah. I was also reading about his first wife who died from TB, possibly exacerbated by pollution in Baku. He threw himself into her open grave.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ 万国の労働者よ、団結せよ! icecore 21 points · 8 months ago

↓ Bashar Al-Assad-type figure: he might be a bastard, but he's our bastard, and the alternative is probably worse.

[After watching this and many other interviews of Assad](#), I'm convinced he's not the maniac and warmonger that the western media paints him to be. He's very articulate, logical and cares for his people.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ KonniBOI 3 points · 8 months ago

↓ Don't know what "western media" paints him that light. I haven't seen any, and personally consider him level-headed enough. Don't know much he cares for his people though

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ israfil_on_sax 5 points · 8 months ago

↓ could you suggest a source for CIA activity in Indonesia in the 60s. The wiki is a bit sparse and I'd like more info re: kill count and timeline.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ [deleted] 14 points · 8 months ago

↓ There's a very good book on this called Killing Hope by William Blum. I'd also check out the film "The Act of Killing" [\[trailer\]](#) which follows around a neighborhood shakedown/extortion mafia of old men who took part in death squad killings in the 60s.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ israfil_on_sax 1 point · 8 months ago

↓ thanks 👍

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ Kangodo 4 points · 8 months ago

↓ I think every Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin discussion needs to include the big quote:
<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/DpE256jXgAAxgut.jpg>

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ gopackthomas 3 points · 8 months ago

↓ The idea that the Tsaritsyn state was a surveillance state is false and modern scholarship acknowledges this . They held little power in the countryside and did not have the means to surveil such a large and diverse empire. The Tsarist state was not even close to as oppressive or authoritarian as Stalin's USSR

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ [deleted] 1 point · 8 months ago · *edited 8 months ago*

↓ The Okhrana was pretty far reaching, so much so that it was counter-productive as elements within the nobility would use the secret services to dispatch their rivals. Okhrana agents even [assassinated](#) Tsarist ministers including Nicholas II's uncle, a grand duke. The Okhrana's files were also seized by the Cheka and put to use after the Bolshevik takeover of power, though of course you are right that the Soviet secret police services would grow into a far more extensive force.

Give Award Share Report Save

+ Comment deleted by user 8 months ago (2 children)

↑ [dirtyprole1917](#) 60 points · 8 months ago

↓ Hello, I used to be libertarian socialist/ ancom for several years. I totally bought the notion that Stalin was a counterrevolutionary monster and that the USSR was state capitalist at best. I accepted these tropes without doing any real research into these topics. I was very quick to throw the term tankie around to anyone who countered my perceptions of Stalin and the USSR.

However, I started to have questions that my own ideology could not answer. Such as, How would a socialist revolution be able to protect itself without some kind of centralized state? Was every actually existing socialist state of the 20th century really “not true socialism?”

Then I started to do my own research, I started off with YouTube videos from Finnish Bolshevik and Eventually found Michael Parenti. Both peaked my interest in Stalin and Marxism Leninism. Then I actually started to read Lenin for the first time. That really kicked open the door for me. By that time I was willing to accept Marx and Lenin, but was still apprehensive over Stalin. Was he really a monster?

After time I discovered the answers from browsing R/communism101. Which led me to the historians J.Arch Getty, Robert Thurston and more. These historians dispelled much of the “Stalin was Monster” hysteria. My point is we have to overcome our Red Scare propaganda conditioning and discover the answers for our selves. As Marxists Leninists we should see Stalin as a man not a monster. A man who made mistakes and found himself at the helm of ship going through the eye of a hurricane. The Soviet Union was under constant attack from within and without. Stalin was reacting to events as they unfolded around him. I would say Stalin accomplished incredible feats and also made some big mistakes. It’s important to view him as a dedicated Revolutionary who was not in control of the world around him. He was an imperfect human but a solid Marxist Leninist.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ [i_am_banana_man](#) 15 points · 8 months ago

↓ Both peaked my interest in Stalin and Marxism Leninism

Not to be a total grammar tankie, but the word you probably meant was *piqued*

The rest of your comment was dope tho comrade. Nothing is black and white. Stalin was flawed not evil. *Some* kulaks, presumably, didn't deserve it. etc

