



r/communism:

Analysis, myth-debunking & other effort posts

Various authors

r/communism: The Book

Collected by u/Mother_Red_Vulture

r/Communism: How many layers of megathread are you on right now?

Reddit: Idk, maybe like 5 or 6 my dude.

r/Communism: You are like a baby, watch this.

- u/ladyscarlett22

Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| Preface | v |
| 1 Refuting General Anti-Socialist Claims | 1 |
| 1.1 The Most Common Anti-Socialist Myths | 2 |
| 1.2 Socialism is Good For You | 8 |
| 1.3 Refuting “The Nazis Were Socialists” | 11 |
| 1.4 Eastern European Views on Capitalism and Socialism | 13 |

Preface

In 1917, the world would be forever changed. In the Russian Empire, there existed a political party known as the Russian Social Democratic Party, or the Bolsheviks. Fed up with their empire's economic instability, industrial underdevelopment, appalling treatment of the working-class people, and the lack of initiative by the new provisional government to address these issues, they realized that a "reformist" plan of action was not tenable. In October that year, they overthrew the liberal provisional government and established a new nation, Soviet Russia. Over the next five years, they fought against the fascist forces of the White Army and its international allies to secure their massive country, and in 1922, such security was permanently recognized. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, otherwise known as the Soviet Union, became the successor to the autocratic, capitalist badlands of the Russian Empire. The Soviet Union would lead its working people on the path towards communism, a state of society in which there is no existence of class, money or the state, and the means of production are commonly owned by all working members of the community.

The establishment of the Soviet Union would inspire many similar revolutions across the world, in which vanguard parties of proletariats (the working class) would take power in their capitalist-torn nations and established socialist societies. Power over the means of production would be taken from the greedy bourgeoisies (the ruling class) and given over to the proletariat, so that they could build their nations into industrial powerhouses of modernity, together and democratically.

This way of thinking is commonly known as Marxism-Leninism, named after its founders Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin, the latter of whom was the founder of the Soviet Union. Marxist-Leninist states have been established all across the globe, and the achievements of these nations—both economically and socially—have been tremendous, and have rivalled the accomplishments of their capitalist counterparts. Unfortunately, they have also been under constant scrutiny and persecution from the imperialist action of said counterparts, and most Marxist-Leninist nations have either submitted to "free market" regression and eventual dissolution, or have been forcefully overthrown by strong capitalist powers, most notably the United States of America.

Nevertheless, Marxist-Leninist theory persists among a small number of proletariats today, and this persistence has been accompanied by a general growing disillusionment with capitalism and its unstable forces across the world. A 2019 study by the PR firm Edelman shows that 56% of the world's population is "dissatisfied" with capitalism, and an Axios survey done the same year showed that at least 40% of Americans prefer their varying definitions of "socialism" to capitalism.

Clearly, the proletarians of the world are once again beginning to wake up to the true nature of the situations they live in. And the internet has only made it infinitely easier for the average working-class person to communicate with and learn from other like-minded individuals from any location on earth. Enter r/communism, an online community powered by the social media website Reddit, and the largest forum on the internet for communists who subscribe to Marxist-Leninist thought. Established in 2008, r/communism has grown to hold approximately 131,000 members as of March 2020. In those twelve years—almost exclusively the past five—dozens of large written posts, known as "masterposts" or "megathreads," have been created by members of our subreddit on various issues and topics pertaining to our ideology. Whether they be detailed analyses of former ML states that cite academic sources, or well-written essays refuting the many lies and myths of socialism, there is a lot to be learned here if you are a newly professed ML looking for short answers to the many questions you may have.

This book is a compilation of 54 of said masterposts and megathreads, written by two dozen authors over the course of a near six-year period, from mid-2014 up until just this year. Some of them have been somewhat altered from their original state to be more suited for book form, but otherwise remain virtually identical to their original posts. We obviously do not advocate these texts over the works of professional Marxist-Leninist thinkers, but for those who are quite new to the ideology, these relatively simple and straightforward posts can offer a suitable starting point.

