

From Tsarism to Soviet Communism: The Historical Continuity of Authoritarian Political Culture

Dr. Muhammad Ahmad¹, Dr. Adnan Tariq², Muhammad Shafi³

¹ Lecturer, Political Science Govt. Graduate College Township, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: ahmadsheikhlahore@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Institute of Global and Historical Studies, GC University, Lahore. Email: dr.adnantariq@gcu.edu.pk

³ Associate Professor, Government Shalimar College, Lahore. Email: Shafiisahib@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63163/jpehss.v3i1.1639>

Abstract

The Russian state has frequently been characterized by highly centralized political authority, limited political pluralism, and a persistent tradition of authoritarian governance. While the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 introduced a radically different ideological framework, it inherited and adapted many institutional and political practices that had long characterized the Tsarist Empire. This article examines the historical evolution of the Russian monolithic state by tracing the continuity of centralized authority from the Tsarist period to the Soviet Union. It argues that Soviet authoritarianism was not solely a product of Marxist-Leninist ideology but also reflected enduring political traditions rooted in imperial governance, bureaucratic centralization, and the suppression of dissent. The study identifies four interrelated historical legacies—autocracy, authoritarianism, imperial expansion, and intolerance of political opposition—as defining characteristics of Russian state formation. Drawing upon historical and political scholarship, the article demonstrates how these traditions shaped Soviet political institutions and contributed to the emergence of one of the twentieth century's most centralized political systems. By emphasizing the historical continuity between Tsarist and Soviet governance, the article contributes to broader debates on state formation, political culture, and authoritarian resilience in modern Russia.

Introduction

A monolith is a superstructure instituted with high authoritative powers in one hand (person or group) and stretched all over the premise (empire). It is a system, which inculcated uniformity in every feature of static affairs from the top to the bottom layers of society. Fascist parties of Germany and Italy promulgated such types of the system in the 1930s to perpetuate their totalitarian designs. This type of system with its most modern form was established in U.S.S.R from 1917 to the early eighties (up to Gorbachev). Political scientists classify such a system as an authoritarian set up in which no opposition to the state can be permitted.ⁱ Traditional authoritarians were the rule of few in the name of few but modern authoritarianism is of oligarchic type as the rule of few in the name of many.ⁱⁱ

Authoritarian tradition of Imperial Russia

The monolithic traditions of Russia comprised four major features: authoritarianism, autocracy, imperialism, and suppression of dissident. The tsarist monarchy of Russia was the most absolutist authority in the European continent among its contemporary monarchies. The tsarist monarchy did not let emerge any sort of free voice and suppression of dissidents was the precedent of Russia since the inception of the tsarist monarchy. Russia was an empire with cruel imperialist designs. From the 15th century to the Bolshevik revolution, the Russian empire consolidated itself by capturing and annexing more and more territories in the Baltic region and Central Asian. Russia's political culture had been always inhospitable to any form of diversity and pluralism. Brute autocracy was the all-time prevalent phenomenon in Russian history. This dominant feature nonetheless had roots back hundreds of years. After the success of the communist revolution, these features of brute autocracy were supposed to be eradicated but instead of shattering them, they got further solidification first by Lenin, though conditionally on transitional supposition, and secondly by Stalin and his successors. That was the way since the inception of creating a super centralized structure of the state in a brute totalitarian style, which led to its collapse.

New State Crafting Under Bolsheviks

Even Lenin reflected tendencies towards a strong center.ⁱⁱⁱ In 1902 he showed strict tendencies regarding the party's organizational discipline. This strictness resulted immediately in a split within the party. Lenin was of the view that Russia was an agrarian country populated with illiterate peasant with the very small proletariat and educated middle class so it is difficult to organize the party in the deep mass root level of it was realized a strong and centrally disciplined party.^{iv} When Bolshevik seized power, they had to face a multifaceted hostile situation. The socialist utopia could only be practiced in highly developed industrial countries because of their mature proletariat classes.^v However, in Russian, the ground was almost diametrically opposite to the required condition. There was no united communist party with strong central control. According to Marxism socialist revolution was to emerge from the masses but this October revolution was a revolution from above which got success only due to the existed power vacuum first by the Tsarist over through then by abolishing provisional government. The provisional government lost due to the lack of any workable socialist program, which could successfully put Russian on the communist track. Bolshevik faced the same situation but they survived why? This is the most important question whose answer could provide us the key to comprehend the step-by-step formation of the monolithic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Bolshevik party survived its static formation due to its tactics and policies, which were different, form the original socialist program.

