**III.5.4.1.Revolution of Russia and the climate**

Cyclical climate crises shape the biological life on Earth, including the development and decline of subsequent human civilizations. Favorable climatic conditions cause a population increase within every civilization. Then comes the deterioration of climatic conditions and the internal crisis of civilization that sets the leader. Then comes the conquest of external countries and the development of the empire until its fall, which shape a new empire. The development and fall of subsequent civilizations follows the rhythm of the movements of earth's coating, what I described in my works. Czingis Khan's empire was born during the climate crisis in Asia. At that time, favorable climatic conditions prevailed in Europe, and it was in the direction of Europe that the Mongol expansion was directed. In the meantime, between the Mughal empire and Napoleon's empire, a powerful Ottoman Empire emerged, whose development indicates the shift of favorable climate zones from East Asia to the west towards Turkey. The empire developed and fell before the summit of the Little Ice Age that was destroying Europe. Russian Empire developed in almost the same time as Ottoman Empire and it collapsed in internal crisis of Russian revolution during east European climatic crisis-see in my work below entitled "Russian revolution and the climate".

The Little Ice Age caused an internal crisis in Europe, the expansion of Europeans to other continents and the rise of Napoleon's empire. At that time, favorable climatic conditions prevailed in Asia. Another climate crisis in Asia is approaching and I am sure that only the global opening of borders and the free migration of peoples can save the world from the Third World War.

**I present below the chapter of my book titled "Natural History and Climate Changes".**

**III.5.4.1.1. Reasons for the outbreak of the Russian Revolution**

The analysis of past revolutions leads to the conclusion that two factors are needed for the revolution to take place: the dissatisfied people and the frustrated intelligentsia driving the revolution.

The dissatisfaction of the people comes from not fulfilling basic life needs and the frustration of intelligence is a consequence of the lack of life prospects in the old social order. The environmental factors (natural and social ) determine the emergence of the revolutionary situation. Natural factors would include, above all, climatic factors - atmospheric precipitation and air temperature, which in the case of Russia are very variable. They determine the basic social parameters - the size and sexual composition of the population developing in favorable climatic conditions for a given territory. In order for the revolution to take place, a decades-long period of good climatic conditions conducive to population growth and its masculinization would be needed, followed by a deterioration of this climatic situation and the social situation that was linked to it. In the decades before the Russian Revolution there were better conditions in Russia (rising atmospheric precipitation) and social conditions (reform of education for Alexander I, release from serfdom and other reforms). The later deterioration of the social situation due to overpopulation and hunger of the land was followed by erroneous actions by the authorities that do not take into account the impact of the climatic factor and destroying the rural communities - сообщество. In the run-up to the revolution, climatic conditions gradually improved and the apogee of the climate crisis took place just before the revolution. The crisis in Europe and the position of European powers pushing for world war caused deterioration of the internal situation in Russia and consequently accelerated the revolution. To the deterioration contributed the coolings of climate of 1901-1905. and 1914-1918. (See fig. 24).

The European elites, mostly landowners, were bankrupted by the constantly cheaping grain (from 1830 supplied by steamers from the USA (about 15% of Europe's grain needs)) and only war left to escape from it. Probably it was one of the main causes of the First World War, apart from the masculinization of the European population.

The social factor decisive for the revolution is the size of the population able to survive in a given territory. When the population rises to the border value for a given territory, it becomes sensitive to any deterioration of living conditions because the environmental resources available to individual units decrease and also, due to the population density, social distances are reduced, which increases the level of aggression. Such a deterioration in the life situation of the Russian people, uprooted Russian nobility, intelligentsia and the Jewish community occurred in the period preceding the revolution, ie from 1861 to 1917. The climate crisis and the lack of knowledge about the real problems of Russian society determined the outbreak of the revolution. Another reason was to stop by the state terror of a progressive and positive evolution of the patriotically minded Russian intelligentsia. The victory of the Bolshevik Revolution was also decided by anti-Semitism, controlled by tsarism (?). In the further course of my work, I will try to show that the above factors determined the existence of a specific social situation and the outbreak of the Russian Revolution.

III.5.4.1.2. Environmental conditions of Russia

III.5.4.1.2.1. The climate of Russia

Link to the website about the climate of Russia: http://www.climatetemp.info/russia/

In the climate of Russia, the precipitation and frost factor is decisive. Atmospheric fronts that bear rain on the Russian lowlands go from the Atlantic, Mediterranean and Black Seas. Developing in an unpredictable way (unpredictability results from lack of research !!!) continental high-pressure periodically blocks low-pressure fronts carrying life-giving rains and there are sometimes many years of drought limiting the volume of grain production in the fertile Russian lands.

The peak of precipitation during the spring and summer season usually falls in the unfavorable period of July and August. Temperature fluctuations are also dangerous for grain crops. Russia is far from the ocean and its ifluence which soothing the climate, what hinders the cultivation of cereals. Frost is dangerous for cereal crops because frosts do not only occur in the short summer period, ie from mid-June to mid-August. The occurrence of a dry and frosty year is a failure of crop failure for Russia's agriculture and a deterioration of the social situation, which is usually quite unfavorable. The income of Russian farmers was small compared to farmers (from warm and well-irrigated by rain, decisive for agricultural productivity) from Western Europe. The following quotes speak about it:

In 1898, Sergey Witte sent a note to the young Czar, the meaning of which was contained in two sentences: "*In my deepest conviction, the peasant question is now*

*a priority issue in the life of Russia. It is necessary to regulate it "(.)" Sergei Witte argued as a financier: before the reform of the budget was 350 million rubles, the abolition of serfdom enabled its increase to 1,400 million rubles. The population of Russia was 130 million. Meanwhile, the budget of France with 38 million inhabitants is 1260 million rubles, the Austrian budget population of 43 million -1100 million rubles. The minister of finance argued that Russia needed funds for intensive industrialization of the country, and the main source of budget revenues, agriculture, gives them too little* (Heller 2000: 682).

The reason for the backwardness of Russian agriculture was the extremely low productivity of land. The fertility of peasant fields was two-four times lower than in European countries. *"Contemporary German peasant informed proudly Rudolf Martin - he earns income three times larger than the Russian peasant. In order to collect the amount of grain that a Russian peasant obtained in an area of ​​2.6 tithes, a French peasant would need half a tithe* (Heller 2000: 683).

This "backwardness" of the Russian peasant resulted from unfavorable climatic conditions hindering the cultivation of land far to the east, from lack of giving life-giving rains and warming the climate from the Atlantic Ocean. This can be proved by the maps of the distribution of grain yield in Europe from the surface unit showing that this productivity decreased from the west to the east (League of Nations 1943: 9), according to decreasing precipitation and increasing impacts of the continental climate.

This "backwardness" of the Russian peasant was a probable cause of the extermination of the peasants in Bolshevik Russia. The revolutionaries believed that the ignorance and backwardness of the Russian peasant is the cause of the underdevelopment of Russian agriculture. It was erroneously believed that collective farms and sovozy would change this situation. I believe that only a return to rural communities "общин" will save Russian agriculture in the 21st century and save Russia.

The resourcefulness of the Russian peasant can be demonstrated by the fact that Russian peasants used a variety of "red-turkish" winter wheat resistant to drought. The Mennonites, when they emigrated from southern Russia to the USA, and brought "red-turkish" winter wheat to American prairies. The extremely dry climatic conditions prevailing in the prairies of the USA were deadly for all known varieties of grain that were tried to grow there. Only the use of wheat grain from the Russian steppe brought results and allowed to develop it.

Climatic disasters happened in Russia often in 1839, for example:

*For example, during the catastrophic crop failure suffered in 1839 by humus areas , especially Tambow, Ryazan, Tulska and Zadniep-Poltawska. A year later, the situation was even worse - the wave of frosts in May destroyed a significant part of crops in very large areas. There were sharp peasant occurrences, landowners were murdered, raided on roads, so that in many places it was necessary to stop postal communication. At the same time, cereal speculation developed, prices of which went up significantly. Kisielow was not in Russia at that time, he went to Karlsbad and returned only at the end of July - at that time various measures were taken to deal with the grave situation: grains were issued from warehouses, they were purchased in other provinces, money was granted to certain regions high officials were sent with extraordinary powers of attorney. At that time, tsar had the temptation to set up yet another secret committee, headed by the Minister of War, hr. Aleksander Czernyszew (1785-1857). This committee has adopted a resolution on the forcible planting of potatoes in state property, so that in addition to the stock for planting, the crops give 1 quart (210 liters) for each "revision soul"* (Bazylow 1973: 87).

The following quote says about the role of grain in feeding the Russians:

*And the Russians are a nation that feeds on bread. Hence the grain problem in the Soviet Union. Bread is the measure of everything - to be or not to be means to have bread or not to have it. Hunger begins when there is no bread. Other things are irrelevant, because they were rare or never existed. But bread ... As you see these loaded people going home after work, they all carry bags with a huge amount of bread. And he is really good there. I also used to eat bread during my travels. I put the bread crusts in my pocket and when I was very hungry, I was chewing them. In my other pocket I had sugar cubes and I could live somehow. The Russian also feeds on the same. The bread is cheap in addition. And here in the period of perestroika trouble began. Basic things have disappeared: for some time there were cards for vodka, there was no sugar. And above all, there were problems with bread. It began to raise concern. Especially that the Russians have a coded fear of hunger. And it's not that you go insatiable. But the one that dies from hunger. Massively. The post-war famine is still in the memory of older generations. From 1944 to 1947, there was a great famine in the Soviet Union. People were fleeing from it to ...* *Workut*a (Kapuściński et al., 2007: 35).

Contemporary climate and precipitation in Russia are briefly described by Britanica:

The main feature of precipitation in all of Russia is the low total amount and the clear maximum summer precipitation. On the entire Russian and Western Siberia plains, there is a fall of precipitation from the northwest to the southeast. In the north-west, with the exception of a few places close to the Baltic Sea, rainfall generally stays below 600 mm, falling from 533 mm in Moscow to around 203 mm along the border with Kazakhstan. In eastern Siberia, they are usually less than 406 mm and only 127 mm along the Arctic coast. Precipitation again grows along the Pacific to 600 mm in Vladivostok, where the humid summer monsoon brings significant rainfall. Precipitation depends on height; the upper part of the Ural receives more than 711 mm, and Kamchatka mountains receive more than 1015 mm per year. Snow is an important feature for the whole country, and its depth and duration of rainfall have a significant impact on agriculture. The duration of the snow cover varies both in the entire territory of Russia, from 40 to 200 days on the Russian plain and from 120 to 250 days in Siberia.

We know little about the climate of Russia from the pre-revolutionary period and the period of the revolution, but these modest data can be used for a schematic assessment of the natural environment.

We have rainfall characteristics from Russia in the years 1850-1980 and temperature characteristics from these years from western Russia and the Caucasus. Below I present relevant graphs describing these factors and their variability over time.

Fig. 21. Rainfall indicators for Europe, the USA, Russia, North Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia in the years 1850-1980

Fig. 22. Indicators of annual precipitation for continental areas of the northern hemisphere

The above drawings come from the following work done by renowned climatologists based on reliable research material:

Precipitation fluctuations over the Northern Hemisphere land area Since Mid-19th Century

R.S.Bradley, H.F.Diaz, J.K. Eischeid, P. D. Jones, P.M.Kelly, C.M. goodes

http://www.geo.umass.edu/faculty/bradley/bradley1987c.pdf

Science, vol.237 p. 171-175 July 10, 1987.

In Fig. 22 showing the annual precipitation in the northern hemisphere are alternating

periods of smaller and larger rainfall. In the years 1850-1875, 1890-1925, rainfall is lower than the average rainfall, and in the years 1875-1890 it is rainier than the average.

A similar picture is visible in Fig. 21, where precipitation in Russia grows gradually from 25% of maximum rainfall in 1850. up to 50% in 1905 with a local maximum of 40-50% of rainfall in 1865-1877. In the years 1905-1930, precipitation in Russia oscillates below 50% of the maximum in the range of 40-50%. So we see that when it comes to rainfall in Russia, they grew in the pre-revolutionary period, that is, conditions conducive to population growth in the period preceding the revolution, because the amount of rainfall affected the increase in grain and potato yields. Such conditions are conducive to population growth because the abundance of food increases the population of each species of living creatures.

Another situation is when it comes to seasonal temperature changes in Russian areas.

We rely here on reconstructions of air temperature in the summer periods described

at work:

Raymond S. Bradley, Philip D. Jones, "Little Ice Age" summer temperature variations: the global warming trends, The Holocene 3,4 (1993) pp. 367-376

http://hol.sagepub.com/content/3/4/367.abstract



According to the reconstruction of the temperature anomalies from the Urals from 1850 to 1880, the air was cooling down and the rainfall was increasing. In the middle of this period there was a slight warming. Then, from 1880, the temperature was growing until 1940 with a slight collapse of 1800.

According to the reconstruction of the temperature anomalies from western Russia made by Borisenkow, the temperature was decreasing in the period from 1850 to 1925, and then began to grow.

This shows some differences in the temperature development in the depths of Russia, the northern Urals and the west of Russia. More favorable conditions for population growth occurred from 1880 in the depths of Russia than in its western counties where summer temperatures ware decreasing until 1925. This allows us to suppose that at that time Atlantic influences dominated in western Russia, when the negative correlation of summer and precipitation temperatures was noted. The temperature of summer decreases when the rain rises, and temperature grows when the amount of rain decreases (Madden, Williams 1978).