Even if you are not a communist or Marxist-Leninist, but are simply intrigued by some of our arguments, we welcome you to read this book as well. Regardless of your ideology, we hope that you find something educational in these pages, and that you can develop a better understanding of who we are, and what we stand for!

Long live the struggle against capitalism, imperialism and fascism!

Long live the people!

Workers of the world, unite!

Chapter 1

Refuting General Anti-Socialist Claims

1.1 The Most Common Anti-Socialist Myths: A Response

Written by u/flesh_eating_turtle on the 11th of February 2020

Introduction

Hello everyone. I just wanted to provide some quick sources to refute the most common anti-socialist myths tossed around online, as a quick reference for arguments with liberals and reactionaries. I hope you all find it useful.

Myth #1: Capitalism and Liberal Democracy Are Popular

According to a recent survey conducted by Edelman (the world's largest PR firm, based in the United States), 56% of the world's people feel that capitalism does "more harm than good in the world."¹

In addition, a recent survey from Cambridge found that 58% of the world's people are "dissatisfied" with liberal democracy.² These figures indicate growing global discontent with the capitalist system.

Myth #2: Capitalism is Democratic

The evidence overwhelmingly contradicts this point. Let's take the United States as our example; according to a study from Princeton University,³ "the preferences of the average American appear to have only a minuscule, near-zero, statistically non-significant impact upon public policy." As the study puts it:

We believe that if policy-making is dominated by powerful business organizations and a small number of affluent Americans, then America's claims to being a democratic society are seriously threatened.

In addition, a study from Northwestern University found that the wealthy "are extremely active politically and that they are much more conservative than the American public as a whole with respect to important policies concerning taxation, economic regulation, and especially social welfare programs."⁴ They also state:

We suggest that these distinctive policy preferences may help account for why certain public policies in the United States appear

¹John, "Capitalism seen doing 'more harm than good' in global survey".

²Bennett Institute, *Global dissatisfaction with democracy at record high, new Cambridge report reveals*.

³Gilens and Page, "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens".

⁴Page, Bartels, and Seawright, "Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans".

to deviate from what the majority of US citizens wants the government to do. If this is so, it raises serious issues for democratic theory.

The people as a whole support significantly more left-wing policies (according to the above study, more than half of all Americans support state-run universal healthcare, wealth redistribution, and a jobs guarantee), but these policies are blocked by the ruling class. These issues can be expected to occur in other capitalist nations as well.

Myth #3: Public Ownership is Inefficient

There is little-to-no evidence that SOEs (state-owned enterprises) are less efficient than private enterprises, given similar external conditions. According to a study conducted at Cambridge University (put out by the United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs),⁵ “there is no clear systematic evidence that SOEs are burdens on the economy.” The study further notes that “Despite popular perception, encouraged by the business media and contemporary conventional wisdom and rhetoric, SOEs can be efficient and well-run.” It points out:

Many countries achieved economic success with a large SOE sector... Conversely, many unsuccessful economies have small SOE sectors.

A study from Stanford University’s Center on Global Poverty and Development evaluated both public and private enterprises in China,⁶ finding the former to be significantly more productive, even when controlling for favorable market conditions and better management:

We find that, the labor productivity and TFP of SOEs are significantly higher than private firms... Furthermore, this paper finds that, although better human capital, more market power and better management can explain partially why productivity in SOEs are higher, there remains a large share of the SOE advantage in productivity that is still left unexplained.

Another study,⁷ published in the *International Journal of Production Economics*, measured the efficiency of public and private enterprises, using Spain as an example. They found that SOEs showed similar or slightly higher efficiency relative to private enterprises:

⁵Chang, “State-Owned Enterprise Reform”.

⁶Cheng, H. Li, and T. Li, *The Performance of State-Owned Enterprise: New Evidence from the China Employer-Employee Survey*.

⁷Arocena and Oliveros, “The efficiency of state-owned and privatized firms: Does ownership make a difference?”