Centralization Policy

After the revolution soviet regime started to abandon the very idea of Marxism and the Soviet state has moved symmetrically towards the set of policies in which the maintenance and enlargement of its power and authority had become the primary objective for the course of action to reconcile the emerging conditions.^{vi} According to Rostov this pursuit for and the emergence of totalitarian Russia was step by step historical process rather than a result of a conscious plan.^{vii} The October Revolution was followed by civil war. The consolidation of Bolshevik power took almost three years. According to *Moshe Levin* a famous Sovietologist, Russian conditions, at the time of October revolution, were not fit for any pre-packaged theoretical model so that was why Bolshevik got enough time during the hostile condition to get transformed the leading elite of Bolshevik cadre into a closed sector new ruling class with strong centralized power which proved to be very advantageous to confront the civil war and other hostile situation.^{viii}

The October Revolution was a revolution from above and what were the major political events and shifts all were orchestrated from above. The political changes and process all from above were deeply rooted into the authoritarian nature of Russian history as well as the political, social, and economic condition of two decades of post-revolutionary Russia was also very much responsible for the extremely center oriented politics and policies which culminated soon in the establishment of a monolithic structure. Bolshevik party was a new instrument for imperial formation. Russia was always in need of a despotic system so that its multi-faceted problem could be reconciled with autocratic repressive measures. That was why the absolutist Bolshevik party replaced the absolutist tsarist's monarchy. The principle of autocratic inevitably firmly rooted in Russian political culture contributed towards the stability of a new socialist order.

An emergency program that was imposed from the top by dictatorial measure tackled all the urgent military-political and economic difficulties. The red army was created to deal with civil war and secret police were created for the protection of the regime by anarchist tendencies within Soviet territory. All the events between 1917-1921 dominated by the civil war and other hostilities were all responsible to prepare the ground for a dictatorial setup for a considerable period. The Bolshevik introduced the socialist system in 1917 ways to be an intermediate period as a middle ground between capitalism and communism. Class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat and this dictatorship of the proletariat only constituted a transitional period until the abolition of all classes and in such a way classless society emerged. In his book *critique of the politic economy*, Marx wrote that "between capitalism and communism there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist society into communist society".^{ix} But in Russia, the case was different as it was an agrarian country with not appropriate bourgeoisie class to play the ground for the transition.

Lenin presented his, 'April Thesis' very before the October revolution.^x According to this thesis, the phase of the 'National Democratic Revolution,' had to be obligated by the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat.'^{xi} This 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' was started but within years after Lenin's death, Stalin had replaced and rejected this theory by theory of socialism in one country. In such a way instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat, dictatorship over the proletariat started to develop and get permanent shape by merging into a Monolithic governmental setup. What developed right in that period was the antithesis of the egalitarian society on the socialist line. Lenin, who was trying his best to set out a program modified according to Russian grounds, has to face civil war which ultimately modified inversely all the linear progression towards the egalitarian social contract. Anti-Bolshevik forces organized a joint venture against Bolshevik these forces were huge in strength as compare to Bolshevik. But they were lack of unity they were disorganized. On the other side, Bolshevik had successfully executed their war efforts to crush civil war. However, Lenin had to adopt dictatorial measures to preserve the strict discipline of the party to encounter the civil war. And only due to his absolutist powers Bolsheviks got success over white forces. In this way, civil war encouraged the development of the monolithic state and profoundly modified Russian socialism from its way to increasingly remote from the notions of socialist program sketched by Marx. The merciless civil war between reds and whites inevitably sowed the seeds of the autocratic soviet system. Due to the civil war, the Bolshevik state was hardened and militarized and began systematic Terror from the state to tackle any rebellion.

Institution of Red Terror was the major aspect of overactive state control over polity and public sphere as well.^{xii} In 1918 the 'Left Socialist Revolutionaries' started the massive revolt against the Bolsheviks. They planned to assassinate Lenin. All their unbearable activities were to intensify the suppression of political rebel and opposition by the government in Tsarist way. The civil war and rebellion made the Bolshevik party much more draconian in their policy conduction. Another major and sufficient result of all this hostility was the economic system, which was modeled as to

cope with the situation with strong central control. This system is known as war communism. It was a highly centrally planned and absolutist response to the war crises.^{xiii} Was war communism a calculated reactionary policy to the civil war hostility or was it merely a manifestation of the leap into socialism? However, it could be assessed as both because the logical ground was prepared for both arguments at the same time. Economic policies, promulgated in the name of war communism, led towards the perpetuation of autocratic structure. This autocratic system was about to become a genesis of Monolithic structures. An assessment of war communism 's policies will make it intelligible how these policies pertained to near-future results. War communism put the state in control of every sort of economic occupation and completely eradicated private property. The policy outline of war communism was supposed to be promulgated in a highly developed socialist state but on the contrary due to inappropriate condition it had to be exercised in such an unfit country.