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ [penloy](#) 2 points · 6 months ago

↓ ! I never knew it was piqued, and I'm a native English speaker. My life is changed forever.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ -ADEPT- 13 points · 8 months ago

↓ Parenti's the MAN

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ guitarandcheese 0 points · 8 months ago · *edited 8 months ago*

↓ Interesting, I'll look into some of the names you've provided. I used to be a Marxist Leninist but after further studying the history of Marxist Leninism, I've since become more of a left libertarian. The question of how a socialist revolution protects itself without a centralized state is a very important question, a question which anarchism or left libertarianism doesn't have the a perfect answer to.

However there are a few historical points that we should address.

Most socialist revolutions happened in extremely poor countries, most of which were previously colonies. Marxist Leninism in these countries served primarily to protect the nationalist interests of these countries, in becoming independent and sovereign from their historic colonizers/ imperialists. We can look at the Cuban Revolution, which was at first a nationalist movement which sought to overthrow what was essentially an American occupation. As the revolution progressed, Castro realized that aligning with the Soviets and adopting ML, authoritarian measures was necessary to counter the incredible powerful imperialist influences of America. The same can be seen in Vietnam, Angola, etc.

Most of these ML revolutions happened in incredible circumstances, namely the end of colonial occupation. This was a period in which imperialist countries sought to exert their influence without the use of colonialism. As such, we can see the ML revolutions as not purely "defending socialism", but defending independence, and levelling the playing field against powerful imperialist, colonialist forces.

So I would argue that, yes, Marxist Leninism is/was necessary in situations where there is heavy external influence and a history of colonial exploitation.

However, there are problems with Marxist Leninism that need to be addressed. The main point is that Marxist Leninism hasn't actually succeeded in bringing about "communism", at least in the Marxist sense where workers own the means of production. Yes, Marxist Leninist countries call themselves communist, but the fundamental aspect of

communism that Marx envisioned is lacking. Instead it has brought about repressive, authoritarian regimes in which a small oligarchy controls most of the political, economic decisions. In other words, the State has "not withered away", as Marx predicted, and it shows no sign of doing so. Yes this is an improvement on being a colony, or what we most commonly see today: a peripheral state which is politically independent, but still essentially an economic pawn of the imperialist countries (see most of Africa, S. Korea, Haiti, Guatemala, etc.). But we cannot honestly call Marxist Leninism an endeavor in worker ownership or freedom. It is a substitute, sure, but a poor one.

So how do you have a revolution without Marxist Leninism? My answer is radical unionism. If workers organize, the power is in their hands. The power has ALWAYS been in workers hands. If workers stop working, the economy, the body-politic dissolves. It is only necessary that workers recognize this fact, and organize appropriately, though strike, sabotage, protest. Once organized it is possible to set up a decentralized system in which workers retain their innate economic power, while also coordinating federally in order to overcome challenges which threaten the nation as a whole. (note that this would only work in a country which has not been historically colonized, and is not one of the peripheral countries which is still heavily exploited).

Very interested in your response, as we seem to have similar diagnosis but different prescriptions...

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [gloom--](#) 20 points · 8 months ago

↓ the State has "not withered away"

I don't think this can happen when you're the only communist country in a capitalist world.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [MrWalrusSocks](#) 7 points · 8 months ago

↓ Not OP but I've found your answer interesting, and have a question.

Most of these ML revolutions happened in incredible circumstances, namely the end of colonial occupation. This was a period in which imperialist countries sought to exert their influence without the use of colonialism. As such, we can see the ML revolutions as not purely "defending socialism", but defending independence, and levelling the playing field against powerful imperialist, colonialist forces.

Given that the empires of the world are officially dead, one might think Marxism-Leninism would no longer be required for defending revolutions. The reality of course is that the bourgeoisie still maintain economic control over most of Africa, South America, and Asia. How would a more libertarian-left approach deal with defending revolutions in the global south, where they will be most heavily attacked by the bourgeoisie? The experience of Venezeula shows quite clearly that even mild social-democratic reforms could potentially bring CIA intervention, so how would a more-or-less decentralised worker's state run by workers survive such an onslaught without resorting to "authoritarian" measures?