In short, SOEs were not amongst the most inefficient in their sectors, but neither among the most efficient, showing a level of efficiency similar or slightly above the median of the efficiency of private companies... our findings would challenge the recurrent argument on the need of privatizing these companies due to their high levels of inefficiency.

While some enterprises did experience an increase in efficiency after privatization, other studies have indicated that this is due to structural changes that occurred *before* the privatization took place. Even the above paper notes that “other studies provide evidence that profitability increases *before* privatization, suggesting that governments can effectively restructure companies before selling them.” It should also be noted that in most cases (eight out of fourteen) “differences in efficiency before and after privatization are not statistically significant.”

Other studies have supported the idea that pre-privatization restructuring is the primary factor in increased efficiency. For example, one study,⁸ published in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, looks at the impact of privatization on efficiency in Britain, noting that “the most dramatic changes have occurred in state-owned enterprises like (pre-privatization) British Steel and British Coal, where productivity gains have been massive by any standards.”

Privatization also depends fundamentally on the competence of the government which carries it out. This presents a conundrum; according to the aforementioned UN study:⁹

At root, it appears that if a government has the capacity and capability to conduct a good privatization, it probably also has the capacity to operate good SOEs; whereas, if a government does not have the capacity to operate good SOEs, it likely also lacks the capacity to conduct a good privatization.

To further complicate matters, the problems that state-owned enterprises *do* have often occur in private firms as well; as the above UN study puts it:

All the key arguments against SOEs—the principal-agent problem, the free-rider problem, and the soft budget constraints—apply to large private sector firms with dispersed ownership.

While public ownership is not problem-free, there is no good evidence to suggest that it is less efficient than private ownership.

⁸Vickers and Yarrow, “Economic Perspectives on Privatization”.

⁹Chang, “State-Owned Enterprise Reform”.

Myth #4: Capitalism Meets Human Needs Better Than Socialism

Socialism has been consistently superior to capitalism in terms of meeting human needs. A study published in the *International Journal of Health Services* notes that “contrary to dominant ideology, socialism and socialist forces have been, for the most part, better able to improve health conditions than have capitalism and capitalist forces.”¹⁰

Another study,¹¹ published in the *American Journal of Public Health*, measured physical quality of life (PQL) in capitalist and socialist countries, finding that:

In 28 of 30 comparisons between countries at similar levels of economic development, socialist countries showed more favorable PQL outcomes... Our findings indicate that countries with socialist political-economic systems can make great strides toward meeting basic human needs, even without extensive economic resources. When much of the world’s population suffers from disease, early death, malnutrition, and illiteracy, these observations take on a meaning that goes beyond cold statistics.

A subsequent study,¹² published in the *International Journal of Health Services*, verified these results, finding that “in general, nations with strong left-wing regimes have more favorable health outcomes (e.g., longer life expectancies and lower mortality rates) than do those with strong right-wing regimes.”

These results can be explained by referencing the aforementioned UN study;¹³ as it noted:

As a “one-dollar-one-vote” system, markets are not likely to adequately meet the basic needs of the poor. For example, 20 times more money is spent on research on slimming drugs than on research on malaria, a disease that kills more than a million people every year. If we want a broad-based and politically sustainable development, we need to find mechanisms that can meet the basic needs of everyone.

These facts must be taken into consideration.

¹⁰Navarro, “Has Socialism Failed? An Analysis of Health Indicators under Socialism”.

¹¹Cereseto and Waitzkin, “Economic Development, Political-Economic System, and the Physical Quality of Life”.

¹²Lena and London, “The Political and Economic Determinants of Health Outcomes: A Cross-National Analysis”.

¹³Chang, “State-Owned Enterprise Reform”.

Myth #5: Capitalism is Eliminating Global Poverty

According to an article by Jason Hickel (London School of Economics),¹⁴ global poverty is significantly higher than most people believe, due to the absurdly low poverty line used by the World Bank (\$1.90 a day). As he puts it:

It's obscenely low by any standard, and we now have piles of evidence that people living just above this line have terrible levels of malnutrition and mortality. Earning \$2 per day doesn't mean that you're somehow suddenly free of extreme poverty. Not by a long shot.

