

Digital agro-towns and the bases of the neoindustrialism social structure

Stanislav Nekrasov
 Department of Philosophy
 Urals state agrarian university
 Department of Cultural Studies and Design
 Ural Federal University
 Ekaterinburg, Russia
nekrasov-ural@yandex.ru

Abstract—In the twentieth century was found a trend of development of human settlements, the relevant future socialist system: «the garden city». Since the village of antiquity was the thesis, the city was the antithesis, the neoindustrial garden city as a village-city turned out to be a historical synthesis of the city and the village. Life in agro-towns makes the exchange of human forces with nature transparent, devoid of the element of spontaneity, and therefore they allow you to remove the fetishistic veil from the social life of capitalist society. The project and the implementation of the «garden city» laid down two exclusive sense: the project led to socialism inside of capitalism. In the second sense, it is converted into a digital agro-city as the basis of the digital new capitalist economy - chrematistics. The garden city provides for the rational planning of the life of the settlements and fundamentally destroys the spontaneous nature of their spread and expansion. Such development requires growing the cells of socialism within capitalism, that is, it requires capitalism. Moreover, the agro-city in its digital version fits into capitalist production and small private property, while not requiring large monopolies and mass production. In the early Soviet Union the leftist excesses in the understanding of the building of socialism by the destruction of any private property, the movement in the direction of absolute collectivization led to the objections against cities-gardens. The accumulated historical experience and the needs of modern Russia in the accelerated modernization development allows us to present the agro-city as an island of the whole archipelago of new industrialism. A new social structure will be formed on this island.

Keywords—*«garden city», new social structure, agro-city, digital agro-city, digital economy, village-city, commodity fetishism, leftist excesses, new industrialism.*

I. INTRODUCTION

What are the optimal sizes of human settlements on the planet? And when humanity is settled on the planets in space? The size of the settlements and the nature of the development of the productive forces in them are closely related to each other, but most importantly, they are associated with the development of the main productive force - man. Will a person be a person who develops higher creative abilities in himself, or will he be humanized and transformed into a consumer, a philistine, a commoner? The size and nature of the placement of people on the planet depends on the technological structure (and we enter the sixth mode of production), on the type of production relations and the relationship of people with each other. Even the ancient Greeks, who lived "nobly" in the polis, believed that democracy and direct elections are possible only in a polis with 5-7 thousand people and no more. In essence, such

are and should be the size of the agropolis of the future as a synthesis of the city and the village.

In the current constituencies of 50–100 or more thousand people, knowing the concrete person for whom it is proposed to vote is impossible in principle. True to a democratic regime of direct democracy in the Greek polis corresponded to "isonomy" (equality before the law), "isothymia" (equal right to perform any functions for all citizens in the state) and "isegoria" (freedom of speech).

In the ancient polis, every citizen either knows personally the one for whom he is voting, or knows the one who knows him. In all other cases, elections are transformed into the manipulation of votes. And since there is no democracy anywhere in its classical understanding today, the question of the optimal type of human settlement and their participation in self-government is the most acute. The problem of the city is connected with the development of productive forces and the most optimal small-scale creative production on the new industrial basis of design and 3d technologies is also possible in cities of the size of Greek polities. In this new synthetic settlement, hidden human creativity will be unleashed. That is, this settlement of the future, its transport communications and food supply will awaken the human higher principle of transformation of nature. This will complete the prehistory and begin the true history of mankind.

II. THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE VILLAGE INTO A CITY IS A TRANSITION TO THE STAGE OF CIVILIZATION

In historical and philosophical literature, the original city is understood as a fortified and walled point, or city-fortress. More precisely, the city is a fenced place, or a village fortified with a rampart and a moat (Burg, bourg, borough). This is a town-village, which is either a burg itself, or a burg enclosed in it, or adjoined to a burg. The etymology of the words "city" means - (enclosed place), "Burger" (citizen from "burg") and the Latin words "urbs" and castrum, castellum (castle and city). From a class point of view, the consideration of history in the works of Marxist historians on the role of the lower classes in the history, such a burg was a fortress with vassals and mercenaries, or a union of the lords who lived in it. The observed transformation of the village into the city is the enclosure of the village by a wall. As F. Engels believed, the appearance of walls is such an external sign, which coincides with the transition of humanity from savagery and barbarism to the stage of civilization. Until now, this concept of F. Engels has not been criticized by anyone, and it is used as historically reasonable in history, cultural studies and social philosophy.