That was why the seeds of monolith grafting were shown in the initial years of revolution and that was also in the era of Lenin. Bolshevik inherited fragile economic conditions with seriously declining agricultural production. They had to introduce so many radical economic measures including the nationalization of banks and monopoly over foreign trade.^{xiv} These economic policies were not aimed at easing the depressing economic situation but to deprive the propertied class of their diverse influence over the economic life of society moreover these policies were intended to consolidate Bolshevik political design by introducing a centrally controlled state capitalism. This gigantic step forward was further accelerated economic disorganization. Rapid establishment of direct static control over all production distribution and allocation was another step characteristic towards central manifestation. It was a policy of total nationalization, resource mobilization, and centralization. This step was to ensure durable and consistent military supplies. Accordingly, all enterprises in metal, textile, glass, cement, etc. were placed under government control to fulfill the requirements of management, an abnormal rise in bureaucracy led to the formation of the ruling elite. This elite class became a concentrated ruling body with complete control over the state apparatus.

Lenin's policies led to the disillusionment of the proletariat of their dictatorship as supposed to happen. He started to develop a new governing class by escaping the proletariat.^{xv} The presence of such a vast bureaucracy was enough to determine the monolith character of the soviet state in Stalin's period. The establishment of such a highly disciplined elite was considered justified by Lenin in terms of their knowledge of Marxist theory and accordingly appropriateness in their decision but unfortunately, this centralized dictatorial set up was filled by a large part of Tsarist State Machinery. This emerging centralized bureaucratic set up violated the aspirations of the revolution.

Towards the end of civil war, Bolsheviks were consolidating the political power not only over central Russia but its old empire was also brought back under the new empire. It was, in fact, civil war, the fortune in disguise, which brought ultimate imperialism, Russian resurgence, and reunification of all of its colonies. This accomplishment was possible due to the highly centralized political system. The constitution drafted by *Stalin* and *sverdlov* outlined a highly centralized political system with a full concentration of power at the top of the governmental body. A hierarchy of national regional provincial and local levels was established with all real powers to the Bolshevik party. There were opposing voices to this centralized superstructure but all such voices could not play their role due to the hostilities of civil war and foreign intervention but when the civil war ended with Bolshevik's consolidation, these voices started to raise their arguments in the party congress. Left opposition focused its attack on the centralized and bureaucratic nature of the government. They raised the issue of the centralized decision-making process and the independent role of trade unions. They focused on their point of objection regarding the centralized leadership

of Lenin and the Party's top. Under the stress of civil war, Lenin had to incorporate a central societal state mechanism with the end of the civil war many such voices raised their point of argument in favor of letting losing such a mechanism. They strongly advocated the principle of socialist democracy and the process of collective decision-making.

They were against the centralized bureaucracy and hierarchical authority. They advanced their proposal that political authority should belong to the soviets and trade unions must hold economic authority. Lenin and his companion including Trotsky were not in favor of such immediate decentralization. They insisted that only one practicable method to achieve socialism in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics through authoritative regulation of economic forces along with political decision-making process strictly. The force of such argument kept Lenin with the lines of authoritarianisms. However, with the end of the civil war Lenin was in doldrums to reconcile the opponents. The defeat of Bolshevik in Poland gave strength to the opponent against the centralism. Lenin started to sense the upsurge of these anti centralist feelings more seriously. He realized the need for democracy in the party. By the end of the civil war Lenin was going too fast to promulgate his centralized policies. However, as soon as the civil war ended he started to develop different thinking in response to anti centralization years. He felt the necessity of retreat to some extent. Keeping in mind the example of Jacobins at the time of the French revolution Lenin formulated his strategy very cautiously.^{xvi} Lenin opted for resolution with insistence to maintain the monopoly over power by preserving the unity and solidarity of party high ranks. Thus Lenin accordingly excluded all perquisites of factionalism within or outside the party. The resolution opted by Lenin enabled him to gain two fundamental objectives one was that of strengthening of the party's monopoly overall political power with strong center orientation while granting some relaxation to economic activities and second major feature was establishment of a formal procedure to prevent factionalism.^{xvii} It was not a mere coincidence that the introduction of new economic policy had to accompanied by prevention of all political parties but also avoidance of every such political behavior within party which could led to factionalism and thus become a threat to totalitarianism.