If a more reasonable poverty standard (such as \$7.40) is used, “we see that the number of people living under this line has increased dramatically since measurements began in 1981, reaching some 4.2 billion people today.” It must also be noted that most actual poverty reduction since 1981 has occurred in China, which is hardly a free market society (five-year plans are still drawn up, and the state still owns most strategic industries). As Hickel puts it:

Moreover, the few gains that have been made have virtually all happened in one place: China. It is disingenuous, then, for the likes of Gates and Pinker to claim these gains as victories for Washington-consensus neoliberalism. Take China out of the equation, and the numbers look even worse. Over the four decades since 1981, not only has the number of people in poverty gone up, the proportion of people in poverty has remained stagnant at about 60%. It would be difficult to overstate the suffering that these numbers represent.

Finally, according to a study published in the *World Social and Economic Review*,¹⁵ eliminating global poverty will be functionally impossible without a significant reduction in global inequality:

Poverty eradication, even at \$1.25-a-day, and especially at a poverty line which better reflects the satisfaction of basic needs, can be reconciled with global carbon constraints only by a major increase in the share of the poorest in global economic growth, far beyond what can realistically be achieved by existing instruments of development policy—that is, by effective measures to reduce global inequality.

These facts make a continued capitalist model highly untenable.

¹⁴Hickel, “Bill Gates says poverty is decreasing. He couldn't be more wrong”.

¹⁵Woodward, “*Incrementum ad Absurdum*: Global Growth, Inequality and Poverty Eradication in a Carbon-Constrained World”.

Sources

- Arocena, Pablo and Diana Oliveros. “The efficiency of state-owned and privatized firms: Does ownership make a difference?” In: *International Journal of Production Economics* 140.1 (2012). Sustainable Development of Manufacturing and Services, pp. 457–465. ISSN: 0925-5273. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2012.06.029. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925527312002745>.
- Bennett Institute for Public Policy, Cambridge. *Global dissatisfaction with democracy at record high, new Cambridge report reveals*. Jan. 29, 2020. URL: <https://www.bennettinstitute.cam.ac.uk/news/global-dissatisfaction-democracy-record-high-new-c/>.
- Cereseto, Shirley and Howard Waitzkin. “Economic Development, Political-Economic System, and the Physical Quality of Life”. In: *American Journal of Public Health* 76.6 (June 1986), pp. 661–666. DOI: 10.2105/ajph.76.6.661.
- Chang, Ha-Joon. “State-Owned Enterprise Reform”. In: *National Development Strategies Policy Notes*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, June 2007. URL: https://esa.un.org/techcoop/documents/PN_SOERreformNote.pdf.
- Cheng, Hong, Hongbin Li, and Tang Li. *The Performance of State-Owned Enterprise: New Evidence from the China Employer-Employee Survey*. Research rep. Stanford Center on Global Poverty and Development, Jan. 2018. eprint: <https://kingcenter.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/1037wp.pdf>.
- Gilens, Martin and Benjamin I. Page. “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens”. In: *Perspectives on Politics* 12.3 (2014), pp. 564–581. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592714001595. URL: https://scholar.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/mgilens/files/gilens_and_page_2014-testing_theories_of_american_politics.doc.pdf.
- Hickel, Jason. “Bill Gates says poverty is decreasing. He couldn’t be more wrong”. In: *The Guardian* (Jan. 29, 2020). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jan/29/bill-gates-davos-global-poverty-infographic-neoliberal>.
- John, Mark. “Capitalism seen doing ‘more harm than good’ in global survey”. In: *Reuters* (Jan. 19, 2020). URL: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-davos-meeting-trust-idUSKBN1ZJ0CW>.
- Lena, Hugh F. and Bruce London. “The Political and Economic Determinants of Health Outcomes: A Cross-National Analysis”. In: *International Journal of Health Services* 23.3 (1993), pp. 585–602. DOI: 10.2190/EQUY-ACG8-X59F-AE99.