One should also pay attention to the summer temperature anomaly diagram for Central Europe - the sixth axis in Fig. 23. It shows two negative temperature anomalies with a minimum in the years 1885-90 and 1912 divided and ended with a period of global warming. They indicate that in the European part of Russia were then two waves of frost destroying sowing. Since the reconstruction of the western climate of Russia indicates a cooling down from 1850 to 1925, with the peak of cooling in 1900-1925, this indicates the possibility of occurrence of more frequent frosts destroying winter crops in western Russia, which caused starvation of the people.

The above climatic data indicate that in the European part of Russia in the pre-revolutionary period from 1850. there were constantly improving conditions for population growth and they improved until 1925, because the amount of precipitation (coming from the cooling Atlantic fronts) was constantly increasing. Therefore, the necessary condition of the exploding revolution was fulfilled, which was the previous growth and masculinization of the population in the several decades of favorable environmental conditions preceding the revolution. At the same time, temperature conditions deteriorated during the same period - steady decline of summer temperatures in Western Russia, which probably decreased the chances of survival of the growing Russian population.

Requires the explanation the genesis of the 1905 revolution, which took place in Europe and Russia. In the analysis of this phenomenon, the following global temperature anomaly graph based on the base period 1951-1980 may be helpful and taken from the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) website - link to http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp / graphs\_v3 /.



Fig. 24. Annual chart (black on the chart) and five-year average moving air temperature anomaly (red color) for 48 US states (calculated on the basis of the average temperature from 1951-1980). Source NASA / GISS



Rys.24A A 400-Year Temperature Record from the Russian Far East

Wiles, G.C., Solomina, O., D'Arrigo, R., Anchukaitis, K.J., Gensiarovsky, Y.V. and Wiesenberg, N. 2015. Reconstructed summer temperatures over the last 400 years based on larch ring widths: Sakhalin Island, Russian Far East. *Climate Dynamics* **45:** 397-405.

<http://www.co2science.org/articles/V18/sep/a16.php>

The graph of the five-year average anomaly in Fig. 24 informs that in 1891 (description of the famine and the weather anomalies (Figes 2009: 181)) and in the years 1900-1904 there was a wave of increasing cold in the world with the lowest temperature of 2 to 4 ° C lower from the average temperature of the cold period of 1951-1980. Immediately after the cold came the rapid warming of 1905-1906, which could have brought drought in Russia. This may have meant for Russia first waves of frost destroying cereal crops and then intensive droughts, which could have caused food shortages and social discontent.

**These climatic changes described above could have been possible only in one case:**

**Earth's coating is moving in the gravitation rhythm of changeable position of Moon and planets of Solar System what I described in my works on Researchgate.**

 This is described in the relevant quotation regarding the famine after the climate crisis in 1891:

In short, as a result of the famine, the entire society became politicized and radicalized. The conflict between the nation and the regime started - and this time there was no turning back. According to Lidia Dan's, hunger was a decisive turning point in the history of the revolution because he showed the young people of her generation that "the Russian system is in total ruin" (Figes 2009: 181).

In addition, from 1914 to 1918, a similar wave of cold weather passed through the world, which, like in 1905, could have caused identical problems. They could have been imposed on the reduction of agricultural production caused by the war. This view is confirmed by the query in publications about Russia:

At the turn of 1891/92, hunger arose in Russia (caused by crop failures, infertility) (Smoleń 1989: 28).

A terrible and unpredictable scourge were frequent crop failures, e.g. in 1901, 1905, 1906 and 1911; on the other hand, the years 1909 and 1910 were characterized by a very huge harvest (Bazylow 1983: 397).

In 1916, panic fear of a 10-fold increase in food prices broke out in Russia. The provisioning difficulties were real because Petrograd and Moscow received 1/3 of the necessary food supplies. Cooling in those years is evidenced by the lack of fuel in the above-mentioned cities, whose deliveries were made in 50% (Pipes 1994: 198).

 Before the outbreak of World War I, a huge wave of strikes swept through Russia, England and the United States (Pipes 2007: 26).

The collapse of the Russian transport system during the First World War increased the dissatisfaction of the urban population, because it seriously hindered the supply of food and fuel to cities in the north of Russia in which hunger started. The high inflation in cities was also very important (Pipes 2007: 46).

During the war, the level and quality of life of the population decreased drastically. In Russia, from 1916, famine spread in the cities. In this situation, pacifist and revolutionary moods were common among workers and armies (Szpak 1997: 167).

 The final defeat of the tsardom was determined by the rebellion of the military garrison in Pyotrograd in February 1917. (Pipes 1994: XII).

Orlando Figes writes about inflation and rising prices as well as the social situation just before the revolution (Figes 2009: 321-328).

During the decisive days ( when the manifestations caused by (as Solzhenitsyn stressed) a sudden lack of "white bread" started in Petrograd), Nicholas II was far from the events, in the calm atmosphere of the headquarters of the chief commander. Here he could not make any decisions. Manifestations became wider and wider, drawing in all those who were unhappy and those who were aware of impunity. Soldiers joined them. Local authorities did not know what to do. Conflicting orders caused chaos. When Nicholas II finally decided to leave Mogilev for Petrograd, he was detained by the revolutionists at the Dno station (Heller 2000: 726).

 **III.5.4.1.2. Russian population**

Historians treat the demographics mostly on a marginal basis, but there are sufficient and generally consistent data on the subject in the publications on Russia. All of them indicate that the Russian population grew rapidly in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, until the revolution. There are data that the population growth in Europe was the largest in Russia. This demonstrates the beneficial for the development of natural and social factors in Russia.

One of the parameters determining the ability of the population to develop is fertility. It is determined in promils giving the number of births per 1000 inhabitants. I have drawn up a plot of fertility variability in time for European and Japanese populations. This is depicted in Fig. No. 25. The Chart No. 25 shows a perfect similarity of the graphs for the majority of populations indicating a decline in fertility of all populations since 1900 with a local minimum around 1925 and a small maximum around 1930. This is a widespread decline fertility was probably associated with crop failure in the early twentieth century, covering the whole Eurasian continent, which caused a three-fold increase in food prices (Allen et al.2012).

The graph shows that the French population has reached maximum fertility before the French Revolution. After it, there was only a fall in the fertility of the French population. This may prove that socio-political conditions also affect the fertility of the population. This is probably related to the permanent deterioration after the revolution of living conditions of the peasant layer subjected to the action of capitalist laws in farming, lack of credit and supply institutions supporting the functioning of small peasant farms. Zos Szajkowski writes about the problems of the loan for peasants launched by the French Jews and banned by Napoleon (Szajkowski 1953). There was no credit for small farmers in all post-revolutionary France and the Jews were the first to start it. However, Napoleon issued laws limiting Jewish lending, fearing unfavorable social consequences - dependence of peasants on creditors. This probably led to the fall of small farms and the rapid concentration of agricultural property in France. This led to the outflow of the peasant population to the cities and limiting its fertility in urban conditions. The rapid fall in fertility in the German population since 1911 is characteristic. This chart shows the homogeneity of causes affecting the decreasing and growing fertility of human communities in large areas. I point to the reason for this volatility, and it can only be the global variability of climate conditions. Chart Fig. 25 also indicates that all populations visible on it reached maximum fertility on the eve of the revolutionary-martial conflict. Fertility in past centuries grew only in favorable living conditions. Then there was a decline in fertility indicating the deterioration of population living conditions and as a result of the war downturn growing the revolutionary attitude of societies.

As far as the Russian population is concerned, from 1820 there was an increase in fertility from 40 promilles to a maximum of 53 promilles around 1870, then fertility stagnated from 1880 on 50 promilles to decrease to 45 in 1915. In 1941-50, fertility in the Russian population was 26 , 6 births per 1000 inhabitants, which proves the huge stagnation of the Russian population and the lack of development prospects. This maximum fertility of the Russian population was on the period 1860-1880 in which favorable climatic conditions prevailed ensuring food abundance, ie periodic warming combined with an increase in rainfall. The population growth in this period could also be due to the development impulse caused by the liberation of the peasants in 1861. The decline in fertility after this summit was forced by the overpopulation of the rural areas of Russia, that was expressed in (the common among the peasants) the famine of the arable land. In the period of decline in fertility of European populations, there was a sharp climate crisis, which caused a great jump of price of food in Europe and in the world.

The mass genocide during the Russian Revolution was caused by the masculinization of the population and violent

Fig. 25. Total fertility of European and Japanese populations. Data from 1801-1950 from the European part of Russia come from (Glass 1965: 97 tab 20). (author of the drawing Bogdan Góralski)

fertility of populations: Russian- prune color,

 German- purple,

 Austria-dark blue,

 Japan- braun,
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 Italia-green,

 France-yellow.

deterioration of living conditions affecting the increase of social aggression (the wartime experiences of the cruel World War I also influenced the increase of aggression during the Bolshevik Revolution).In Russia the harvest of agricultural produce in 1920 - half of the harvest in 1913. Already in the years of the First World War, Russia's agricultural production was rapidly reduced because of appointing 15 million recruits - mainly young farmers. This caused a drop in the agricultural production of Russia at first by 13% and caused food shortages that negatively affected public moods. Orlando Figes writes about the mass use of soldiers in Russian landed estates (Figes 2009: 77). This was due to the fact that after the defeat of the Crimean and Japanese war, the army's prestige fell sharply and expenses were reduced from 30% of budgetary funds in 1881 to 18% in 1902. This caused poverty among soldiers and the need for paid employment them by landlords in agricultural properties. These assets provided grain surpluses for the Russian market and for export, and the recall of soldiers to the war front deprived them of manpower and production capacities. In addition, the recruitment to the army deprived peasant farms of their labor which lowered the agricultural production of Russia. This is shown in Fig. 26.

Fig. 26. Production of grain in the US-yellow, Europe-navy blue and Russia-purple. Source (League of Nations 1943: 9) (author of the drawing Bogdan Góralski)

The difficult food situation of revolutionary Russia is confirmed by a huge drop in the production of cereal grains and potatoes in the years 1919-1923. The crops in the years 1909-1913 amounted to an average of 745.7 million quintals of cereals (grain exports amounted to 105.3 million quintals) and 87.5 million potatoes quintals, and in 1919-1923, an average of 355.5 million quintals of cereals and 62.4 million potato quintals were collected (League of Nations 1943: 9).

Annual harvests reached 92 million tons in 1913. 40% of the harvest was for rich peasant farms and 12% from properties of big landlords "(Bazylow 1983: 397).

In 1913, the population of Russia had about 155 million, which gives 481-593.5 kg of grain per head per year. In 1919-23, the annual harvest of cereals amounted to 35.55 million tons, which gives 229 kg of grain per year per year for the same population. Deterioration of food had to affect people's mood and level of aggression. In 2010 in Russia there was a huge drought which limited the harvest of grain to the level of 430 kg per head. In 2011, the harvest was normal and amounted to 662 kg per capita with a population of 141 million.

The largest fertility in Europe in the Russian population caused the rapid growth of the population of tsarist Russia. As early as Piotr I in 1724, there were 5,400,000 peasant male souls (of which there were 1 049 000 state peasants), at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries there were 16 million peasants, and directly before the reform of 1861. their number exceeded 21 million (it is probably the number of men?) (Bazylow 1973: 54). The state peasants, i.e. paying rent and capitalization, were in 1811 6 356 872 and in 1816 there was a decrease in their number 5 774 823 and in 1857-1858 there were 9 345 000 of them (Bazylow 1973: 65-66)).

 The population of Russia grew in the 19th century from 30 to 92 million (Szpak 1997: 125), and at the beginning of the 20th century it amounted to 126 million (Bazylow, Wieczorkiewicz 2005) - 75% survived from agriculture.

Russian sources say that during the last two decades of tsar the population of the whole state of tsars grew from 125.6 million in 1897. to 171.8 million in 1917. At the time the Bolsheviks took power in 1917. Russia had 143 million people (29 million people were deprived of their population from Poland, Romania, Turkey, Latvia and Estonia), of which 76.68 million were Russians and 31.20 million Ukrainians (Dmochowski 1999).

 D. V. Glass (Glass 1965: 63) gives the following data on the Russian population:

1806-41 million, 1811-44 million, 1859-58,6 million, 1863-70 million, 1897-94.3 million, 1913-155,4 million.

From 1897. 65% of Russia's rural population has not yet exceeded age of 30 years (Figes 2009: 116), and young people are more impulsive, aggressive and vulnerable to the manipulation of politicians.

The following quote attests to the overpopulation of Russia and the hunger of the land:

Peasant protests, revolution 1905-1906. they ran under the main slogan that expressed the basic postulate of the rural population - more land. The Bolsheviks were victorious in 1917 because, as well as demanding the end of the war, they put forward the postulate "land for peasants". In the first years of the 20th century political life in Russia developed surprisingly quickly, many parties of different colors were created. Their overwhelming majority - all revolutionary and many liberal and centrist - supported the postulancy of the peasants. The hunger of the land, the dwarfing of peasants 'farms and the ability to satisfy peasants' demands by taking over land from landowners is the most important Russian myth of the 20th century (...) In 1906, P. Maslow's book "Agrarian Question in Russia - Agrarnyi vopros in Rossia, St. - Petrburg 1906 p. 204 ", contained data that could disprove the myth. The author used official statistical data. They testified first of all about the existence of land in Russia, refuting views about its lack. After excluding from the calculation of one third of the territory of Russia (north and north-east) with land not suitable for farming, in Russia there was a per capita of 2.1 tithes (1 tithe = 1.092 ha) of land (this land, however, gives the harvest four times less than in France or Germany-the author's parable), in France 0.82 tithes, in Germany 0.62 tithes. From the point of view of the consequences, the myth of landowners who rule the entire land was much more important. Starting from the 1860s, the nobility sold their land. In 1905, peasants owned 164 million tithes of land, landowners-53 million tithes (a large part of this area was occupied by forests.) In 1916, 80 percent of arable land belonged to peasants who also leased part of land owned by landowners. "Give land" was the division of landowners 'property after the October Revolution. Each peasant received from 0.1 tithe (in the Moscow, Novgorod and Sviat Governors' Governors) up to 0.5-1.0 tithes (in St. Petersburg and Saratov governorates) (Heller 2000: 684 ).