Interested to hear your reply - though if this same question has been asked on one of the various non-ML subs and you have an answer from one of them you think is relevant, please feel free to just link that instead of typing up your own answer that conveys the same message :)

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [guitarandcheese](#) 2 points · 8 months ago

↓ You'll see I actually addressed this in my initial comment. While formal colonialism has ended, it is has been replaced with economic control and exploitation, as you mention. In these situation I would still advocate Marxist Leninism as the best approach for overthrowing an exploitative external force.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [MrWalrusSocks](#) 1 point · 8 months ago

↓ So what you're saying if I understand correctly is that most of the global south still needs Marxism-Leninism, but those of us in the imperialist centres of the world have the 'luxury' of adopting a less "authoritarian" Marxism?

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [guitarandcheese](#) 1 point · 8 months ago · *edited 8 months ago*

↓ Yes, absolutely. Although I hesitate to use the word luxury.

I think Marxist Leninism is also highly unlikely to succeed in imperialist countries, as power is so deeply rooted in the military might of the State, as opposed to peripheral countries where there are often many informal institutions which can actively compete with the State.

It's important to understand that different systems require different solutions, and the nature of Imperialist economies are so vastly different than those of exploited economies that it would be foolish to prescribe the same solution to both.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [MrWalrusSocks](#) 1 point · 8 months ago

↓ I think Marxist Leninism is also highly unlikely to succeed in imperialist countries, as power is so deeply rooted in the military might of the State, as opposed to peripheral countries where there are often many informal institutions which can actively compete with the State.

Could you elaborate on this? At present I understand your point to be "Marxism-Leninism won't work in imperialist countries, because the state is too powerful" which may be a complete misreading of what you're saying.

Equally, regarding defence: any revolution will be attacked from all sides by imperialists. Revolutions in the imperialist cores could only avoid this inevitability by all having simultaneous revolutions, which is highly unlikely. So the question remains: how does a more-or-less decentralised worker's state run by workers survive such an onslaught without resorting to "authoritarian" measures? How does one win what is a war (perhaps in all but name) without an NKVD, centralisation of authority and a focus on defence? I am curious to hear how non-vanguardist ideologies would approach these questions so hopefully you can shed some light on the topic.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↓ So the essence of anarcho syndicalism is the notion that at its core, a state is dependant on its economic production. This is indisputable. If a state has no economy, the state ceases to exist.

An economy is dependant on labour, and labour is dependant on workers choosing to work. This is also fairly indisputable. Some argument could be made that in slave economies, the workers don't choose to work, instead working under threat of violence. This is true, however slave economies require complex ideological maneuvering in order to remain stable, such as the development of racist ideology etc. Not to mention, we don't (quite) live in a slave economy.

So an anarcho syndicalist looks at these facts, and concludes that all that is necessary to overthrow a capitalist state is for workers to organize themselves into broad unions, and all simultaneously go on strike. If workers were to organize successfully, they would bring the State to its knees. Such a strike would almost certainly be met with violence, but being that such violence towards strikers is firstly unconstitutional, secondly blatantly immoral, anarcho syndicalists theorize that such State violence would only increase public favour for the strikers. Of course defence is necessary, so military organization amongst unions is necessary in order to defend oneself. This does not mean creating a centralized army, but informal, decentralized militias who can defend themselves as they strike, until the economic repercussion of such a strike bring the State to its knees.

So I see unionism as the best means to challenging a capitalist state in an imperialist country as the revolution comes from the economic base. In Marxist Leninism, such a revolution would not occur at the base, but instead challenge and replace the existing state with the vanguard. Because Imperial States are so dominant militarily, I have trouble seeing a Marxist Leninist revolution succeeding.

I do think anarcho-syndicalism is just a better system once implemented, being that Marxist Leninist states can be so brutal in their drive to consolidate power. So, yes actually maybe "luxury", as you previously stated is the right word. But I do believe these different prescriptions to be primarily the result of necessity.