- Navarro, Vicente. “Has Socialism Failed? An Analysis of Health Indicators under Socialism”. In: *International Journal of Health Services* 22.4 (1992), pp. 583–601. DOI: 10.2190/B2TP-3R5M-Q7UP-DUA2.
- Page, Benjamin I., Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright. “Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans”. In: *Perspectives on Politics* 11.1 (2013), pp. 51–73. DOI: 10.1017/S153759271200360X. URL: <http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/~jnd260/cab/CAB2012%20-%20Page1.pdf>.
- Vickers, John and George Yarrow. “Economic Perspectives on Privatization”. In: *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5.2 (June 1991), pp. 111–132. DOI: 10.1257/jep.5.2.111. URL: <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/jep.5.2.111>.
- Woodward, David K. “*Incrementum ad Absurdum*: Global Growth, Inequality and Poverty Eradication in a Carbon-Constrained World”. In: *World Social and Economic Review* 4 (Feb. 9, 2015). URL: <http://wer.worldeconomicsassociation.org/papers/incrementum-ad-absurdum-global-growth-inequality-and-poverty-eradication-in-a-carbon-constrained-world/>.

1.2 Socialism is Good For You: Health, Welfare, and Quality of Life

Written by u/flesh_eating_turtle on the 1st of March 2020

Introduction

Hello everybody. When discussing a contentious political issue, it is often useful to examine the empirical evidence before coming to a conclusion. Seeing as healthcare is consistently ranked as one of the most important issues in nations like the USA,¹⁶ it will be helpful to examine the matter more closely, to determine what socialism has to offer here. Feel free to use Sci-Hub to bypass any paywalls.

Socialism, Health, and Welfare

According to a study by Vicente Navarro (Johns Hopkins University),¹⁷ published in the *International Journal of Health Services*, “contrary to dominant ideology, socialism and socialist forces have been, for the most part, better able to improve health conditions than have capitalism and capitalist forces.” He states that “the historical experience of socialism has not been one of failure. To the contrary: it has been, for the most part, more successful than capitalism in improving the health conditions of the world’s populations.”

¹⁶Hrynowski, “Several Issues Tie as Most Important in 2020 Election”.

¹⁷Navarro, “Has Socialism Failed? An Analysis of Health Indicators under Socialism”.

A well-known study published in the *American Journal of Public Health* found that “socialist countries generally have achieved better PQL [physical quality of life] outcomes than the capitalist countries at equivalent levels of economic development.”¹⁸ These results were verified in a later follow-up study,¹⁹ published in the *International Journal of Health Services*, which found that “in general, nations with strong left-wing regimes have more favorable health outcomes (e.g., longer life expectancies and lower mortality rates) than do those with strong right-wing regimes.”

Nobel-winning economist Amartya Sen (Harvard University) authored a study looking at quality of life in developing countries.²⁰ He found that “Clearly the relative performance of communist countries is superior,” prompting him to remark, “One thought that is bound to occur is that communism is good for poverty removal.” Similarly, a study published in the journal *Population and Development Review* observed “a general association between communism and low mortality, at least among poor countries.”²¹

Even reformist policies (insufficient though they are) can have a positive effect. One study from Texas A&M University found that “citizens find life more rewarding as the generosity of the welfare state increases,”²² concluding that “socialism... provides the potential for improving the human condition, in so far as we agree that making ‘life as satisfying as possible’ is the appropriate standard of evaluation.”

Another study, published in the *International Journal of Health Services*,²³ found that “political traditions more committed to redistributive policies (both economic and social) and full-employment policies, such as the social democratic parties, were generally more successful in improving the health of populations.”

Capitalism’s Harmful Impact

There is significant evidence that capitalist policies have a detrimental effect on health, particularly as they result in inequality. According to a study published in the *International Journal of Health Services*,²⁴ “there is a strong correlation between income inequality and [negative] health outcomes.” In addition, they found that “countries that do not use International Monetary Fund loans perform better on health outcomes.”