In 1910, in the European part of Russia, the peasants owned 151 million ha of communal land and 14 million ha of private property (...) Private land belonged mostly to associations and villages than to individual farms (Pipes 1994: 77).

The overpopulation of the Russian village was a source of crises because when were coming poor harvest

caused by unfavorable climatic conditions, food was not enough to feed everyone. The village was starving, and in the city were high price of food and this was a source of trouble.

In Russia, the average ground for the male "soul" was in 1861. 5.24 ha and in 1900 2,84ha. For every 5 ha of arable land there had to be a hectare of pastures to keep cattle and horses. In the Russian countryside, the horse population was particularly numerous. The pigs was in 1900 three times less per capita than in Germany (Fiszer 1987: volume 5 tab.4). The overpopulation of the Russian village was also due to the lack of fertilizers, because farm animals were very few and manure was not enough to fertilize the field. Mineral and artificial fertilizers were used in Europe only in the second half of the nineteenth century. The peasant had to use a three-field system so as not to sterilize the soil. The following quote says about it:

Rudolf Martin noticed that in 1800 there was not much difference between the Russian and German peasants. "Even the most primitive tools of the Russian peasant could not be much worse than the tools of the German peasant." The age has passed, and the Russian peasant retained, according to Prokopowicz, sixteenth-century agricultural technique. At the beginning of the 20th century, a wooden socha was still in use. The three-field system dominated (Heller 2000: 683). In the three-field system, the usable area of ​​crops decreased, so the Russian peasants lacked land.

In the homeland of the Great Russians, only every fifth square kilometer was suitable for cultivation and in the middle agricultural counties, the population density before the revolution was 50-80 people per km² (Pipes 1994: 80).

In Europe, the highest demographic increase of 15% took place in In pre-revolutionary period in Russia.. It meant a yearly increase in the rural population by a million, which had to be fed. These figures show that Russia needed an additional 2 million ha of arable land every year. Russia did not have a safety valve in the form of emigration and developed industry (in 1900, 2.2 million employees). The Russian peasants did not emigrate. In 1871-1916, however, internal migration continued in the Tsarist state. In total, 9.043 million Russian displaced persons moved from these years, including 3.698 million to Siberia and Far East and 1.93 million to Kazakhstan and Central Asia (Dmochowski 1999: 63).

Lasted permanent migration of landless peasants to Russian cities (about 300,000 a year) where they created an explosive, non-assimilating element (Pipes 1994: 80-82).

The difficult food situation of revolutionary Russia is confirmed by a huge drop in the production of cereal grains and potatoes in the years 1919-1923. The crops in the years 1909-1913 amounted to an average of 745.7 million quintals of cereals (grain exports amounted to 105.3 million quintals) and 87.5 million quintals of potatoes, and in 1919-1923, an average of 355.5 million quintals of cereals and 62.4 million quintals of potatoes were collected. They were years of total drought. The decrease in harvest and consumption in 1919-1923 was therefore 43%. In the years 1925-29, the production of Soviet Russia was 671.4 million quintals of cereals, and in 1934-1938 885.9 million quintals. Potatoes were produced respectively 105.5 and 139.8 million quintals. In 1919-1923 in western Europe there was also a 25% drop in the harvest (League of Nations 1943: 9). The grain import to the British Isles in the years 1909-1913 was 10 million tons, and in 1919-1923, 8.2 million tons. Imports of grain to Western Europe amounted to 16.4 and 13.6 million tons respectively (League of Nations 1943: 17). Western Europe was a huge importer of cereals which proves its difficult payment and nutritional situation.

Report (Kapuściński 2007: 17) in the book entitled "Kapuściński: I do not embrace the world" leaves no illusions about the economic situation of past and present Russia, I quote:

"It is rarely considered in the analyzes - that the USSR society is terribly poor. And that it is a chronic poverty. There are two kinds of poverty in this country: one is due to the fact that it is generally a poor country. Potentially it is rich, but it is actually covered by structural poverty. The great American historian and sovietologist Richard Pipes in his book The Russian Revolution points out that the phenomenon of hunger occurs constantly in the history of Russia. When you look at the seventeenth or eighteenth century, every dozen or so years came the calamity of mass famine. Russia has bad soil. In addition, it has a terrible climate. And a very short summer. Cold climate and poor soils make agricultural productivity always low. Hence the momentum, the expansion of the Russians to the south (and to the west - the author's plot). To heat. That is why Ukraine was so important for them. Hunger is therefore a chronic phenomenon in this country. Hunger was still, only smaller or larger. And sometimes deadly. The "communist hunger" was imposed on it: either, let's say, by a political or a communist economy resulting from the inefficiency. Speaking of political starvation, I think about the destruction of Ukrainian peasantry in the early 1930s. At that time, a mechanism of hunger was used for political purposes - to eliminate the potential threat to the Soviet authorities. On the other hand, economic ideology, especially the kolkhoz system, led to famine. It was he who destroyed the already poor agriculture. Getting out of this will be extremely difficult. Actually, there is no chance of a quick improvement. The problem of ownership is still undecided. "

Against the background of the above-mentioned relations, the boon of the Bolshevik Revolution was the adoption of the Russia's industralization program, which ensured the use of Russia's natural resources and mineral resources. This resulted in an increase in the wealth of the Russian nation that supplemented shortages from agriculture. For example, today oil and gas exports decide on obtaining funds for food imports for the needs of Russian society. But the economic and ethical errors of the Bolsheviks were also huge.

**III.5.4.1.3. THE SOCIAL FORCES OF THE REVOLUTION**

**For the revolution to take place, rebellious masses are needed. Lenin, who saw the revolutionary potential of the Russian peasants, gained power because he promised them the land. And he kept his word. Later, they were used for the sake of industrialization, in which cheap food was necessary to keep workers' wages low in industry. It was necessary to take the land from the peasants and nationalize it to set up collective farms and sovozy. This made it possible to control food prices impossible under free market conditions. A flower of Russian farmers was murdered to achieve this. In the 21st century, Russia must import food worth 50 billion dollars a year. There were bright but dark sides in the revolution that last until today.**

**Revolt elites are also necessary in the revolution. I am writing about them below.**

**III.5.4.1.3.1. Rebellious peasants**

*The peasant communities ruled themself alone with only the minimal supervision of the nobility. (...) The peasants remained under the jurisdiction of local customary law (Figes 2009: 61). Until 1861, serf peasants were subject to the jurisdiction of their owners and the state did not interfere in relations between them until the nobility paid taxes (Figes 2009: 68). The power of the tsarist government actually ended in 89 provincial capitals, where the governors had their offices. The peasant Russia, inhabited by 85% of the population, was completely unknown to the municipal bureaucrats. The main weakness of the tsarist system was local administration in smaller towns and villages. For every 1,000 inhabitants of the Russian empire there were only 4 state officials compared with 12.6 in Germany and 17.6 in France. Expenses for the police constituted only a quarter of the amount spent on these purposes by Prussia. On a rural population of 100 million people in 1900, Russia had 1852 non-commissioned officers and 6,684 stand-up officers. Indeed, since 1903, officers in the villages were supported by peasant officers, around 40,000 (ie one officer per 2052 inhabitants)* **(Figes 2009: 67).**

*Due to the lack of own effective organs in the village, the central bureaucracy assigned more and more tasks to the local police:*

*Not only maintaining order, but also collecting taxes, implementing laws of government and military decrees, implementing health, safety and hygiene regulations, controlling roads and public buildings, collecting statistical data and general supervision of "good manners" in public life (on For example, watching peasants if they wash beards). General backwardness of Russia - low tax base and poor communication - largely explained this local administration* **(Figes 2009: 68).**

*A.Kofod in "Russkoje ziemleustrojstwo" gives: from the total number of 12 million peasant farms (which became the subject of enfranchisement since 1861) and 119 million tithes of assigned land - only 23.1% of homesteads and 17.3% of the land area have belonged to individual owners, and the rest - 79.9% of homesteads and 82.7% of the area - it was collective property within rural communities (Bazylow 2008: 204).*

*As a result of the affranchisement act of 1861. and the large natural increase, the economic situation of the Russian peasants deteriorated. The burdensome burden of rising taxes and the rising prices of land and increasing prices of land due to the overpopulation of the villages generated social tensions. "The total area of ​​arable land has been growing constantly. Relevant numbers are given again very inconsistently; Generally, you can accept without fear of making too much of a mistake that on the eve of the First World War there was in the empire under the cultivation of about 120 million tithes, of which over 70 million in European Russia.*

*(...) Annual harvests reached 92 million tons in 1913. 40% of the yields were from rich peasant farms and 12% from huge landlords* **"(Bazylow 1983: 397).**

*So 52% of the collections were produced by the peasants - peasant communities. Russia did not have enough income to cover expenses, which is why grain was exported - in the years 1891-95 about 7 million tons, and in 1902 even 9.3 million tons. In 1900, only 7.9% of treasury revenues were direct taxes and 53.2% from consumption taxation, and 24% on railway earnings.*

*Indirectly and directly, most of the income came from peasants who paid agricultural tax, and moreover, taxes on basic necessities (salt, matches, kerosene) and vodka* **(Pipes 1994: 60).**

*Taxes growing in the years 1870-1890 impoverished the peasants, whose consumption decreased, because the plots of land used by them decreased. The maintenance of the army and the development of the railway were financed from foreign loans. About 1.4 million soldiers and 42,000 officers served in the army. The only chance to balance the expenses and revenues of the treasury was the industrialization of Russia, which Witte preferred, incurring foreign loans on its development. In 1914, the Russian government's debt totaled 8.8 billion rubles, of which 48%, ie 4.2 billion (2.1 billion dollars, equivalent to 3360 tonnes of gold) were debts incurred under foreigners.:*

*at that time it was the highest foreign debt in the world. In addition, in 1914, foreigners held 870 million rubles in securities and 422 million rubles in municipal bonds* **(Pipes 1994: 61).**

*This is largely due to the growth of non-agricultural sectors, possible thanks to foreign injection (French-32.6%, English-22.6%, German-19.7%, Belgian-14.3% (Pipes 1994: 62)) of capital, between 1892 and 1903, treasury income increased more than double (from 970 million to 2 billion rubles). It was also pointed out that foreign investors did not make profits from the the Russian economy, but invested them again, which resulted in a cumulative positive effect. (...) In mid-1914, European investment in the United States was estimated at 6.7 billion dollars, twice as much as European investments in Russia* **(Pipes 1994: 62).**

*The need to borrow abroad has become particularly urgent after the collapse of 1891 and 1892, which forced the government to temporarily reduce grain exports what caused a fiscal crisis. Foreign loans, which until 1891 were taken by Russia on a relatively small scale, have increased significantly since then* **(Pipes 1994: 61).**

*This testifies to a reduction in grain harvest and a reduction in their exports by Russia in the period after 1891, which resulted from a series of very cold and barren years.*

*As a result, Russia, looking for capital in the countries of parliamentary democracy, became vulnerable to the influence of the supporters of the parliamentary form of government. It was natural, therefore, that the Ministry of Finance, playing a major role in fiscal operations, became the spokesman for liberal ideas. He did not dare to defend the slogans of constitutionalism and parliamentarism, but he demanded a reduction of bureaucratic and police arbitrariness, respect for the law and equal rights for minorities, in particular Jews who were important in the international banking system* **(Pipes 1994: 63).**

*In 1898, Sergey Witte sent a note to the young Czar, the meaning of which was contained in two sentences:*

*In my deepest conviction, the peasant question is now a major issue in the life of Russia. It is necessary to regulate it "(...)" Sergei Witte argued as a financier: before the reform of the budget was 350 million rubles, the abolition of serfdom allowed to increase it to 1,400 million rubles. The population of Russia was 130 million. Meanwhile, the budget of France with 38 million inhabitants is 1260 million rubles, the Austrian budget of population of 43 milion reach to 1100 million rubles. The minister of finance argued that Russia needed funds for intensive industrialization of the country, and the main source of budget revenues, agriculture, gives too little. The energy that the 1861 impulse launched was exhausted. The peasants interested Wittego primarily as tax payers. He systematically increased their burden, but more and more money was needed. The impoverishment of peasants limited the possibility of increasing tax pressure, and their resistance increased (Heller 2000: 682).*

*In a letter to Mikołaj II Witte he proposed to "make the peasant a truly free man" - give him the opportunity to withdraw from the community and give all rights enjoyed by other social states. (") The reform carried out in 1906 was based on the program proposed in 1898. Witte believed that Stolypin "stole" Witte's plan* **" (Heller 2000: 684).**

*From 1898 to 1902, tensions among the Russian peasants grew, which turned into riots and demonstrations. In regions affected by the riots in 1901. crop failure occurred.*