↑ [MrWalrusSocks](#) 1 point · 8 months ago

↓ I just typed a lengthy reply to you, and decided I wouldn't bother sending it. I was barraging you with questions that I could easily take to [/r/anarchy_101](#) or similar, and I might well do so sometime - it seems much fairer to do so than to expect you to personally tutor me in every facet of Anarcho-Syndicalism. Though if you have an FAQ or manifesto-like book for Anarcho-Syndicalism I'd love to read it.

Thank you for your time and patience comrade :)

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [ilia_volyova](#) 3 points · 8 months ago

↓ in this model, would the federal coordination institutions be completely voluntary? or would they have power to compel the members, under some circumstances (say, non-unanimous decisions in economic planning etc)?

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [guitarandcheese](#) 1 point · 8 months ago

↓ Not sure i understand the question... Who is "they" in this scenario?

Regardless, here is a useful video to understand left libertarian structure:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0RwlaNva_4g

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [ilia_volyova](#) 1 point · 8 months ago

↓ i'll try to watch the whole video tonight (no time right now). however, the question is rather elementary: in the system you propose, does 'federal coordination' ever result in non-voluntary/non-unanimous decisions? i am asking because such decisions seem necessary, if central planning is to be implemented (at least to some extend), and production is not yet fully automated.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [guitarandcheese](#) 1 point · 8 months ago

↓ To my understanding it would be voluntary. That is the essence of having a central organization without it becoming a "State". That being said, by not cooperating with the federation you give up a lot of power, and depending on the situation you might be met with economic sanctions/repercussion. So i can't really envision a scenario where NOT cooperating with central planning is actually beneficial.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)



[PeacefulComrade](#) 10 points · 8 months ago



He was a flawed implementer of communism by the most charitable interpretation of him and a egotistical despot who highjacked the communist movement for personal power at worst.

So much for anti-Communist propaganda. The kindergarten 'great man' theories aren't appreciated by real historians, it's just an easy method to manipulate the uneducated and promote the bias, which in this case leads to disregarding the advantages of communism and furthermore equating it to fascism.

I see the value of Marx, but Stalin and other 20th century communist leaders seem very problematic in many ways.

Name a perfect historical person, I'll wait. History is very problematic, it's never "one thing at a time", it's always complex, and it's always controversial, just as dialectical and historical materialism of Marxism imply. Study more about the USSR history from 1924 to 1953 and maybe Stalin's personal biography to get a better understanding why Stalin is so appreciated by today's communists.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)



[deleted] 8 points · 8 months ago



Stalin was the first one practicing socialism. He, and the society during that time certainly made mistakes, but those mistakes are important and likely, will never appear again.

Even though, many don't know what truely happened there. The terror was too soft, some changes were wrong, some, like 1936 Constitution, gave one of the keys to the further destruction of USSR. You'd better focus on that time. It keeps some interesting secrets, that can be overwhelmingly shocking when revealed.

And don't underestimate "bunch of dead Russian dudes". Our society hasn't changed that much from those times. Their lessons are very valuable today. What Lenin was describing 100 years ago as a future is now our everyday, basic reality.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)



[Anarcho-Bolshevik](#) 7 points · 8 months ago



Because anticommunists don't want to talk about anything else.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [Plasmic_Socialist](#) 7 points · 8 months ago

↓ This is actually one of the most key points that is so often overlooked. Anyone against communism or socialism attacks Stalin and "Stalinism" using bourgeois historians and capitalist propaganda as evidence. Many leftists just accept this partly because they're usually just as indoctrinated as liberals, but also because it's much easier to completely disavow him and use utopian and idealist visions of the future rather than reality when talking about communism.

I think it would be better just to embrace Stalin and promote the truth about him and the Soviet Union because capitulating to anticommunists may set us back in the long run.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [neuroklesis](#) 19 points · 8 months ago

↓ again, for the billionth time on here, give "Another View of Stalin" a read. It' debunks much of the liberal bourgeois historian perspective which you are heavily citing here.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [-ADEPT-](#) 5 points · 8 months ago

↓ Not a proper answer, but I contend that you should consider the self defense that was required to preserve the powerhouse that was the ussr (a poor, feudalistic region that rocketed towards world superpower, on par with countries that had been experiencing market innovation for several centuries prior). There was so much subterfuge and sabotage from the west it's really no wonder the guy was paranoid.