¹⁸Cereseto and Waitzkin, “Economic Development, Political-Economic System, and the Physical Quality of Life”.

¹⁹Lena and London, “The Political and Economic Determinants of Health Outcomes: A Cross-National Analysis”.

²⁰Sen, “Public Action and the Quality of Life in Developing Countries”.

²¹Bryant, “Communism, Poverty, and Demographic Change in North Vietnam”.

²²Pacek and Freeman, *The Welfare State and Quality of Life: A Cross-National Analysis*.

²³Navarro and Shi, “The Political Context of Social Inequalities and Health”.

²⁴Ferre, “Economic Inequalities in Latin America at the Base of Adverse Health Indicators”.

Conclusion

In short, socialism provides the best means of achieving high quality-of-life and good health outcomes, compared to capitalism.

Sources

- Bryant, John. “Communism, Poverty, and Demographic Change in North Vietnam”. In: *Population and Development Review* 24.2 (1998), pp. 235–269. ISSN: 00987921, 17284457. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2807973>.
- Cereseto, Shirley and Howard Waitzkin. “Economic Development, Political-Economic System, and the Physical Quality of Life”. In: *American Journal of Public Health* 76.6 (June 1986), pp. 661–666. DOI: 10.2105/ajph.76.6.661.
- Ferre, Juan Cruz. “Economic Inequalities in Latin America at the Base of Adverse Health Indicators”. In: *International Journal of Health Services* 46.3 (2016), pp. 501–522. DOI: 10.1177/0020731416653428.
- Hrynowski, Zach. “Several Issues Tie as Most Important in 2020 Election”. In: *Gallup News* (Jan. 13, 2020). URL: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/276932/several-issues-tie-important-2020-election.aspx>.
- Lena, Hugh F. and Bruce London. “The Political and Economic Determinants of Health Outcomes: A Cross-National Analysis”. In: *International Journal of Health Services* 23.3 (1993), pp. 585–602. DOI: 10.2190/EQUY-ACG8-X59F-AE99.
- Navarro, Vicente. “Has Socialism Failed? An Analysis of Health Indicators under Socialism”. In: *International Journal of Health Services* 22.4 (1992), pp. 583–601. DOI: 10.2190/B2TP-3R5M-Q7UP-DUA2.
- Navarro, Vicente and Leiyu Shi. “The Political Context of Social Inequalities and Health”. In: *International Journal of Health Services* 31.1 (2001), pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.2190/1GY8-V5QN-A1TA-A9KJ.
- Pacek, Alexander and Benjamin Freeman. *The Welfare State and Quality of Life: A Cross-National Analysis*. eprint: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.489.8918&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Sen, Amartya. “Public Action and the Quality of Life in Developing Countries”. In: *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 43.4 (1981), pp. 287–319. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0084.1981.mp43004001.x. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1468-0084.1981.mp43004001.x>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0084.1981.mp43004001.x>.

1.3 Refuting “The Nazis Were Socialists” With Academic Sources

Written by u/flesh_eating_turtle on the 4th of January 2020

Introduction

Hello comrades. There’s been an upsurge in reactionary nonsense lately, with people making false claims intended to either excuse the horrific actions of fascist regimes, or slander socialist ones by association. As such, I figured it would be useful to provide some quick refutations of these myths.

“The Nazis Were Socialists!”

The Nazis favored privatization and opposed socialist economics in every way they could. According to a study published in *The Journal of Economic History* (published by the Cambridge University Press):²⁵

Irrespective of a quite bad overall performance, an important characteristic of the economy of the Third Reich, and a big difference from a centrally planned one, was the role private ownership of firms was playing—in practice as well as in theory. The ideal Nazi economy would liberate the creativeness of a multitude of private entrepreneurs in a predominantly competitive framework gently directed by the state to achieve the highest welfare of the Germanic people.

The Nazis despised nationalization, and instead pushed for intense privatization whenever they got the chance:

Available sources make perfectly clear that the Nazi regime did not want at all a German economy with public ownership of many or all enterprises. Therefore it generally had no intention whatsoever of nationalizing private firms or creating state firms. On the contrary the reprivatization of enterprises was furthered wherever possible.