*Peasant riots in 1902 took the largest size in the Ukrainian governorates: Poltava and Kharkov. The first riots began in March in the Konstantinogrodzki poviat in the Poltava Governorate, when a group of local peasants attacked the goods of Prince Mecklemburg, robbing farm produce, living inventory, burning the manor and the outbuilding, and demanding land parcelling. Subsequently, the riots covered other poviats and looted 80 properties. In most cases the robberies were calm and well organized. Decisions on the robbery were often made open at village meetings, and those who took part in them were led by the head of the village. Confiscated goods were fairly shared among peasants, depending on their needs. The events in the Poltava and Kharkiv Governorate Governments launched riots in the neighboring Ukrainian regions. At the same time, similar riots took place in the Volga provinces - in the Saratov and Tambow provinces. In mid-1902, all southern Russia, from Ukraine to the Ural, was covered by a wave of peasant riots* **(Smoleń 1989: 29-30).**

**The riots began to expire at the end of 1902, i.e. probably after the harvest.**

*Not the best crops in 1901 and the worries in the cities caused a wave of riots and disturbances in 1902. In Volhynia, central governorates and Ukraine, the peasants refused to work on land, burned manors, took cereals and landowners' inventory, resisted the police and military units. Numerous punitive expeditions and brutal repressions enabled the government to somehow relieve the situation, although it was far from calming the peasant masses. On January 22 (February 4) 1902, just before the climax of rural disturbances, another commission called the Extraordinary Council for Agricultural Production was established, which survived until the first months of 1905. After the formation of the Council, over 600 separate committees were established in individual Governorates and counties of the entire empire. Their action and the Council did not bring about any results - the reasons for the crisis were not specified. It was pointed out that the most urgent needs of agriculture are:*

*-make the level of education of the people*

*- increase the independence of the social initiative*

*-change of the onerous tax system*

*- eliminating interference of administrative factors*

*-the liquidation of rural commune communities was only partially supported (Bazylow, Wieczorkiewicz 2005: 316-317).*

Piotr Arkadjewicz Stolypin was a Russian providential man because he wanted to improve the agricultural system of Russia. But he also did not avoid the mistakes that resulted from his limited knowledge of Russia's problems. The beginnings of his career took place in the Kaunas Governorate, where he observed peasants cultivating the fields of their own land. Their methods of cultivation were much more efficient than the methods of Russian peasants known to Stołypin. However, Stolypin did not take into account the fact that the climate of the Kaunas was better than in the depths of Russia (rains from the Atlantic and the well-developed river system and the warming effect of the Gulf Stream). When he later became the governor of Saratov, located near the border with Kazakhstan, the least irrigated by the rains of the region of Russia, he came into contact with the poorest and most rebellious Russian farmers who lived in the communities, and the owner of the arable land was the rural comune, not the individual peasant. He experienced the wealth of the Kaunas farmers and the poverty of the Saratov peasants. It is from these observations that his conviction about the superiority of the peasant individual economy over the communal economy of the obszczina one came about. Certainly there was also a mechanism to facilitate the flow of modern agricultural knowledge from England and the Netherlands, which easily reached Kaunas, and access to Saratov was difficult. Thus, Stolypin decided to introduce in Russia a system based on individual ownership of land, seen in the Kaunas province (information about Stolypin (Figes 2009: 246)).

The actions of Russian politicians aiming at the liquidation of rural communities were influenced by an erroneous view of the ineptitude of the Russian peasants:

Granting extra land to the peasants will not help in solving their problems, because they result from the inefficiency of the community system, not the lack of land. This argument was strongly influenced by the recent experience: always considering the community as the rock of the old rural order, the conservatives found in 1905 that it could easily become the organizational mechanism of the peasant revolution .... The nobility now clung to the idea of ​​abolishing the community and creating peasant class of landowners as an alternative to the radical land reform of the Duma (ie taking over land from the nobility and handing it over to the peasants) (Figes 2009: 244).

The decree of 9 November 1906 gave the peasant the right to withdraw from the rural community together with the land he owned at the time. (...) The decade 1906-1916 demonstrated the desire of a large part of the peasants to free themselves from the cocoon of the community, to become free farmers. Until 1916, 2 million peasant families left the "mir" and moved to the farms or remained in the countryside, but as owners of their own land. The Bolsheviks' coming to power stopped this process. (...) An important part of the Stolypin program was the organization - for those interested - of resettling small farmers from Ural (to Siberia, the Far East, Central Asia). In the years 1906-1913, about 3.5 million of peasants move there (Heller 2000: 700-702).

*The government, said Duma Stolypin, set the stakes not on the poor and alcoholics, but on the strong ones. Under the Act of November 9, 1906 entrepreneurial peasants were granted the right to appear from the community and establish their own separated farms-separate farms (chutors) or connected plots within the community (otrub). The ownership in the rural comune - village could be transformed by voting of family heads, by the two-thirds votes in the entire village . Money for the purchase of land from the nobility and the state came from low-interest loans from Chłopski Bank Ziemski* (Figes 2009: 259).

Views on the community of Baron August Haxthausen, a German economist who traveled around Russia in 1843-44:

*The community is the result of the earliest forms of development, and its ownership relations originate from the original idea of ​​the unity of the community, and the equal rights of every peasant to the part of the land that comune owns. The peasants' demands for land division of the land resulted from the fact that the maximum number of land divisions was already carried out in communities and the plots granted were too small to support peasant families at a decent level of existence - hence the postulate of the land division of great landowners* (Bazylow 2008: 199).

*The subjection of the peasants left one more problem in the fall. By allocating generous farmland to the liberated subjects (about 5 ha to an adult man), the enfranchisement law left pastures and forests as landowners' property. Under the conditions of serfdom, the peasants used the right to graze cattle and collect wood for fuel and timber, but lost it due to the separation of property* (Pipes 1994: 79).

*At the turn of the century, one of the most complaints of the peasants concerned the shortage of pastures. The peasant had to have access to a sufficiently extensive pasture - ideally one hectare of pasture per two hectares of arable land, and in the worst case, one to five - otherwise he could not feed his cattle and draft horses. Also, closing the access to the forest caused enormous inconvenience. In 1905, the most widespread form of peasant protest was the felling of trees* (Pipes 1994: 79-80).

*The land within the rural community was usually not inherited. Inheritance occurred only in the west and south of Russia. After the death of the host (bolszaka - choziaina) who ran the farm, the family shared only mobile property, and the land returned to the community and there was a new division between the male members of the village community - the peasants.*

*The land parcelling itself in villages was extremely complicated, partly due to communal practices, and partly as a result of serfdom. In Russia, before 1861, the estate was not a homogeneous plantation. The custom required that the landowner should divide the farmland that belonged to him into two parts, one part of which was cultivated for the landowner, and the other for the peasant. As a rule, these halves were mixed up. During the serfdom, a typical peasant village, especially in northern and western governorates, was a mosaic of long, narrow patches of land: scraps grown for the landowner and cultivated by the subjects for themselves were located nearby. Such a system, called a checkered field, was preserved after the subjects were released. As a result of the divisions carried out in connection with the abolition of serfdom, land that remained the landowner's property, and henceforth was cultivated by means of hired labor, often remained pressed between plots belonging to the commune. Therefore the land, which landlords later sold to peasants, remained in the hands of buyers and was cultivated by them alongside municipal property, to the strong dissatisfaction of peasants belonging to the community, who hated private plots, called them "Babylonia" and wanted to retrieve them for communal ownership* (Pipes 1994: 79).

How the land plots looked within the community says the following fragment:

Ten tithes (27 acres) of the peasant Siemionow consisted of over 50 different narrow plots in various places. The belts were definitely too narrow - some were no more than a meter wide - for modern plows and harrows; besides, too much time was wasted to move machines from field to field. Periodical distribution of plots within rural comunitydid not motivate to fertilize the soil, because any benefits resulting from this could be lost as a result of subsequent field assignments. There was little chance of introducing a modern crop rotation, because in the system of open fields everyone was obliged to stick to this pattern of cultivation so that the cattle could fall simultaneously on the stubble, and this is how the stagnation came about. It was my dream, wrote Siemionow, to set up a fenced farm with seven-crop rotation; no more narrow plots (Figes 2009: 259).

What were the arguments against the breakup of the Russian village community:

- granting certain property rights will deprive access to the land of others for which it was the only means of subsistence,

the private property of the oldest man in the family will liquidate family property. He could deprive the inheritance of other family members,

-thepeople are afraid that the elders will sell the land and their children will be poor,

- many were afraid that permission to buy land would move it into the hands of the richest,

-difficulties with a fair distribution of chessboard fields due to their different quality (Figes 2009: 260).

Other obstacles preventing the exit from the community were that you had to:

*- pay interest on bank loans*

*- provide own means of transport, tools, wood, pastures and seed stocks that were previously a community benefit*

*- other municipal services - church, school, shops, and small crafts and network of neighborly contacts - have now become unavailable at least partially.*

*By 1917, many individual farmers had fallen into terrible poverty and were all too scrambled to liquidate farms, to rejoin the village community and participate in the division of loot, when the community resumed the battle for noble estates* (Figes 2009: 264).

*Of the six million individual land application applications that were received by 1915, more than one-third were later withdrawn by the applicants themselves, mainly due to the pressure of their neighbors. Of those that were completed (a total of about one million individual land consolidations), two-thirds had to be forced by the authorities against the community's opposition* (Figes 2009: 262).

*The number of consolidations after the initial impulse dropped drastically after the period 1909-1914. Between 1906 and 1917 about 15% of all peasant farms in the European part of Russia connected the land to private plots, individually or in groups, which in total amounted to 27 to 33% of peasant farms in perpetual usufruct. Most of the peasants farmed in the otrubie, which gave the right to access municipal pastures and forests. Chutors were preferred by Stolypin, but nevertheless they were less popular* (Figes 2009: 263).

*Between 1906 and 1911. the chances of pulling the peasantry into active participation in governing the country were missed. The Stolypin Reform aimed at establishing self-governmental lands at the level of the commune seized by self-employed peasants was rejected.*

*Stolypin proposed to establish a representation of the lands at the level of the commune, where the electoral law would be rather based on property rather than on birth. This eliminated the nobility's dominance over the peasantry, which triggered strong protests from the nobility, which could lose its social position of domination over the peasantry. Stolypin lost the struggle for peasant lands and the system of rural administration remained in the hands of 20,000 nobles. If Stolypin had succeeded in broadening the social base of local self-government in the countryside, perhaps it would not have disintegrated so catastrophically, and the Soviet authorities would not fill the social vacuum as effectively as it did* (Figes 2009: 251).

*There was an unobtainable barrier between the czar and the peasants, and the space filled up the conflict of interests. As a result of free-market reforms, land ownership was concentrated in the hands of rich peasants, and small farmers cultivated small plots of land to survive.*

*Inheriting from the past, the fragmentation of the peasant economy has increased even more as a result of the October coup: the number of independent farms increased from 16 to 25 million during the first decade, which inevitably led to the purely consumerist character of most peasant farms* (Trotsky 1991: 25).

*At the same time, peasant farms were concentrated. Meanwhile, already in the spring of 1926, almost 60% of the grain for sale remained in the hands of 6% of peasant farms* (Trotsky 1991: 26).

These were probably large peasant farms created as a result of buying land from small farmers and worse farmers. This led to the stratification of the rural community and the formation of a large group of landless people. This caused a reaction of the Bolsheviks and the establishment of kolkhoz and sovozy, along with the abolition of private land ownership.

But earlier was the great crisis of 1920, partly culpable by the Bolsheviks.

Russia's difficult food situation was also caused by terror directed by the Bolsheviks against Russian peasants in 1918. Terror directed against the so-called the kulaks, ie the best farmers, caused a huge decline in agricultural production and shortages in food supply for the Russian population. Who knows whether this did not lead to a decision to attack Poland in 1920?

*In 1921, 5 million people died of starvation in Russia (Pipes 1994: XII).*

The appeal published in Poland in the summer of 1920 *(Miłosz 2000: 120)* speaks of the reasons for the Bolshevik invasion of Poland:

*Why do the Bolsheviks go to us?*

*Do you remember the German and Austrian "potato troops"? They were called because the German staff, when the time of potato harvest was approaching, directed the troop movements so that they could take as many potato fields as possible to nourish a hungry army.*

*All of Russia is such a "potato army" today.*

*The Bolsheviks heard that in Poland this year was extremely fertile and our grain tasted good for them.*

*In Russia for almost three years, especially since the Bolsheviks rule there, misery is increasing more and more, people are dying of hunger and dying in cities, and in the villages it is not better either, because they take everything they have, and even that there is not much, because there is no sowing crop and there are not even agricultural tools to cultivate the land.*

*The Bolsheviks want to eat their fill.*

*They want to collect this harvest, which promises everywhere so beautifully that the oldest people of better harvests do not remember.*

*Bands of hungry rags are coming to us!*

*They are going to plunder, not only for themselves, but for the whole of their country, which the Bolsheviks have brought to hunger and misery.*

*Let the peasant stand by the farmer and drive the hungry locust away from his fields and his barns. You must defend yourself against this wilderness or else they will eat us all.*

**In 1929, when Stalin proclaimed the transition to the policy of collectivization and the liquidation of kulak as a class, the reconstruction of the rural community began (on the Soviet order). At the beginning of the nineties of the twentieth century, kolkhozy and sovchozy, contrary to predictions, did not fall apart (Heller 2000: 700-702).**

**I refer to the above quotation again on February 29, 2016, obliged by thoughts about the Russian revolution. In post-revolutionary France, there was a huge concentration of agricultural ownership. This was related to the economic processes accompanying the continuous reduction in global prices of agricultural products related to the progressive global warming. The Bolsheviks, knowing probably about the process of concentration of land ownership in France, decided to carry out this process in Russia. It was the most adapted to the current global situation in agriculture. Hence the decision to concentrate land ownership in Russia in the form of collective farms and state farms. The difficulties that arose during the development of post-revolutionary small-scale French agriculture were thus avoided:**

**the need to provide loans to small farms,**

**supply them with means of production,**

**organizing purchase of agricultural products,**

**educational campaign about modern agricultural technologies,**

**organizing specializations in production.**

**In short, the decision of the Bolsheviks to organize collective farms and sovachments was very rational and adapted to the existing economic and political situation. A necessary condition was the extermination of the peasants for whom it was taking away the land promised by Lenin. Nowadays, a different situation is emerging, because soon food prices will skyrocket and food imports will become too expensive for the Russian budget. The only way out of the situation will be to change the structure of Russian agriculture and the development of small-scale farms in place of collective farms and sovkhozes. Small farms are 100% more efficient than large-scale agricultural enterprises and will be able to double Russian agricultural production. Unfortunately, to organize this, we need to return to the former rural communities and feudal system in Russian agriculture. Will it be possible to carry it out and explain it to the Russians?**

# III.5.4.1.3.2. The nobles and successful liberals - elite of the bourgeois revolution

# The prices of European grain, which fell rapidly since 1820 to the beginning of the 20th century, and the affranchisement of peasants, impoverished the Russian nobility.