New Economic Policy

Lenin's post-civil war resolution required some analytical assessment. With the end of civil war, it was realized that concept of socialist egalitarianism was not befitting and unworkable for the Russian situation. This situation required a radical program different from socialist program.^{xviii} Sailor revolt in Kronstadt in 1921 was the major immediate political reason, which brought about this radical economic program.^{xix} This program was known as new economic policy. Lenin realized the need to restore some economic activity according to the lines of capitalism this was a retreat but in fact, it was determined by the stress of the fragile economic situation. This step was described by Lenin as a step back to capitalism so that the subsequent step towards socialism could be taken. N.E.P. relaxed the economic and political pressures exerted by the state during the civil war and created some scope for private enterprise and financial ventures while restoring private ownership state retained control over the commanding position over the macro level of economic spheres, which included the banking sector, foreign trade, and large-scale industry.^{xx}

Authorities did not allow the consolidation of big monopolies or to huge industrial section. Restricted restoration of capitalism was restrained by the strong central government with high political powers so that on one side N.E.P. could accomplish and on the other side, a counter check could be imposed on the side effects of these capitalists' policies. That was why along with and despite economic relaxation an extremely strong authoritarian center was promulgated by curbing all political parties, trade unions, and opposition voices within the Bolshevik party. Thus in such a way NEP violated the socialist state in two respects: In terms of the structure of party and state where Lenin's dictatorship was strongly confirmed and in making centralized machinery of control

and direction strengthened.^{xxi} This tightly centralized character of Bolshevik party was set out due to continued challenge and response in every unexpected situation. Lenin was stern believer of all these policies as temporary inevitable.

References

ⁱ Darred Paul Hammer, *U.S.S.R: The Politics of Oligarchy* (London,1986), 7.

ⁱⁱ Ibid.,

ⁱⁱⁱ Vladimir Lenin was one of the leading political figures and revolutionary thinkers of the 20th century, who masterminded the Bolshevik take-over of power in Russia in 1917, and was the architect and first head of the U.S.S.R. Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov was born in Simbirsk on the Volga River on 22 April 1870 into a well-educated family. He excelled at school and went on to study law. At university, he was exposed to radical thinking, and his views were also influenced by the execution of his elder brother, a member of a revolutionary group. Expelled from university for his radical policies, Lenin completed his law degree as an external student in 1891. He moved to St Petersburg and became a professional revolutionary. Like many of his contemporaries, he was arrested and exiled to Siberia, where he married Nadezhda Krupskaya. After his Siberian exile, Lenin - the pseudonym he adopted in 1901 - spent most of the subsequent decade and a half in Western Europe, where he emerged as a prominent figure in the international revolutionary movement and became the leader of the 'Bolshevik' faction of the Russian Social Democratic Worker's Party. In 1917, exhausted by World War One, Russia was ripe for change. Assisted by the Germans, who hoped that he would undermine the Russian war effort, Lenin returned home and started working against the provisional government that had overthrown the tsarist regime. He eventually led what was soon to be known as the October Revolution, but was effectively a coup d'etat. Almost three years of civil war followed. The Bolsheviks were victorious and assumed total control of the country. During this period of revolution, war and famine, Lenin demonstrated a chilling disregard for the sufferings of his fellow citizens and mercilessly crushed any opposition.

Although Lenin was ruthless, he was also pragmatic. When his efforts to transform the Russian economy to a socialist model stalled, he introduced the New Economic Policy, where a measure of private enterprise was again permitted, and a policy that continued for several years after his death. In 1918, Lenin narrowly survived an assassination attempt, but was severely wounded. His long-term health was affected, and in 1922, he suffered a stroke from which he never fully recovered. In his declining years, he worried about the bureaucratization of the regime and expressed concern over the increasing power of his eventual successor Joseph Stalin. Lenin died on 24 January 1924. His corpse was embalmed and placed in a mausoleum on Moscow's Red Square.

^{iv} Lal Khan, *Bolshovik inqilab aur aagj ka roo* (Lahore 1989), 49.50.

^v Seweryn Bialer, *The Soviet Paradox* (New York, 1989), .173

^{vi} W.W.Rostow, *The Dynamics of Soviet Society* (New York,1954), 89.

^{vii} Ibid., 44.