On the rare occasions when they were forced to make use of state-owned factories, they included a contract option allowing private owners to purchase it. In addition, they avoided the creation of state-owned enterprises whenever possible, favoring private investment:

State-owned plants were to be avoided wherever possible. Nevertheless, sometimes they were necessary when private industry

²⁵Buchheim and Scherner, “The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy: The Case of Industry”.

was not prepared to realize a war-related investment on its own. In these cases, the Reich often insisted on the inclusion in the contract of an option clause according to which the private firm operating the plant was entitled to purchase it. Even the establishment of *Reichswerke Hermann Goring* in 1937 is no contradiction to the rule that the Reich principally did not want public ownership of enterprises. The Reich in fact tried hard to win the German industry over to engage in the project.

In short, *no, the Nazis were not socialists*. Now, let's quickly refute another myth.

“The Nazis Saved the German Economy!”

This is a favorite of fascist apologists everywhere. However, in reality, the Nazi economy was a tremendous failure, and led to enormous reductions in living standards for the German people. According to a study published in the journal *Economics and Human Biology*:²⁶

The results imply that Germany experienced a substantial increase in mortality rates in most age groups in the mid-1930s, even relative to those of 1932, the worst year of the Great Depression. Moreover, children's heights—an indicator of the quality of nutrition and health—were generally stagnating between 1933 and 1938, but had increased significantly during the 1920s. Persecution, by itself, does not explain such an adverse development in biological welfare; the non-persecuted segments of the German population were affected as well.

These problems were the direct result of Nazi economic policy:

The reason for this adverse development was caused by the fact that military expenditures increased at the expense of public health measures. In addition, food imports were curtailed, and prices of many agricultural products were controlled. There is ample evidence that this set of economic policies had an adverse effect on the health and nutritional status of the population.

I hope this clears this issue up.

²⁶Baten and Wagner, “Autarchy, market disintegration, and health: the mortality and nutritional crisis in Nazi Germany, 1933–1937”.

Conclusion

I hope you comrades find these sources helpful. Be sure to cite them properly when debating with liberals and reactionaries; the worst thing we can do for our cause is defend it poorly.

Stay informed comrades.

Sources

Baten, Jörg and Andrea Wagner. “Autarchy, market disintegration, and health: the mortality and nutritional crisis in Nazi Germany, 1933–1937”. In: *Economics & Human Biology* 1.1 (2003), pp. 1–28. ISSN: 1570-677X. DOI: 10.1016/S1570-677X(02)00002-3. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1570677X02000023>.

Buchheim, Christoph and Jonas Scherner. “The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy: The Case of Industry”. In: *The Journal of Economic History* 66.2 (2006), pp. 390–416. ISSN: 00220507, 14716372. eprint: <http://piketty.pse.ens.fr/files/capitalisback/CountryData/Germany/Other/Pre1950Series/RefsHistoricalGermanAccounts/BuchheimSchermer06.pdf>. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3874882>.

1.4 Breakdown of Eastern European Views on Capitalism and Socialism (By Nation)

Written by u/flesh_eating_turtle on the 18th of December 2019

Introduction

Hello comrades. I decided to do some calculations to figure out the percentage of Eastern Europeans who feel that life in their country was better under socialism. To do this, I made a table, and added the nations, populations, and degree of popular opinion within the individual nation. My sources for these numbers and percentages are at the end.