# In the mid-nineteenth century, many heirs had already fallen in debt. Until 1859, one-third of the estates and two-thirds of the peasants owned by the land aristocracy were rendered mortgaged to the aristocratic banks and the state (Figes 2009: 69).

# The gentry, the landowners, seriously declined economically in the years of the agricultural crisis( low prices of american grain) in the late nineteenth century and turned to the local governments, to defend their local interests against the centralizing and industrializing bureaucracy of St. Petersburg (Figes 2009: 69).

# Because the nobility paying taxes (about 15% of income (Figes 2009: 73)) impoverished, Russia's income also decreased. Already from the mid-nineteenth century, the foreign debt of the Russian treasury grew on the eve of World War One until 5.6 billion rubles (Bazylow 2005: 315). Probably a large part of this indebtedness was caused by investments in agricultural infrastructure run by the local-local self-governments. It was probably a far-reaching plan of Russia's reform continued by the tsars. This was to be improved by the peasants' position and, in the future, the state's income was to increase. Russia's debt was to be remedied by the reform of the Russian village - abolition of the peasants' serfdom, which caused an increase in the income of the Russian treasury from 350 to 1 400 million rubles. This meant impoverishing the nobility's income by about 1,000 million rubles a year and depriving them of its free labor force.

The liberation of the serf peasants brutally shook not only the economy, but also the entire culture of the provincial gentry's life. Deprived of the free workforce, the landlords inevitably impoverished. The entire period between 1861 and 1917 could be depicted as the slow death of the former agricultural elite, on which the tsarist system was based. In the past, the old Russian serfdom economy was never carried out with the intention of generating profits. The land gentry gained prestige (and sometimes also high office) on the basis of the number of serfs owned. The feudal system thus occupied the lands of Russia. The collapse of this social system ennobling the nobility, after the liberation of the peasants from serfdom, destroyed the world of prosperity of the old elite of the Russian nation. From then on they had to fight for existence subject to market rules. Although they received substantial sums as a result of the tsarist reform (the government was obliged to pay landowners an advance payment of 80% of the land transferred to their former subjects (Pipes 1994: 60)).Advance payments to the nobility payed by banks came from the peasants' purchase of land (burdened with 49-year high-interest payments), but the nobles had to invest them reasonably. However, the noblemen who used to be used to the vain life (Kropotkin 1959) with difficulty and with failures adapted to the requirements of the market. Debts continued to grow, forcing the nobles to lease or sell the land in their hands.

In the period 1861-1900, over 40% of the lands belonging to the nobility were sold to the peasants, and the growing hunger of agricultural land caused by a sharp increase in the population led to a seven-fold increase in the value of land. A similar increase was recorded in lease prices and until 1900 two thirds of landed arable lands were leased to peasants. (...) Not all landowners eagerly made the debts. Many of them started the business by transforming their assets into profitable ventures, and it was from these circles that liberal representatives of the local council emerged who questioned the autocracy in the last decades of the centuries (Figes 2009: 70).

The above-described processes led to the formation of a dissatisfied elite, on the one hand composed of landless and bankrupt landowners, and, on the other hand, from dissatisfied noblemen who were dissatisfied with the autocratic power system and who, thanks to their own work and a certain limited freedom, achieved market success. The second major reform of 1864 led to the creation of local self-government assemblies called lands( in Polish "ziemstwo") and city council.

The lands introduced education and reform in the countryside. However, even more difficult to solve the problem for the lands was the growing opposition of the central government towards their activities under the rule of the last two tsars. Alexander III considered the lands as a dangerous breeding ground for liberalism. The government was very concerned about 70000 professional land workers - teachers, doctors, statisticians and agronomists - referred to as the third element (Figes 2009: 73).

The following quote says about the important role of the lands in reforming the countryside:

Most of the initiatives improving the location of peasant citizens were taken up by new self-government bodies, so-called lands, established at county and provincial level in 1864. They were guided by landowners who resembled the heroes of Tolstoj's and Czechow's liberal prose, full of good intentions, dreaming about civilization of a backward village. With the help of the enormous resources they had at their disposal, they founded schools and hospitals, provided peasants with veterinary and agronomic services, built new roads and bridges, invested in the development of local crafts and industry, financed insurance programs and agricultural loans, and carried out ambitious statistical surveys to prepare further reforms (Figes 2007: 172).

The educational and legal reforms led by Alexander I contributed to the rise of the revolutionary boiling, starting with the decembrists' movement. Thanks to them, the level of education and public awareness has already grown considerably, under rule Alexander II who is moving towards the constitutional monarchy.

Between 1860 and 1914, the number of university students in Russia increased from 5,000 to 69,000 (of which 45% were women), the number of daily newspapers increased from 13 to 856, and the number of public institutions from 250 to 16,000 (Figes 2009: 186).

When the liberal and educated part of society - mainly members of the lands and students - gained more self-awareness and a sense of leadership in politics, at the same time realized the huge and terrifying chasm - the gap that emerged during hunger - dividing them from undernourished masses (Figes 2009 187).

The reactionary landowners, trying to oppose the influence of peasants and Jews in the lands, led to the adoption in 1890. a law prohibiting Jews and peasants from participating in elections to the lands. Self-governing lands were given to the governor's control, and the heads of the lands appointed as a result of the counterreform in 1889 served the tsar faithfully until 1917 (Figes 2009: 74). Two thousand heads of the so-called to small tsars, the extensive executive and judicial powers were granted over the peasants and they could even go into public flogging. However, their power weakened after the revolution of 1905. The officers were appointed from among retired officers and minor noble sons. With their help the tsar wanted to restore the old social order based on the alliance with the nobility. This failed the tsarist regime and the Russian society on the path of a growing conflict. Autocratic reaction against the lands-local goverments, excluded the masses from politics - peasants were considered too savage to play a role in politics. The Stolypin Reform - the project to establish the lands at the level of the commune dominated by the peasantry in 1906-1911 fell (Figes 2009: 74).

The 19th-century philosopher Dymitrij N.Szypow had a similar vision of independent Russian communities:

The key to his liberal Slavophilism was the vision of Russia as "a country with local self-governments and an autocratic ruler at the helm". He believed in an ancient spiritual bond between the tsar and his people, in a relationship which in his understanding was broken only by the "autocracy of the bureaucracy" (Figes 2009: 188).

It was among the new elite of the society subjected to market reforms that the staff of the lands focused on a democratic reform of the political and social system of Russia. The Social Democrats were divided into Mensheviks, who believed that education and propaganda will lead to the social breakthrough, and the Bolsheviks insisting on workers revolution in a country in which workers constituted 1.42% of the nation. The basis of the Menshevik ideology was the thought of Aleksander Hercen:

The theory of revolution presented by Hercen boils down to one central assumption, since the only source of all freedom is the people, the source of oppression is the tsarist state, Russia can only free the true social revolution. (...) The only democratic means of revolution is education and propaganda, because they will help people understand what is in their best interest and prepare them gradually for the tasks of exercising power (Figes 2009: 158).

The reason for the victory of the revolutionary Bolshevik concept was the growing state terror. In a state with terror, continuaus terror, evolutionary concepts were hardly accepted.

In the years 1906-1909 more than 5,000 political prisoners were sentenced to death and 38,000 were imprisoned or sent to exile. In the areas of the peasant revolt, the army equated with the land of the village - it killed the leaders of the revolution. Between mid-October and the opening of the First State Duma in April 1906, the regime shot 15,000 and wounded at least 20,000 and condemned 45,000 people. (...) After the Duma was formed, there was a gulf between the constitutional ideas of liberal classes and the socio-economic problems of the masses workers and peasants: the paths of social and political revolution have spread (Figes 2009: 222).

Bloody Sunday in January 1905 began the culmination of the bloody revolutionary events of this period. They were a consequence of the crisis associated with several years (1900-1905) rapid cooling of the climate, which probably caused famine in the countryside and high prices of food in cities. The violent uprisings and riots of people in Russia frightened the liberal intelligentsia, who from the example of the French Revolution knew that the revolution was killing their children. The liberal bourgeoisie so far supporting the revolutionary movements changed its policy and began to see in the tsarist repressive system the only guarantee of preventing a bloody revolution. A political vacuum was created because the revolted masses lacked leadership. This gap was filled by the Bolsheviks and their program of workers revolution.

The gentry was frightened by the violence of the peasant masses in the 1905 revolution. They were selling their property: between 1906-1914, the landowners sold 20% of their land to peasants, 30% in more rebellious regions (Figes 2009: 231).

Reformers in the Russian state began to fear the masses.

*As Lenin later estimated, by the year 1905 three things became clear:*

*- The bankruptcy of the bourgeoisie and its liberal parties as a revolutionary force*

*- the huge revolutionary potential of the peasantry*

*-the ability of nationalist movements in the border regions to irreversibly weaken the empire.*

*According to Lenin, workers can bypass the bourgeois revolution postulated by Mensheviks, and take power in alliance with peasants and national minorities* (Figes 2009: 235).

It was a conscious assessment of the current political and social situation in Russia.

The Jewish minority was the most frustrated people in Russia. The persecuted, well-educated and extremely solidarity Jews were the most motivated minority to overthrow the tsarist state. Hope for a new social system in which they would not be persecuted was a sufficient reward to dedicate themselves to the revolutionary movement. They have become the leaders of the Russian revolution to use the revolutionary potential of the Russian people.

**III.5.4.1.3.3. Elite of the Bolshevik revolution. Jews and the Russian Revolution.**

The Bolshevik elite were revolutionaries from the Jewish people living in Russia. Other branches of revolutionaries were also directed by Jews. The Russian Jews, in the pursuit of gaining power in Russia, were supported by the entire world Jewish community. Interesting is the process leading to the transformation of the victims of persecutions lasting centuries into the executioners of the victims of the revolution. I describe this process below.

The Jewish Diaspora in Russia currently has about 800,000 people, but many Russian Jews emigrated to Israel and the United States. Probably in tsarist Russia, the Jews were more numerous because for centuries they fled to the east before the pogroms in Western Europe. The Jewish population in 1864, *excluding Poland, had one and a half million people. On the other hand, together with Poland there were: in 1850 - 2,350,000, in 1880 - 3,980,000. From the initial group of around one million, at the first partitions of Poland, they reached 5,175,000 at the census in 1897* (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 118). .

 Russian Jews could also be descendants of the Khazar state's former society. In any case, they create usually compact, self-governing communes as a mainstay for its members. Centuries of hardships, wandering and painful struggles with fate have made them entrepreneurial but socially sensitive people. They were characterized by extraordinary solidarity because they learned that it would be easier to survive in a compact group.

*A professionally disabled Jew was condemned to a total handicap. In struggling to match or even surpass the Christian majority that surrounds them, the Jews created a strong bond of solidarity between themselves, leading in some areas to the creation of mafias aimed at mutual support and elimination of Christian*s (Krasuski 1978: 97).