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [Haakipulver](#) 30 points · 8 months ago

↓ I'm sorry, but this isn't a very neutral, nuanced or properly researched view of history you provide here. The term "evil" really is an indicator of this as it is first and foremost unscientific, but also idealist af .

If you are serious about marxism, especially in practice, you should really look more into the subject. The USSR under Stalin leadership provides both inspirational accomplishments, but also some horror stories. A true marxist will take lessons from both.

Personally, after extensive research, i believe the "goods" outweigh the "bads" by an astronomical margin

I suggest you start with "Another view of Stalin" a real eye-opener

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)

↑ [dorian_gray11](#) 14 points · 8 months ago

↓ "Stalin: Man of History" is also excellent, and does a great job of highlighting Stalin's undeniably incredible achievements but not shying away from his ruthlessness and brutality.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ [Dagger_Moth](#) 7 points · 8 months ago

↓ Yeah, OP doesn't sound like a "history buff" if that's the framework that they're adopting.

Give Award Share Report Save

+ Comment removed by moderator 8 months ago (0 children)

+ Comment removed by moderator 8 months ago (1 child)

↑ [yungshrek](#) 2 points · 8 months ago

↓ I bought all of the high school caricatures of Stalin as a brutish strongman until I began to read Marx, and then Lenin. With an understanding of Marx, I still had the Trotskyist claim you mentioned above in mind — that Stalin 'betrayed' the revolution. Reading Lenin, I began to understand what "the revolution" was. But then came another discovery. As others in the thread have noted, Stalin did indeed produce volumes of written works, addressing political questions thoroughly and firmly, while also displaying a robust knowledge of the writings of Marx, Lenin, other socialists, and even philosophers such as Hegel and Feuerbach. This came as a big surprise. So, I began to ask, what did this guy have to say that took him literal thousands of pages of collected works to say?

Reading Stalin, I was surprised to see very little discrepancy between his and Lenin's use of materialist dialectics to address political questions. There are numerous points at which Stalin does differently than Lenin in policy, but there are also times when Lenin does differently than the mythological "Lenin" — for example, the New Economic Policy. When we investigate the particular conditions of these 'turns,' more often than not, we see a nuanced grasp of Marxist dialectics that is just as deliberate as Lenin's and just as measured in its balance of stakes, losses, and gains. Stalin, like Lenin, could appreciate the value of such and such retreats (the NEP, Socialism in One Country, etc,) when the future of the revolution depended on them, and even when ultra-left and rightist elements reacted strongly in dissent.

Further, the purges must be understood as a party phenomenon, and not something that comes down to one person — in this case, Stalin. Beria was responsible for a great number of these purges and acted opportunistically beyond the approval of his colleagues and superiors. G. Furr notes that Khrushchev was indeed an aggressive participant of the purges, which he later blamed on one person — Stalin.

ultimately the global socialist movement owes to the Stalin era

- the first affirmative action program in the world (Roland Boer's argument)
- the first measures by any government to outlaw ethnic chauvinism, and indeed, antisemitism, and punish pogromists firmly
- the defeat of the Nazi regime
- the genesis of other socialist movements around the world through the allyship of the Soviet Union
- the 1936 constitution (of which "Chapter X : Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens" is *especially* interesting)

Please check out this interview between H.G. Wells and J.V. Stalin, btw. I've found it to be very illuminating.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B_KybGq9rnszN19VNVI5ZG9FZmM/view?usp=drivesdk

Give Award Share Report Save



Genoskill 2 points · 8 months ago



Because he had balls to do the necessary. And that deserves respect.