Aristotle believed that people gathered in the city for a "noble life." First of all, this is a Greek polis: a city-state in which male slave-owners enjoyed the complete freedom of citizens. This implies the Aristotelian definition of man as a political animal (*zoon politikon*). In Greek and Roman cultures, the city and the state coincided in the polis. The Greek "polis" and the Latin "civitas" mean both the state and the city. The city is the state, and the state is reduced to the totality of the city and its surroundings. From the Aristotelian understanding of freedom one can deduce the whole further history of the liberation of man from social inequality, the history of class struggle and revolution: here one can see the direct continuity of all classical philosophy from Plato and Aristotle to Hegel and Marx.

However, already in the twentieth century an illiberal and non-bourgeois-democratic tendency towards the development of a human settlement corresponding to the future socialist system was found: the so-called "garden city". V.V. Mayakovsky reflected this in the poem "The story of Khrenov about Kuznetskstroy and about the people of Kuznetsk": "In four years here there will be a city-garden!"

It seems like that this project was born in a capitalist society - first in England, as part of the quest for utopian socialism. In this project, despite failures in the first historical model of socialism in the form of building communal apartments and barracks, a social ideal was outlined. The main thing is that then the possibility was proved not of the spontaneous emergence of urban-type settlements, but of the building of the latter according to the will of their creators. The society realized that it is possible to build new types of settlements and grow from them a new society itself and a new type of social connection. For the first time in history, socialism is consciously and purposefully was built in contrast to all other spontaneous antagonistic formations that take shape during the clashes of classes and interests. Paradoxically, in the victorious socialist society in the USSR, the project of agro-towns implemented by the first five-year plans first arose, which was objectively aimed at restoring capitalism. Implementation of the project changed the form of ownership, the project itself was focused exclusively on commodity production, rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat, approval of the leading and managing role of the party, then on the deconstruction of the system with the leading role of the party and of the State Planning Committee, rejection state monopoly, introduction of private property and formation of shadow economy. Later N.S. Khrushchev frankly took a restoration course, which ended with the destruction of real socialism in 1991.

III. THROUGH THE CITY-GARDEN TO THE CITY-VILLAGE

90 years ago L.A. Velikhov wrote in the classic work on urban economy that "the emergence of the first cities is lost in deep, prehistoric antiquity. It is clear, however, that neither in the epoch of primitive communism, nor in the epoch of the primitive tribal community could the city arise: primitive technology, the absence of sedentary agriculture, the everlasting nomadic and robber's life of the ancient hordes i.e. this titled factors did not provided a long concentration of people in one place. On the contrary, ancient feudal relations and despotic systems of the East already provide sufficient economic and political prerequisites for the formation of the cities." [1].

And historically it turned out that "the ancient village was a thesis. The city was the antithesis. The garden city contains

a synthesis of the city and the village. For centuries, the city appeared in its various forms as a superstructure above the technical and economic bases of alternating eras. He exhausted all possibilities and, having served as the focus of human civilization, he finally developed all the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system. At present, the capitalist city denies itself. Marx's dialectical method is fully justified here."

In the first third of the last century, researchers in our country and in the West reflected on the path of further development of the productive forces of society and the resettlement of humanity: "It is difficult, of course, to predict in detail how the further development of events will proceed. Will the giant-city die as part of the socialist system, as it has exhausted its purpose, giving place to the wide development of the city-gardens? Or will garden cities, according to Unwinna, appear in the near future only sputnik cities (satellite cities) around metropolitan cities, as a replacement for boundlessly and spontaneously spreading suburbs and adjacent area, as a new and rational way of accommodating the population of large cities? One thing is clear: a new technical and economic basis in connection with electrification provides a prerequisite for the merging of the city and the village, and in the depth of capitalist society, the sample that apparently is destined to become the gravedigger of a capitalist city, in modern meaning has matured.

They still thought too little about this truly damned question, and even in the USSR there are defenders of an old construction project under the capitalist system; there are - scary to say - followers of a multi-storey house-barracks, which so long and so undeservedly condemned the proletariat to live in an anthill. There are defenders of the dying system of life, who neglect the voice of the best specialists of the whole world, do not see the fact that the garden city has no prospects in the capitalist world and that only where the principle of combining city and village is proclaimed, only where private ownership of land is abolished, only where the beginning of conscious planning of life has been made, only where industrialization and electrification of both the city and the village have been realized to carry out in any way the project of garden city or a city-village can become not the random exception oasis as Lechuors, but happy and long-desired mass fact. The "city-village" of primitive peoples will thus be revived in the splendor of all cultural acquisitions of many millennia".