^{viii} Ibid., 16.

^{ix} Michael Voslensky, *Nomenklatura* (New York,1984), 3.

^x In 1917, things were changing for Russia. The Tsar was overthrown, new governments were set up and Russia was firmly set on the path towards new political ideologies. The truth was, a lot of people didn't know what the future held for Russia, and those with strong opinions about this disagreed with each other. Of the many voices to propose a path for Russia, the strongest ended up being that of Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924). Lenin helped define the objectives of 1917 and the future of the nation, and his first step to doing so was publishing his ideas in a brief collection of notes. The 'April Theses' was a document of ten points presented to the April Conference of Bolsheviks by Lenin in 1917.

^{xi} Lenin also put much emphasis on the leading role of the party. As early as 1902 he was concerned with the need for a cohesive party with a correct doctrine, adapted to the exigencies of the period, which would be a motive force among the masses, helping to bring them to an awareness of their real situation. In *What Is To Be Done?* He called for a party of professional revolutionaries, disciplined and directed, capable of defeating the police; its aim should be to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to do this, he

wrote in *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, it was necessary “to subject the insurrection of the proletarian and non-proletarian masses to our influence, to our direction, to use it in our best interests.” But this was not possible without a doctrine: “Without revolutionary theory, no revolutionary movement.” On the eve of the revolution of October 1917, in, ‘*The State and Revolution*,’ he set forth the conditions for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the suppression of the capitalist state. Lenin assigned major importance to the peasantry in formulating his program. It would be a serious error, he held, for the Russian revolutionary workers’ movement to neglect the peasants. Even though it was clear that the industrial proletariat constituted the vanguard of the revolution, the discontent of the peasantry could be oriented in a direction favourable to the revolution by placing among the goals of the party the seizure of privately owned land. As early as 1903, at the third congress of the party, he secured a resolution to this effect. Thereafter, the dictatorship of the proletariat became the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. In 1917 he encouraged the peasants to seize land long before the approval of agrarian reform by the Constituent Assembly.

^{xii} The Red Terror in Soviet Russia was a campaign of political repression and executions carried out by the Bolsheviks—chiefly through the Cheka, the Bolshevik secret police—in mid-1918 after the beginning of the Russian Civil War. Arising after an assassination attempt on Vladimir Lenin, the Red Terror was modeled on the Reign of Terror of the French Revolution, and sought to eliminate opposition, political dissent, and any other threat to Bolshevik power. More broadly, the term is usually applied to Bolshevik political repression throughout the Civil War (1917–1922) as distinguished from the White Terror carried out by the White Army (Russian and non-Russian groups opposed to Bolshevik rule) against their political enemies. Estimates for the total number of victims of Bolshevik repression, however, vary widely. One source asserts that the total number of victims of repression and pacification campaigns could be 1.3 million, whereas another gives estimates of 28,000 executions per year from December 1917 to February 1922. Estimates for the number of people killed during the initial period of the Red Terror are at least 10,000. The most reliable estimations for the number of killings in total put the number at about 100,000, whereas others suggest a figure of 200,000. The Red Terror in Soviet Russia was justified in Soviet historiography as a wartime campaign against counter-revolutionaries during the Russian Civil War of 1918–1921, targeting those who sided with the Whites (White Army). Bolsheviks referred to any anti-Bolshevik factions as Whites, regardless of whether those factions actually supported the White movement cause. Leon Trotsky described the context in 1920. The severity of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia, let us point out here, was conditioned by no less difficult circumstances. There was one continuous front, on the north and south, in the east and west. Besides the Russian White Guard armies of Kolchak, Denikin and others, there are those attacking Soviet Russia, simultaneously or in turn: Germans, Austrians, Czecho-Slovaks, Serbs, Poles, Ukrainians, Roumanians, French, British, Americans, Japanese, Finns, Estonians, Lithuanians. The first conquest of power by the Soviets at the beginning of November 1917 was actually accomplished with insignificant sacrifices. The Russian bourgeoisie found itself to such a degree estranged from the masses of the people, so internally helpless, so compromised by the course and the result of the war, so demoralized by the regime of Kerensky, that it scarcely dared show any resistance. Bolshevik newspapers were especially integral to instigating an escalation in state violence: on August 31, the state-controlled media launched the repressive campaign through incitement of violence. One article appearing in *Pravda* exclaimed: “the time has come for us to crush the bourgeoisie or be crushed by it. The first official announcement of a Red Terror was published in *Izvestia* on September 3, titled “Appeal to the Working Class”, calling for the workers to “crush the hydra of counterrevolution with massive terror. The first victims of the Terror were the Socialist Revolutionaries (SR). Over the months of the campaign, over 800 SR members were executed, while thousands more were driven into exile or detained in labour camps. The Internal Troops of the Cheka and the Red Army practised the terror tactics of taking and executing numerous hostages, often in connection with desertions of forcefully mobilized peasants. According to Orlando Figes, more than 1 million people deserted from the Red Army in 1918, around 2 million people deserted in 1919, and almost 4 million deserters escaped from the Red Army in 1921. Around 500,000 deserters were arrested in 1919 and close to 800,000 in 1920 by Cheka troops and special divisions created to combat desertions. Thousands of deserters were killed, and their families were often taken hostage. According to Lenin's instructions. After the expiration of the seven-day deadline for deserters to turn