Table and Analysis

| Nation | Population | Percent Favor- ing Life Under Socialism | Number Favor- ing Life Under Socialism |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|--|
| Russia | 144,438,554 | 63% | 95,329,446 |
| Ukraine | 42,386,403 | 72% | 30,518,210 |
| Belarus | 9,491,800 | 38% | 3,606,884 |
| Moldova | 2,681,735 | 42% | 1,126,328 |
| Azerbaijan | 9,981,457 | 31% | 3,094,252 |
| Georgia | 3,729,600 | 33% | 1,230,768 |
| Armenia | 3,046,100 | 66% | 2,010,426 |
| Kazakhstan | 18,195,900 | 25% | 4,548,975 |
| Tajikistan | 9,420,175 | 52% | 4,898,491 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 6,389,500 | 61% | 3,897,595 |
| Turkmenistan | 5,983,043 | 8% | 478,643 |
| Lithuania | 2,742,221 | 30% | 822,666 |
| Bulgaria | 7,000,039 | 68% | 4,760,027 |
| Serbia | 7,020,858 | 81% | 5,686,895 |
| Romania | 20,121,641 | 69% | 13,883,932 |
| Hungary | 9,798,000 | 45% | 4,409,100 |
| Eastern Germany | 13,600,000 | 20% | 2,600,000 |
| Poland | 37,868,701 | 19% | 7,195,053 |
| Czech Republic | 10,698,355 | 22% | 2,353,638 |
| Slovakia | 5,458,230 | 39% | 2,128,710 |
| Total | 370,052,312 | 53% | 194,580,039 |

It is clear from these statistics that the capitalist system has failed to improve life for the majority of people in Eastern Europe.

It must also be noted that these numbers factor in the entire population of these nations, including the young people born into capitalism. However, as Pew Research Center notes,²⁷ “those who lived through communism have a more negative view of the post-communist era.” In other words, the percentage favoring socialism would be significantly higher if those who never actually experienced socialism were discounted. This would also be true if we discounted those described by Pew as “higher income,” as among the working class, support for socialism is far higher (as Pew shows in their study). For example, in Slovakia, 67% of “higher income” people say that capitalism has improved their standard of living, while only 37% of “lower income” people say the same. However, given that most studies do not make this distinction, I have included the entire populations here.

²⁷ Wike et al., *European Public Opinion Three Decades After the Fall of Communism*, p. 29.

One might also note that support for socialism tends to be highest in those nations which had their own independent revolutions. Nations which were compelled to adopt socialism (such as the Czech Republic) tend to have less favorable views. This indicates the importance of independent revolution.

Finally, it should be noted that support for socialism in Belarus is likely higher than the statistic indicates. This is because that nation has retained a largely state-owned economy (as well as extensive social benefits) since the fall of the USSR, and thus the question asked in Belarus (“Has the fall of the USSR hurt your country?”) is likely to have given a misleading answer (they were not as hurt because they largely retained socialism).

Question Details and Conclusion

In some nations, the people were asked “Has the fall of the USSR benefited or harmed your country?” In these cases, the percentage that said “harmed” was counted. In other nations, the people were asked whether capitalism has had a positive impact on living standards. In these cases, the percentage that said “no” was counted. In Serbia, people were asked when they lived best. Those who chose “under socialism” were counted.

For those nations not included here, I was unable to find the statistics. I apologize for any omissions.

Sources

- Balkan Investigative Reporting Network. “Serbia Poll: Life Was Better Under Tito”. In: *Balkan Insight* (Dec. 24, 2010). URL: <https://balkaninsight.com/2010/12/24/for-simon-poll-serbians-unsure-who-runs-their-country/>.
- EFE. “‘Con el comunismo se vivía mejor’: el 66% de los rumanos votaría al dictador Ceausescu”. In: *El Mundo* (Apr. 10, 2014). URL: <https://www.elmundo.es/internacional/2014/04/10/5346de4d268e3e8f598b458c.html>.
- Esipova, Neli and Julie Ray. “Former Soviet Countries See More Harm From Breakup”. In: *Gallup News* (Dec. 19, 2013). URL: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/166538/former-soviet-countries-harm-breakup.aspx>.
- Wike, Richard et al. *European Public Opinion Three Decades After the Fall of Communism*. Research rep. Pew Research Center, Oct. 15, 2019. eprint: <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/10/Pew-Research-Center-Value-of-Europe-report-FINAL-UPDATED.pdf>. URL: <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2019/10/15/european-public-opinion-three-decades-after-the-fall-of-communism/>.