We do not usually write about Jews in historical books, so I have found information about their fate in Tsarist Russia in the article "The area of ​​settlement - homeland of Central European anti-Semitism" by Anna Pawlikowska -link: http://www.znak.org.pl/?page1= sylwa & subpage1 = sylwa00 & infopassid1 = 758 & scrt1 = sn, which appeared on the pages of the Jewish-Christians-Muslim-Forum online bulletin to the Forum website http://www.znak.org.pl/. I quote:

*The settlement zone was established (Jews in the zone of settlement could settle down - the author's parable) in the western Russian governorates formed after the next partitions of Poland, as well as the Governors located on the Black Sea. Ukaz meant de facto the deportation of Jews from eastern Russia. The rules regarding the settlement of Jews in Russia and in the zone permitted for them were extremely strict and restrictive under the aforementioned edict. They were forbidden to live in the country (they had alcohol production and they sell liquor there, because how they were supposed to maintain themselves? - author's note) and acquiring land, the ban also included larger cities. It caused huge overpopulation in small towns, resulting in lack of work, misery of inhabitants and rapid growth of national antagonisms. The journalist of "Gazeta Łódzka" notes in 1915 that "Russian laws, however, are similar to the famous bridges, which travelers must evade (circumvent) on both sides. Avoiding the law is the same specifically as a Russian institution, such as "tsarism despotism", " rural self-goverment commune" and "knut." However, to circumvent the law, you had to have some countable "arguments", which means that a huge mass of Jews could not afford to get it. The liberation of restrictive rules was relaxed by Tsar Alexander I in 1810 Many wealthy Jewish merchants and military found themselves in St. Petersburg or Moscow at that time, and poorer Jews settled in an increasing number of villages in which trade could be developed. In the Russia were increased the number of Jewish students, but finally the Russian educational authorities found an original solution: the Minister of Education Tolstoy introduced the amounts known as "numerus clausus" - no more than 3 to 6 percent of Jewish students were allowed to attend gymnasium. Even this small influx of Jews caused in Russia, a strong anti-Semitic reflex In 1882, during a great wave of pogroms, Tsar Alexander III toughened the rigors of the settlement zone. The "May Acts" signed by Tsar prohibited Jews from settling in villages and towns below 1000 inhabitants. Jews were also forbidden to act as advocates. As part of the execution of tsarist law, the Jewish population was expelled from St. Petersburg and Moscow to the settlement zone. The next wave of pogroms took place in the years 1903-1906. Responsibility for this falls on the Russian authorities, which inspired the population to them. A powerful and sinister role was played during the pogroms of the Association of the Russian People, the notorious Black Sotnia. It was a powerful blow to Jewish communal structures, usually deprived of all property and the ability to organize Jewish life.*

*The only major groups of people leaving Russia were non-Russians from the western gubernias: 3026 thousand tsarist subjects who emigrated in 1897-1916, over 70% were Jews and Poles* (Pipes 1994: 81).

Jewish emigration to the USA was probably selective. These The Jewish families emigrated, recognizing the domination of women and the oral Talmud, and in Russia there remained families subject to the authority of the man and the written Talmud. The difference between them is that when the Oral Talmud is in force and the family kills a failed business son, husband, father, according to this Jewish law, there is no crime. In the written Talmud, this provision probably does not occur. These differences in the law developed by the rabbis shaped the entire Jewish culture. I learned this from a desperate orthodox Jewish Jew who told me in 2000 after the collapse of the Polish People's Republic and the USSR: Jews no longer want to live.

Communist system was the rescue for Jewish man because in this system Oral Talmud

it was not in force, and in the free market system it was the most applicable.

 Thus, we can see that in the society of Jewish immigrants to the United States, families using the Oral Talmud prevailed and this fact shaped the business culture of the United States, while in Soviet Russia remained the Jewish community using more liberal (shaped by men) written Talmud. The subsequent hostility between the Soviet Union and the US resulted from various social tactics, defined by the Talmud law, used by the elites of these countries. There are, probably because, two world Jewish mafias applying their laws in practice. Jewish capital is created thanks to a 10% tax on the turnover paid by members of the commune. This results in the principle of supporting this community of Jews in high-income positions that ensure high taxes. All methods are used to place members of Jewish communities in positions in state, municipal and business administration - wherever money is available. This money then appears in companies controlled by Jews.

For example, in the final phase of Edward Gierek's rule in Poland, in the Polish state-owned industry, all supply departments of large enterprises were taken over by the so-called Moczara men - the Jewish male mafia. This Mafia, after the collapse of the PRL, preferred supply purchases located in "their" enterprises run by Jews, who thus mastered the Polish trade in industrial goods.

*It is therefore hardly surprising that the Jews played such a large and significant role in the revolutionary movement. Even Witte after the Jewish pogrom in Chisinau in 1903. he was forced to admit that if the Jews "constitute 50% of the members of revolutionary parties", it is "the fault of our government. Jews are overly repressed. "(Figes 2009: 104).*

*Tsar believed that 90% of the Jews were revolutionaries and that the pogroms were deserved (Figes 2009: 222).*

*In pre-revolutionary Russia there was a huge, five-fold increase in the Jewish population in 100 years, and at the same time:*

*the largest reform of Alexander I, historically the most important turning point in Russian history - the liberation of the peasants, the abolition of the serfdom in 1861 - turned out to be extremely unfavorable for the Jews in Russia, and even ruinous for many of them. The general socio-economic changes taking place in connection with the abolition of serfdom's dependence [...] greatly worsened the financial situation of the broad Jewish masses during this transitional period. The social change consisted in the fact that the population of the peasantry, many millions of people deprived of rights and freedom of movement, were now free, and thus the significance of numerous Jewish freedoms fell relatively. On the other hand, the economic change was expressed [...] that the peasant who was freed from dependence [...] needed the Jewish services less ..., that is, he did not have to obey the strict ban on selling his products and buying goods differently than through the designated an intermediary (almost always a Jew in western governorates [...] Now, landowners, having lost their free serfdom so as not to go bankrupt, [...] were forced to personally deal with their farm, in which earlier an important role belonged to Jews - tenants We note that the agricultural credit introduced in those years was pushing out the Jew [...] as the organizer of the financial basis of landed existence .. The development of client and credit associations led to the liberation of people from the tyranny of usury (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 119) , which cut the roots of the existence of the Jewish masses in Russia and caused their dissatisfaction From the government, the Tsar unsuccessfully called the Jews to:*

*settling on the land, allocating fertile land to them,*

*to education and assimilation in Russian society.*

*Only after the issuance of a new military regulation in 1874 allowing those educated for relief in the military service, there was a period of influx of Jews to high schools - medium and high to shorten the period of service, but also to receive officer's degrees (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 131). In the 1870s, the percentage of Jewish students (from bourgeoisie and intelligentsia) grew considerably in universities to up to 9%, and even up to 31% in Odessa and 42% in Kharkiv, which caused reluctance in the Russian elite. The Jewish masses remained faithful to cheders and yeshivas (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 132). After the successful attack and death of Alexander II, six weeks later, there were pogroms of Jews, all over Russia, which precludes the inspiration of the Russian government. Such an action would be very difficult to organize in such a short time. Most of the Jews were robbed.*

*In the spring of 1881 also Łoris-Mielnikow reported to the Ruler: the basis of the present riots lies the deep hatred of the local population to the captivating Jews (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 153) caused by Jewish usury, lease of agricultural property, and mass sale of alcohol.*

*However, the current anti-Jewish riots [...] prove that despite all efforts of the authorities, the abnormality of relations between the Jewish and native populations of these places exists as before. Since the time of easing legal restrictions, using economic conditions, the Jews took not only trade and industry, but they also acquired considerable land ownership, "with which, thanks to solidarity and solidarity, almost all of them, with few exceptions, directed their efforts not to increasing the productive forces of the state, but to exploiting mainly the poorest layers of the surrounding population (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 158).*

*Post-revolutionary estimates indicate that in villages lived one-third of the Jewish population, in towns also the third part, 29% in medium-sized cities and 5% in large ones. Restrictions in limiting the village population worsened the living conditions of a large part of the Jews. It caused emigration.*

*In early 1883, Alexander III approved the establishment of the highest commission for Jewish rights in Russia. It was attended by eminent representatives of Russian and Jewish society. The result was a conclusion: there is only one way out and one way is a way of liberation and uniting Jews with the entire population under the protection of one and the same rights (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 165).*

The positions of the tsarist administration were offered to educated Jews, especially in Polish governorates (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 140), which aroused aversion to them among Poles. Jewish educated youth in Russia wanted to break this vicious circle of animosity, sometimes turning into hatred towards the Jews, and turned to serve the Russian people to ease peasants destiny. The ideals of the nation favored the assimilation and assimilation of the Russian spirit, but the young revolutionaries encountered a wall of misunderstanding among the peasants. The pogroms in Russia in 1881 caused a breakthrough in the Jewish intellectual consciousness and a further progressive union of the young revolutionaries with the Jewish masses.

There is a view that if the settlement zone were liquidated as part of the 1861-1863 reform, everything would have gone differently in our history [...] Alexander II would have abolished the settlement zone and there would be no Bund or Trotskyism! (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 177).

However, the influx of socialist ideas, Marxism from the West, caused that young Jewish revolutionaries did not fight for the abolition of the zone of settlement but dreamed of overthrowing the tsar. Youth is impatient and acts unwisely, wants to demolish and build from scratch. The evolution of the tsarist system of power towards an enlightened monarchy ruling a united nation was against the Marxist ideology calling for the destruction of the old order. Marxist ideology based on the false basis of Marx's theory led the young Jewish revolutionaries to the end of history, to a pointless situation. It was only the collapse of the Soviet Union and the fall of communism that showed the historical truth - the road that young educated Jews went through was false, cruel and ineffective. This shows the importance of research on the historical process and unadulterated scientific discourse about our past and future. Jewish propaganda in western Europe shouted differently-minded scientists and was universally embraced Marx's theory of class struggle as the spring of history. Meanwhile, it turns out that permanent political, economic and social crises result from the impact of the Sun and planets on the Earth's environment, resulting in a temporary reduction of plant production on our planet. This was predicted by an economist and mathematician Stanley Jevons 200 years ago. The phenomena that occur as a result of the Sun's influence, permanent starvations, force the human population to aggressive behavior leading to the revolution. Climate change and the resulting lack of food are responsible for the outbreaks of the revolution.

In order to avoid misfortune in the development of our civilization, we should finally deal with the Marx theory adopted by the Jewish community and confirm with scientific research that being shapes consciousness and consciousness shapes a new being, which statement is the result of my many years of research. It should also be admitted that the peaceful evolution of the socio-economic system is the only way leading to civilization growth, development of culture and world society.

Alexander III, after 1887, energetically turned to the inhibition of Russian Jewry by civic and political restrictions, which he continued until his death. It was justified by the Jewish participation in the revolutionary movement and their anti-state attitude. The limits of Jewish admission to schools were set, which were usually the seedbed of the revolution (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 214-215). The tsar acknowledged the intellectual superiority of the Jews over the Russians and the limits leveling the chance of less-learned Russian youth. In practice, the limits of admission to schools, for example in women's, specialist, artistic, commercial, private or private schools, have not been respected. The limits of admission to state schools, however, were a severe blow to the Jewish youth who wanted to educate. The university diploma was a pass to settle in the governorates outside the settlement zone. The careers of Jews in the advocate were also officially limited, to which they were exceptionally gifted thanks to the good memory of the centuries practiced in learning and memorizing the Talmud.

Religious minorities were oppressed in tsarist Russia as exemplified by the cruel persecutions of the Old Believers, the spiritualists, and the Molokany. At the same time, hereditary noble titles (196 nobles in 1897) and non-hereditary titles (3371 personal noblemen) were granted to Jews (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 216-223). In 1890, Jews were removed from participation in local self-governments, and in 1892 from administrative positions in the cities of internal governorates. According to the census of 1897, 9% of the population of Russian Jews (315,000) lived outside the settlement zone, not counting those staying there illegally. For comparison, in the United Kingdom there were two hundred thousand and in France, one hundred and fifteen thousand Jews (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 224-225). The natural and geographical conditions made the Russian lands three times poorer than the lands of Western Europe, which is why the Jews lived in Russia hardly and insufficiently in comparison with the rich West-European Jewry. The government and the tsar were blamed for this, the more so because the Jewish competition was too large in the zone of settlement as the population grew. It was not the tsar who owed the poor subjects, but the environmental conditions much worse than, for example, in Europe and the USA.

The Russian Empire had too small means to organize efficiently the administration of the state, so it is incomprehensible why the well-developed local self-government has not developed.

Neither the financial nor the educated Jewish upper social layer felt the restrictions of the settlement zone, freely settling in the inner governorates. 14% of the Jewish population had a free profesion. In 1905, in Russia, over a million three hundred thousand Jews were engaged in craft work, that is, they could live outside the zone and trade there. Restrictions on Jewish settlement rights in Russia contained a very "humanitarian" idea of ​​securing dark Russian peasants against exploitation on the part of Jews, who were smarter and had greater commercial knowledge and contacts with the world. However, it is necessary to see the bright side of this "exploitation" - it was the Russian Jews who organized the export of eggs, wood (in 1813-1913 increased 140 times), grain (a million Jews engaged in grain trade) to Western Europe, what supporting the Russian state. At the beginning of the 20th century, Jews constituted 35% of the merchant class of Russia (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 238). Private banks in Russia were mostly in Jewish hands.

In 1896, the state's monopoly on alcohol trade was introduced, removing private (mainly Jewish) Jews, and Russia's income from this account amounted to 285 million rubles, while direct taxes on the population amounted to 98 million rubles. As a result of the state alcohol monopoly, one hundred thousand Jews lost their source of significant earnings (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 231-232).

In 1903 a ban was issued for Jews to buy immovable property outside the borders of towns and cities. In 1908, Jews owned or rented two million tithes of land, and cultivated in the Jewish colonies one hundred and thirteen thousand tithes. The agrarian reforms of Stolypin transferring the land exclusively to the hands of those who work with them with their own hands violated the interests of an influential part of the Jews (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 234). Stolypin was shot by the Jewish revolutionary Bogrov, whose father was a wealthy entrepreneur.

Meanwhile, Russian Jewry in these decades, from the 70s of the XIX century to the beginning of the twentieth century, experienced accelerated development, undoubted flourishing of their intellectual elites, for which not only the zone of settlement, but also the limits of the Russian empire became too tight (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 240). Intellectual and business superiority of Russian Jews over the Russian native elite gave them the idea of ​​taking power in the Russian Empire. This thought was consistently implemented with the help of European and American Jewry. It was necessary to first finish tsarism and then to eliminate the Russian elite. This task was done at the expense of millions of victims. A state was created according to the Jews ideal - the Soviet Union. History, however, plays tricks and the time has come to eliminate the revolutionary Jewish elite destroyed by Stalin and his company.