themselves in, punishment must be increased for these incorrigible traitors to the cause of the people. Families and anyone found to be assisting them in any way whatsoever are to be considered as hostages and treated accordingly. Historians have argued that the Bolsheviks needed to use terror to stay in power because they lacked popular support. Although the Bolsheviks dominated among workers, soldiers and in their revolutionary soviets, they won less than a quarter of the popular vote in elections for the Constituent Assembly held soon after the October Revolution, since they commanded much less support among the peasantry. Although the Constituent Assembly elections predated the split between the Right SRs, who had opposed the Bolsheviks; and the Left SRs, who were their coalition partners, consequentially many peasant votes intended for the latter went to the SRs. Massive strikes by Russian workers were "mercilessly" suppressed during the Red Terror. According to Richard Pipes, terror was inevitably justified by Lenin's belief that human lives were expendable in the cause of building the new order of communism. Pipes has quoted Marx's observation of the class struggles in 19th century France: "The present generation resembles the Jews whom Moses led through the wilderness. It must not only conquer a new world, it must also perish in order to make room for the people who are fit for a new world", but noted that neither Marx nor Engels encouraged mass murder. Robert Conquest was convinced that "unprecedented terror must seem necessary to ideologically motivated attempts to transform society massively and speedily, against its natural possibilities." Orlando Figes' view was that Red Terror was implicit, not so much in Marxism itself, but in the tumultuous violence of the Russian Revolution. He noted that there were a number of Bolsheviks, led by Lev Kamenev, Nikolai Bukharin and Mikhail Olmsky, who criticized the actions and warned that thanks to "Lenin's violent seizure of power and his rejection of democracy," the Bolsheviks would be "forced to turn increasingly to terror to silence their political critics and subjugate a society they could not control by other means." Figes also asserts that the Red Terror "erupted from below. It was an integral element of the social revolution from the start. The Bolsheviks encouraged but did not create this mass terror. The main institutions of the Terror were all shaped, at least in part, in response to these pressures from below." The German Marxist Karl Kautsky pleaded with Lenin against using violence as a form of terrorism because it was indiscriminate, intended to frighten the civilian population and included the taking and executing hostages: "Among the phenomena for which Bolshevism has been responsible, terrorism, which begins with the abolition of every form of freedom of the Press, and ends in a system of wholesale execution, is certainly the most striking and the most repellent of all.

^{xiii} Alec Nove, *An Economic History of U.S.S.R* (London, 1984), 78.

^{xiv} *Ibid.*, 84.

^{xv} Michael Voslensky, *Nomenclature*, 45.

^{xvi} It would not be out of place to make an analogy of his post-civil war policies with revolutionary France of 1794. Jacobin lost justification for state terror and economic centralization and whole revolution moved to the right *Therimdor*. Lenin and his companion had this example in their mind that is why he intended to avoid a clash with opposite sects. However instead of Robespierre who had struck out against individuals and thus lost grounds. Lenin had opted to avoid such political consequences by keeping strict control over all political powers. To avoid any future possible rebellion, party was retained with high centralized powers in order to strengthen the discipline. W.W.Rostow, *The Dynamics Of Soviet Society* (New York, 1954), 42.

^{xvii} Basil Dmytry, *U.S.S.R: A Concise History* (New York, 1990), 120.

^{xviii} Michal Reiman, *The Birth of Stalinism* (London, 179), 2.

^{xix} W.W.Rostow, *The Dynamics of Soviet Society*, 46.

^{xx} Alec Nove, *An Economic History of U.S.S.R* (London, 1984), 85.

^{xxi} W.W.Rostow, *The Dynamics of Soviet Society*, 49.