Give Award Share Report Save



Kangodo 2 points · 8 months ago



Let's make two things clear:

1. Almost everything we know from Stalin comes from people who benefit from you believing bad things about him.
2. A lot of information comes from Trotsky. Trotsky was banished because was a fucking idiot who didn't think the rules applied to him, even rules he made up himself. He then got mad that he was banished and worked together with fascists in an attempt to start a coup in the USSR, he wanted to use the invasion of the USSR by Germany to take back power there. That is why the fucker got an icepick to his head.

He was a literal enforcer thug that other party members did not want to gain power

It was a democracy, the majority wanted him in power. If they didn't, they wouldn't have voted for him.

Lenin in particular called him out before his death

Lenin said he wanted someone who is exactly like Stalin, but just a little bit less rude. That's as if you say that someone is perfect, except for one little thing. People misquote this so-

called testament often. In reality Lenin and Stalin were close personal friends.

He was a power hungry

He often said he didn't want to be in power. He tried to step down several times and people begged him to stay.

paranoid

How was he paranoid? Because Trotsky literally worked together with fascists to overthrow him? Because the entire world had troops in the USSR during the Civil War in an attempt to stop communism? Because Hitler invaded his country and killed dozens of millions Soviet citizens? Stalin wasn't paranoid, he was being realistic.

his policies if growth resulted in more deaths and suffering

What policies? Please back it up when you make these claims.

in favor of a more nationalistic, militaristic plan.

It's not nationalism when you are literally a union of a dozen countries. And they worked hard on their military because across Poland you had this crazy little Austrian guy with a funny moustache saying he would build thousands of Tigers to eliminate all communists. Thank god that he did it, otherwise Germany would have won the Second World War.

Some links from me to you:

1. <http://marxism.halkcephesi.net/Grover%20Furr/Furr%20tortsky%20japan.pdf>
2. <https://revolutionaryleftradio.libsyn.com/joseph-mother-fucking-stalin>
3. <https://socialism-simplified.com/2018/12/28/einstein-h-g-wells-and-other-leading-figures-who-you-didnt-know-were-pro-stalin/>

Give Award Share Report Save



ARedBlueNoser 1 point · 8 months ago



<http://www.lulu.com/shop/ludo-martens/another-view-of-stalin/paperback/product-23896969.html>

Give Award Share Report Save



Marxist-Leninist-Khrushchevist [seth_se](#) 1 point · 8 months ago



I was banned from Communism101 for suggesting Stalin was a bad guy. Keep in mind I'm a Marxist-Leninist.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ FankFlank 0 points · 8 months ago

↓ I think who Stalin is isn't really important, for if we were to go back in time and kill Stalin as a baby, history would have turned out similarly.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ mistifies 4 points · 8 months ago

↓ What makes you say that?

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ PeacefulComrade 5 points · 8 months ago

↓ Historical materialism probably

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ Theodicee -2 points · 8 months ago

↓ I'm going to leave the more theoretical side of the discussion aside because I don't believe myself to be an authority when we're talking about Stalin. I just came here to say that, I think, the supporters of Stalin aren't with as many as some would think. There's the Trotskyist tradition and there are a lot of other forms of marxist/socialist/communist thought that condemn Stalin.

I think there is an image of most communist as being Stalinist because of some reasons. First of, there is a lot of anti-communist propaganda that equates socialism and communism, in all its forms, with Stalinism. Then, there are the memes. Supporting Stalin and making memes about him is edgy and some people like doing this without supporting his specific form of communism (or even knowing a lot about it). And, maybe Stalinist just shout louder and get more attention because of this?

Obviously, I didn't hold a survey on this or anything, so I don't know this as a fact. If I'm wrong, correct me.

Give Award Share Report Save

↑ ilia_volyova 6 points · 8 months ago

↓ I think there is an image of most communist as being Stalinist because of some reasons.

if 'most communists' include organisations like the communist parties of china or nepal or cuba or india (M) or greece, to name a few, this does not appear entirely inaccurate.

Give Award Share Report Save

+ Comment deleted by user 8 months ago (1 child)

+ Comment removed by moderator 8 months ago (1 child)



[foreverc4ts](#) -2 points · 8 months ago



I wish I knew too!

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)



[Insanebassninja](#) -3 points · 8 months ago



Most of them are tankies...

[Give Award](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#)