The idea of ​​mastering Russia was also caused by the anti-Semitism which was growing in Western Europe and the United States. It was caused by the high prices of food at the end of the 19th century (and the beginning of the 20th century) and the most profitable professions dominated by Jews. The phenomenon of business dominance of Jews was caused by their extraordinary solidarity in creating purchasing groups for negotiating favorable prices from suppliers (for this purpose, one Jew bought for other Jews), then controlling the sale of the selected company, taking over this supplier and mastering entire industries, trading and services. This put Jews at the top of the social ladder and pushed to the margins of the native elite, which caused resentment and self-defense in the form of anti-Semitism. It was an illustration of the order of the processes of the circle of life discovered by me, in which the threat causes the increase of knowledge and then the growth of ethics-solidarity interpersonal, which gives strength-energy to life. Jews were threatened by growing persecution, which caused their rush to education ensuring a social position, which resulted in a stronger sense of connection, ethics between the young intelligentsia and the Jewish masses. This gave the incredible strength of the Jewish people who built a new, just state in their opinion. The increase in Jewish advantage was caused by the constant threat from Christian persecutors and was a reaction to anti-Semitism. Over the centuries of persecution, the Jews, in order to survive biologically, created a social system that was restrictive for Jewish men. A Jewish man who was unable to support a family was poisoned at the behest of a rabbi or kahal by his mother, wife or daughter. The Jewish men, defending themselves, created the masculine world mafia to support themselves in business, which allowed them to preserve their lives. They were forced to get rich under the threat of death from the Jewish women. To achieve this, they poisoned the others, killed their competitors or took over their property through marriages.

Marx's revolutionary theory, establishing state property instead of private, exempted Jewish men from a frenzied struggle for property and promised them safe state salaries. After the victory of the Bolshevik revolution, Russian Jews had enough power in Russia to organize a state-owned industry serving all Russians and to make a secular state. They offered their extraordinary entrepreneurship to their dream state and built a real industrial power in a short time. However, there were no mechanisms for rivalry in the Soviet economic system, what brought technological backwardness. Russia, however, still has a solid foundation for quickly entering the path of innovation and reforming its socio-economic system. It must be appreciated that the Jews, by creating the Soviet Union, abandoned the role of the social layer, which was growing at the expense of society, for the service of their skills to the Russian people. They have achieved great successes in the civilization of this huge but very poor country. They can go on, but you have to help them. Their state that gives social security to the nation is falling because it turned out to be inefficient. Thus, the former economic system that gave power to oligarchy and the Jewish mafia had been restored in Russia. I propose to change in this system only the rules of inheritance.The local community should only inherit private property or the Russian society as a whole should only inherit from these mafia legends. In other words, it is commendable to get rich, but everything that you have gained in life must be given back to the public by getting a proper pension or retirement. This will allow to create a civilized and effective socio-economic system in Russia. The Jews suffered a lot and were spiritually mature under the influence of constant persecution on the part of Christians.

 From this comes the conclusion that addressing with understanding and love for Jews will deprive them of the tendency to alienate from the surrounding society. Turning with love to enemies comes from the teachings of Jesus Christ and is the foundation of Christianity, therefore: Christians !!! Love Jews, if you want to convert them !!!!.

Jews could have already accepted Christianity and blended into Russian society. It was impossible for them due to the fact that no one in this society observed the teachings of Christ as the basis of Christianity. Russian Christianity (and Polish too!) Consisted in cultivating the ceremonial, it was a form of worship of the deity without the obligatory requirements of applying Jesus' injunctions in everyday life. Meanwhile, the Jews had their own ethical system - Torah and Talmud, enforcing universal virtuous everyday life. How to abandon such a system in favor of an unregulated Christianity system? How to live in an immoral Russian society using ineffective (including business !!!) ethical system of Christianity? The Jews saw great potential in Christianity. It grew out of the evolution of Judaism. Jewish nationalists carried the Gospels to the Russian people, but this movement froze after the pogroms in 1881. The Russians could not forgive the Jews and it was against the teachings of the Church. The trick is to convince ordinary people to apply the teachings of Christ. Until now, it is failed. I proposed for Poland the Program of the Party of the Decalogue, which may allow the improvement of Christianity, and it can serve virtually every society, including Russia. I am convinced that this program will make truly Christian nations of Europe, Russia and the world. You can find it in the current version in the next chapters of my book.

At the time when the Jewish Russian intellectual elites continued to flourish, Jewish emigration to the United States grew. 78.6% of Jews (about one and a half million people) leaving Russia arrived in the US in the years 1881-1914 (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 244). Emigration was caused by the growing deprivation of the Russian people resulting from overpopulation and climatic crises causing small yields and high prices of food. Poverty of the Russian people brought about an economic crisis ruining Jewish interests and an increase in the level of aggression of the peasantry in the overpopulated Russian village. The climatic crisis intensified towards the turn of the century and at the beginning of the 20th century and it was also marked in western Europe in the high prices of food. This resulted in growing inflation, increased tension and aggression in European societies manifested by growing anti-Semitism, which in turn led to the First World War.

The determination of the extent of the influence of the Orthodox Church is important for determining the causes of persecution of Jews in Russia.

In the second half of the 18th century, the Orthodox church lost a large part of its lands to the state, and an army of 100,000 parish clerics and their families was maintained by the state (Figes 2009: 77-104).

You can see from this quote that the Orthodox church had the largest propaganda apparatus and the best access to the people from all tsarist institutions. This alliance of the tsar and his powerful propaganda tube - the Orthodox Church played its part in persecuting resourceful and well organized Jews into self-governing Jewish communities. The Orthodox Church taught that Jews should be blamed for the death of Christ. They were the salt in the eye, the stranger, who, because he was more resourceful than the average Russian, was often the object of the people's reluctance. The Jews believed that the pogroms were caused by the tsarist apparatus in times of crisis, when a scapegoat was needed to divert the attention of the people from the socio-economic problems that Jewish pogroms were called to relieve the aggression of the crowds. Having an internal enemy on which the aggression of crowds can focus is easier to rule. However, it is not a coincidence that the waves of pogroms occurred during the years of climate crises, which turned into hunger crises and increased the number of riots. Pogroms have always exploded in the south-west of Russia and never in northern, central and eastern Russia. An example may be the Polish-Jewish Holocaust during the Chmielnicki Uprising, which probably broke out due to the sudden drought in Ukraine in that period. After all, there was no persecutor, no tsarism, and the Poles were just as murdered by the inhabitants of Ukraine as Jews.

The Jews had nowhere to run because they were persecuted everywhere. They did not want to live in such a humiliation as in their tsarist state. The only advice they came up with was to change the social system. The evolutionary road took time, and they did not want to wait anymore. The French Revolution was an example for them. No wonder there were so many revolutionaries among Jews fighting the tsarist system. They were the Bolshevik elite and did not hesitate to lead the revolution by abandoning their Jewish identity. They were not scared of the terror of the revolution but stood at its head. They had nothing to lose and everything to win. They had motivation. Thanks to this motivation, they planned and executed the extermination of almost all of the Russian intelligentsia, that could prevent the introduction of Marxism in Russia. Fate taunted the efforts of the Jews because Karl Marx's ideas were mostly false, and they themselves faced them in opposition in the twentieth century, when it turned out that they lead nowhere.

The Pogrom in Chisinau in 1903 caused a breakthrough in Jewish consciousness and initiated the creation of armed self-defense groups. This provoked a provocative change in the attitude of Jews towards the Russian state. Tsar and the government were blamed for persecution and provocation of anti-Jewish incidents and they openly called to overthrow them. This evoked a hostile reaction from the law-abiding Russian people who saw the protection in Tsar of the opposition from Jewish overwhelming oppression. At that time, the Russian government applied for large loans in international banks controlled by the Jewish finance. Therefore, it is difficult to accuse him of thoughtlessness and simultaneous organization of Jewish pogroms in Russia, which made it impossible to take loans from Jewish bankers. The tsarist force inside Russia was too weak to contain few revolutionaries and far too weak to control the aggression of the Russian people resulting from the food and economic crisis. The Russian people themselves evoked the pogroms of the Jews, defending themselves against the aggression of Jewish revolutionaries destroying the eternal order of the tsarist state. In 1905, in three days, a wave of pogroms passed through the settlement zone (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 312).

Leo Tolstoy said: I do not believe that the police are stirring up people [to pogroms]. And so they said about Chisinau and Baku [...]. It was a brutal expression of the will of the nation [...] The nation sees the violence of revolutionary youth and prevents it (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 314).

Similarly, Szulgin explained in the State Duma: People's lawlessness is very widespread in both Russia and other countries [...]. The instructive picture shows in this respect [...] America, where the lynching occurs under the name "Lynch's court" [...]. But an even more dangerous phenomenon has recently occurred in Russia - it is the same law that is defined as Jewish pogroms! When the authorities struck, when the most outrageous crimes against national feelings and national sanctities were completely unpunished, then people under the influence of spontaneous anger themselves went to trial. It goes without saying that, as happens in such cases, the nation is unable to separate the guilty from the innocent and, at least in our countries, he has blamed everything on the Jews. Of these, not many culprits suffered because they were very cleverly escaping abroad, while a whole host of completely innocent people were harmed (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 314).

W. Szulgin proposed, in 1907, from the tribune of the State Duma, to state in his resolution that [...] the western half of Russia, from Bessarabia to Warsaw, boils with hatred towards Jews, which he considers to be the main perpetrators of all misfortunes (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 321).

The Orthodox clergy were weak and long ago suppressed by the authorities and could not resist the pogroms:

The clergy could not even protest to the crucifixes and church banners wavering at the front of throngs persecuting the Jews (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 315).

In the years 1905-1907, 235,000 Jews emigrated to the United States alone (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 321). At the same time, Jewish youth were educating themselves with all power of trying to get a chance to get out of the danger in the settlement zone.

In 1905, there were 2247 Jewish students in Russia (9.2%), in 1906 there were 3702 (11.6%), and in 1907 - 4266 (12%) (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 322). The rush to education became a characteristic feature of Jewish youth because education softened the military service, gave the right to settle throughout the empire and often a free profession ensuring good living. He was an escape from a business threatened with bankruptcy and death from family cancer, and thanks to the good memory of Jews, he facilitated his scientific career. Education made it easier for Jews to gain a good professional position in the gentile society. Therefore, in the 20th century, every seventh Nobel winner in the world was a Jew.

However, it should be remembered that in 1905-1907 in Russia there were also massive pogroms of nobles and there were more of them than Jewish pogroms. The aggression of the people turned against all oppressors.

The Jews supported all enemies of Russia, including Japan in the war of 1905. The Jewish most powerful American banker Jakub Schiff granted Japan a $ 200 million loan for war purposes, guaranteed Japanese obligations incurred in Europe and at the same time torpedoed the Russians' efforts for a loan (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 271-272). He also financed the revolutionary movement in Russia. Russian Jewry in close international agreement organized world press campaigns that discredited the Tsar and the Russian government. A new secularized educated generation of Jewish revolutionaries emerged at the turn of the century. A new organizational network and battle groups conducting terror against state organs were created. These activities were supported by Austro-Hungary, Germany, the United States, Japan, Turkey in order to weaken the tsar's power and bring about internal riots which weakened the then strong Russian state. Lenin and a group of Russian revolutionaries were transported to Russia by the German authorities to organize revolution and sabotage actions of the tsarist authorities, which aimed to establish a separatist peace between Russia and Germany. Lenin's peace slogans with which he referred to the masses were then populism, but nevertheless had a great humanistic sense in stopping cruel and stopping millions of victims of war.

 In March 1917, the well-known lawyer O.O.Gruzenberg spoke with passion and commitment to the leaders of the Provisional Government and the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies' Council: We generously gave the Revolution a huge "percentage" of our nation, almost all of its flower, almost all youth [...] And when in 1905, a revolutionary people arose, innumerable Jewish militants flowed into its ranks with unstoppable force (Solzhenitsyn 2012: 283).

No one knows how to argue against that the Jews really helped Lenin in organizing the Russian proletariat and in bringing him to power. This is evidenced by the names of the first commissars and statistics of the Bolshevik administration in 1917-18: 448 Jews, 30 Russians, 34 Latvians, 22 Armenians, 12 Germans, 3 Finns, 2 Poles, 1 Czech, 2 Georgians, 1 Madjar.

Later, the picture changed and now we see natives from the Caucasus at the place of the Jews (written in 1930 \*). We know that the Jews helped Lenin with their money, but we also know that the attacks on Lenin, Trotsky, Uricki, Volodarski and Joffe were organized and carried out by Jews. We know, too, about the curse, which the rabbis cast against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Uricki, Volodarski, Parnus-Gelfand. I could not remain silent about this fact, because he proved the passivity of the Russians and the mobility and strong internal organization of the Jewish "diaspora", which is now being prosecuted and suppressed by new factors forming part of the Soviet Russia government (...) Indeed, the Bolshevik staff received from Sweden i.e. from Sumy Sumenson, considerable sums in gold, which was found by the investigation commission of Gen. Riezanów, and about which all Russian, French and English newspapers were written. The investigation revealed that these sums came from the Spartacist coffers, led by Liebknecht, with whom secret relations were held by Jakub Schiff, Kuhn, Loeb, Maks Warburg, and other bankers who belonged to the Jewish universe finances. On the other hand, the union of these Jewish activists with the staff of William II was not indicated by General Ryazanov, nor by Miliukov, Nabokov or Kierenski (Ossendowski 1930: fragment of Postscript).

The tsarist policy towards the Jews had a huge impact on the rise of anti-Semitism in the Polish territories, which became the area of ​​acute economic struggle between Jews fleeing from persecution and indigenous peoples. The principles of the settlement zone, introduced by Katarzyna II and creatively developed by its successors, lasted until the February Revolution of 1917.

 Litwacy - Russian Jews came to Poland, they were hostile to the Polish State (Różański 2007: 165). Some explanation of this hostility results from the treatment of Polish Jews in Poland. They were employed to multiply the money of the Catholic Church and were killed when they suffered financial losses impoverishing the Polish Church. The Lithuanians knew this and hated the Polish State for tolerating such practices. They were possible because they were convenient for kahals that had enormous church assets and for the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, which generated huge income from borrowing money for a percentage to the Jewish communities. These practices probably continue to this day not only in Poland.

The above information is an explanation of why the Bolshevik revolution was led by people genetically originating from the Jewish nation, created by centuries of persecution and anti-Semitism of Christians who are not practicing the teachings of Christ. The Jews deprived of illusions about human nature and distant from God, whom they could not forgive centuries of anguish, wishing to take their destiny into their own hands, merciless and intelligent in the use of terror, only to free themselves from the rule of the hated tsar. The fate of Jews, including Russian Jews, is an example of the effect of antagonisms between people resulting from the existence of different religions created by the elite nations. I am calling on these elites for dialogue, which will surely lead to the establishment of a new universal world religion. My voice in this very important matter is included in the short texts published on Researchgate.

**III.5.4.1.3.4. Understanding the Bolsheviks.**

There were about 150 million people in post-revolutionary Russia, of which 120 million were peasants, as described by Stanisław Przybyłowski in the book "Peasants under Bolshevik rule." Such a large number of peasants were min. the effect of the previous feudal rule, where the nobleman was rewarded for the number of subjects and he headed for the maximum number of them. The social structure caused a huge handicap of the peasants because the demand for the food they produced was very small - there were only 30 million of its recipients.

In this context, efforts to reduce the number of peasants or increase the number of their clients were desirable. The Bolsheviks adopted the optimal program of this change leading to the improvement of the entire Russian people's existence, because they planned to reduce the size of the peasant layer and increase the number of city residents.

Implementation of the plans took place during the reign of Józef Stalin, who was pushing for the industrialization of the country with the simultaneous organization of large state and cooperative farms. The first caused an increase in population in cities where large industry was built, and the second one reduced the demand for labor in agriculture, causing its outflow to cities. This process, although having a humanistic message, caused great suffering in the transforming layer of the Russian peasantry, forcing her to abandon the age-old way of life and move to cities and employment in industry. During its implementation, during the Bolshevik terror, 15 million Russians were killed (Solzhenitsyn 2014: 264). This terror was directed by the Bolsheviks - mostly Jews and they are responsible for the largest genocide in the 20th century in the Russian nation - murdering the intelligentsia and a large part of the Russian people. The result was the enrichment of the Soviet Union, because fewer farmers produced food for a larger number of industry and the rest of the economy, which increased industrial output and national income.

A similar process, only natural, forced by natural processes, took place in England and Western Europe over several centuries, ie from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century.

The age-old cooling of the climate called the Little Ice Age caused the demand for warm clothing. Technical progress and the demand for warm clothing has led to the development of a cloth industry producing woolen fabrics in the Netherlands from the beginning of the 16th century. This caused an increase in the demand for wool and increased sheep farming. Especially favorable conditions for sheep breeding prevailed in England, whose humid climate was conducive to the growth of grass, the main feed of sheep. A profitable sheep farm was interested in England the rich bourgeoisie who started to buy decayed estates. Transforming them into profitable capitalist enterprises resulted in the reduction of employment in agriculture changing its character from feudal to free market. In the former agricultural system, the importance of the feudal lord depended on the number of subjects remaining in his possessions. In the free market system, the importance of the businessman depended on the capital accumulated and the company's profit. The increase in the number of profitable landowners resulted in a reduction in employment in agriculture and the outflow of free employees to cities where the industry developed, supplied with a cheap labor force coming from the village. The demand for mechanization on the part of modern agriculture stimulated the development of industry, which caused a constant change in the social composition of the population of England and, consequently, the increase in urban population and the decline of the rural population. This resulted in an increase in national income and the enrichment of Western European societies following the footsteps of England.

The similar process of the Bolsheviks was carried out over several decades, which should be called their tragedy and success at the same time. It was a tragedy because it caused huge suffering in the Russian nation, and a success because it led to a huge modernization of this backward and poor country.

Nowadays, in order to use the potential of Russia built by the Bolsheviks, it is necessary to increase the number of rural population, deconcentrating Russian agriculture and introducing in it the peasantry and modern variant of the feudal agricultural system, which, after all, promotes the increase in the number of subjects and the increase in food production. This will stop the process of Russia's depopulation (Eberhardt 2010: 50-70) and will increase the production of food, so much needed in the world and in Russia. It will also increase the demand for products of the Russian industry.

A similar procedure must be carried out in Europe. Russia and Europe need farmers which skould be resettle from overcrowded Asia and Africa. This is my way of solving the problems of the Eurasian continent.

**III. 5.4.1.4. Summary of the Russian revolution**

In this work I tried to show respect for the authors of quoted quotes. Without their tedious research work, I would not be able to prove my thesis. The right arrangement of the quotes indicated the direction of my thinking about the revolution in Russia.

Considerations about the impact of climate on the economic and political process have begun recently. Our 20th-century predecessors were not aware of its overwhelming influence and cyclicality. Climatic crises caused repetitive crises of hunger, and political and social conflicts. Carat tried hard to cope with this cyclical poverty experienced by his subjects as evidenced by the following quote:

In November 1906. "Broke out" very troublesome for the government, irritable and undesirable during this period "Hurko-Lidval case", as it was commonly called. It was one of the largest financial scandals in tsarist Russia. A special spice was added by the fact that the main accused was Deputy Interior Minister Włodzimierz Hurko. Hurko was the main director and coordinator of relief for starving province. (...) From accurate calculations, it was necessary to buy and deliver to the hungry governorate about 40 million cereal presses (ie 665 200 tons) so many orders were ordered in various enterprises, which carried out successive deliveries according to the adopted assumptions and plan ( Bazylow 2008: 184-185).

Erik Leonard Lidval, a Swedish citizen, got an order from Minister Hurka for the supply of 16 000 tons of rye at a price of 76 to 85 kopeks per 16,3 kg and an advance of 800,000 rubles, but the contract was not able to realize. It can be seen from this that tsar actually had powerful problems with its bureaucracy that prevented the crises from being resolved. He undertook numerous attempts at reforms going in the right direction and aimed at alleviating crisis situations. The people rebelled despite this. There was no contact between the tsar and the people. And yet there was a time and opportunity to create a powerful and efficient self-government apparatus based on peasant self-governments - lands and сообщество. Would it not help in solving state problems? The problem of hunger can be avoided by having money to buy food and an efficient supplier who will reliably realise supplay of the food at the time. Tsarist Russia had neither money nor efficient suppliers. The food crisis that began in the world at the beginning of the 20th century made food prices soar upwards. Because people have to eat, and when they are hungry, they rebel, the crisis in Russia could not have been avoided at the time. However, writing about those times gives us a lesson in what can wait for us in the future. Both European revolutions: French and Russian, occurred during a powerful cooling of the climate (See Figure 23 - C. Europe (6) and Fig. No. 24). At the same time, the Chinese Revolution and the Mexican Revolution took place with the Russian Revolution. Agricultural production in the world fell then and food prices increased very much, which is visible in the chart below (Drawing No. 27). People were not able to accept it, they went out into the streets and began to murder those guilty (?) Of the crisis. Guilty was nobody but climate. And the climate on Earth is dependent on the Sun and the planets. We depend on the processes of the Sun and the Cosmos.

The coolness of the climate, threatening another great revolution, can come at any moment and sweep away the current elite. Unless they start investigating the climate issues and find out the date of the next cooling. We will then be able to take countermeasures and prevent the revolution. Everything in our hands.



Fig. No. 27. Grain prices in China and Europe in 1738-1906 (in grams of silver per kilogram)

Sources: Rice prices in the lower reaches of Yangzi and wheat prices in Zhili-in North China from the work of Lillian M.Li, Integration and Disintegration in North China's Grain Markets, 1738-1911, The Journal of Economic History, Vol.60, No.3 (Sept.2000), European prices from Robert C. Allen's work The Great Divergence in European Wages and Prices from the Middle Ages to the First World War, Explorations in Economic History, 38, 2001, 411-447
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**III.5.4.1.5. The future of Russia and Slavs**

The result of the Bolshevik revolution, which was mainly directed by the Jews, was the murder of the indigenous Russian elite and about 15 million of the best Russian farmers during forced collectivization (according to A. Solzhenitsyn). It was the largest genocide planned and performed in the 20th century. This is another quote:

In the last century, at a time when this was already spoken of loudly in Western Europe, and thus between 1823 and 1877, in other words, in 55 years, the Russian tsarist government sent 598 000 people to Siberia ...

After the overthrow of the tsarist government and the outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution, the Council of People's Commissars, following Lenin's personal instructions, announces on December 20, 1917 a decree on the establishment of the "Extraordinary Commission for Counter-Revolution and Speculation", commonly known as: CZEKA.

On April 15, 1919, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, known under the acronym WCIK, announces the first decree on the establishment of "Forced Labor Camps", expanded then and worked out in detail by a decree of May 17, 1919, signed by the then chairman of WCIK Awanesov. At the moment, 97 concentration camps are being built.

On February 6, 1922, by the resolution of the Ninth Congress of the Supreme Soviet, CZEKA was renamed the "Special State Political Office", or in short OGPU.

By decree of July 10, 1934, the OGPU becomes under the name GUGB (Central Office of State Security), included in the General Commissariat of Internal Affairs of the NKVD. At the same time, in order to facilitate the fight against counter-revolution, special so-called "Adjudication Teams" -OS (Osoboje Sowieszczanije), issuing administrative judgments, were selected. The number of convicts sentenced to death in this mode or serving a sentence in concentration camps before the outbreak of the Second World War, in other words over twenty-two years, amounts to over twenty-two million people.

The number of concentration camps exceeds the number 200, also sharing sub-camps, or "Łagpunkty". And in this number there are such colossi as Kolyma, housing about three million condemned. The general loss of the population incurred as a result of the revolution, through civil war, terror, victims of collectivization, hunger and concentration camps - during the same twenty-two years before World War II - were about forty million people (Mackiewicz 1957: 48-49).

All this happened in the name of the social theory of Karl Marx, which, as I show in the book Natural history and climate was false. About 40 million Russians were murdered in the name of false Jewish ideology. With the help of this ideology, an attempt was made to build a paradise on Earth, a Bolshevik state in which almost all of the achievements of human civilization were rejected. Building from scratch you have to know where it's going, you need to have knowledge. Marx and his followers did not have this knowledge.

Without knowing where it is going, it is difficult to build a stable state. The Soviet Union fell and with it Jewish dreams of a carefree life. After the Soviet Union, from which many Jews left for Israel in the end of XX century, the Russian state remained on the ruins of the Soviet empire. It is struggling with an inefficient social system, inefficient industry and agriculture. The largest state on Earth requires reforms to ensure a peaceful existence for the Russian people. These reforms should consist in returning to the past, which was destroyed by the Bolshevik revolution. A self-government structure should be established, based on former rural communities - battles and new non-hereditary nobility supported by (being a social property) business and science center. The ideology of the new Russia will be based on the teachings of Jesus Christ. Based on such principles, the Russian state will become a home for hundreds of millions of Asians who will build their prosperity for themselves and the oppressed Russians with their work. For this to happen, aggression in international relations must stop, allowing Russia building a just state.

The American and European elites want to destabilize Russia to bring order there based on theirs heartless principles. There must be an agreement between the Slavs who will save the largest Slavic state and will use the entire culture of the Slav nations for the prosperity of the world.

Jakuszowice, 5 August 2014, 4:30 Bogdan Góralski

Translated from Polish using Google Translate in July 2018 in Jakuszowice

Jakuszowice, 26 July 2018, time 7:33

**Living conditions in Russia and climate changes in period 1700-1900 years.**

**Author Bogdan Góralski**

In Russia, systematic research on the growth and health of candidates for the army was conducted.

Because, as shown earlier in numerous works, the change the height of the members of the human population depends on nutrition, and the diet improves and deteriorates cyclically to the rhythm of climate change. Favorable climatic conditions result in better nutrition of the population and a greater height of its members and vice versa.

In the chart below, we see that the candidates for the Russian army-conscripts, in the period 1700--1790 had deteriorating board, nutrition which was signaled by a declining height in conscripts.

In the period 1790-1915, the conditions of feeding Russian conscripts improved, which is indicated by the height, increasing among the candidates for the Russian army.

This shows that the climate conditions in Russia deteriorated in the period 1700-1790, and were fluctuating periodically, improving in general until 1915. Demographic data on the Russian population indicate that in the period 1790-1915, the number of population of Russia grew rapidly, and anthropological research indicates that the abundance of food affects the masculinization of the population - an increase in the number of men in the population. The society with the majority of men is more aggressive, which explains the revolutionary behavior of the Russian population when the climate crisis of the early 20th century came.



Fig. 1 Changes of the height of candidates for the Russian army in the period 1700-1915.

The chart was prepared by Bogdan Góralski based on the data from tables 4.1.5.1 and 8.5 contained in the book by Boris Mironov (2014), The standard of living and Revolutions in Russia, 1700-1917, Routledge, London-New York.
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