IV. AGRO-TOWNS OF NEOINDUSTRIALISM AND DEFETISHIZATION OF PUBLIC LIFE

History shows that the synthesis in the future will be the restoration of the original social system "City-village". This system was the thesis in the beginning of historical development. The antithesis was the separation of the village and the city and their social contradiction. It is clear that the future harmonious society as a synthetic new form of life "City-village" will grow with agrotechnopolises and technopediapolises, and possibly techno-and-anragopolises, which is the re-creation of the prehistory of humanity and the beginning of the real history at the new historical stage. At the present time, when the story is still underway, promising forms of a new synthesis are emerging - the digital agro-city. This is a new start of socialist tendencies in the resettlement of humanity and the development of productive forces.

The previous start was in 1902: «In 1902, Ebenezer Howard, a modest parliamentary stenographer in England, unknown to the present, published the book "Cities of the

Future”(exact translation: “Garden City of Tomorrow”), which was destined to compose an era in questions of planning, construction and housing in the cities ... Howard's idea partly corresponded to the tendency of the development of human settlements that was born at that time, which, however, took on ugly forms thanks to the dominant at that moment of an “economic” system. It consisted in combining the positive aspects of both urban and rural life, while eliminating their shortcomings. Howard formulates his idea in this way: “In the city, there is a lack of nature, there is a totally spoiled air, fogs or dry air, remoteness of workplaces, high prices for life, slums and taverns, but a developed intellectual level and a social life, high wages, plenty of entertainment, luxurious palace buildings and well lit streets”; in the village - “the absence of society, of work, entertainment, drainage, but the beauty of nature, bright sun, fresh air, plenty of water, low rent. In a town-village or a garden-city created according to a conscious plan, there should be all the virtues (magnets), but there should not be any of the distinctive defects of two types of settlements opposing each other.”».

Life in agropolis, with the function of complete natural management (agriculture) and social (self-government and education) processes, makes the circulation of the essential human forces in such a society and the exchange of human forces with nature transparent, devoid the elements of spontaneity. In other words, the agro-towns allow the fetishistic veil to be removed from the social life of capitalist society. And for this, the classic socialist proletarian revolution is not needed. Socialism grows from below as the living creativity of the masses. However, in the second half of the twentieth century the new socialism began to come no longer by a Marxist way, but as a result of a revolution from above, during the conquests and diplomatic negotiations of blocs of states with different social systems.

V. GARDEN CITY: OLD AND NEW PROJECT

There are two mutually exclusive ideas in the project and implementation: the project leads to socialism, and implementation to capitalism. In the second sense, it is converted into a digital agro-city. L.A. Velikhov in the first third of the last century wrote speculatively: “The term put forward by Howard has a double meaning: inaccurate, i.e. “Garden city” in a broad sense, and exact, i.e. “Garden city” in the narrow sense, namely “city-village”. In the first sense, nowadays ordinary cities are often completely incorrectly called ordinary cities with a predominance of small-scale construction (that is, with houses no higher than two floors) and an abundance of greenery.” And further “the “garden city”, conceived by Howard and partially implemented in England in part, corresponds more to a socialist than to a capitalist system. Firstly, it is clearly expressed in the synthesis, i.e. complete merging of the city and the village, since the corresponding rough division of labor has been eliminated: the inhabitants of such a settlement are engaged in both agriculture and manufacturing, and, according to Howard, their products should satisfy the main needs of the new settlement. The opposite between town and country disappears in this way. True, among the socialists, the question of the possibility of destroying this opposition remains controversial, and, for example, Hertz asserts that “the great centers of energy and culture, like big cities, cannot be destroyed, because without them progress is impossible.” However, V.I. Lenin spoke categorically in the sense that the socialist program must include the elimination of opposites between town and country, since: a) it is

necessary to make the treasures of science and art accessible to the whole people and to eliminate the alienation from the culture of millions of the rural population, i.e. “Idiocy” of village life, b) it is necessary to eliminate the situation when people choke in their own dung and run out of the city in search of fresh air and clean water, and c) rational utilization of urban sewage and human excrement also requires the city to approach the village. Finally, there is no doubt that “the existence of two types of settlements with different life, living conditions and opposing economic interests in some respects hardly allows for the realization of socialist equality and harmony.”.

It can be concluded that the garden city of a talented humanist Howard is a purely revolutionary and socialist project that solves the fundamental issue of land ownership and the land speculation associated with it, rent and the high cost of housing in the city, ultimately destroying the right to private land ownership. And the garden city provides for rational planning of the life of settlements and radically destroys the spontaneous nature of their expansion and expansion. However, such a development requires the cultivation of the cells of socialism within capitalism, that is, it requires capitalism. Moreover, the agro-city in its digital version fits easily into capitalist production and private property, while it does not need large monopolies and mass production.

In the early USSR, left-wing excesses in the understanding of building socialism, the movement towards absolute collectivization led to the so-called objections to the garden-towns: “On the other hand, in the USSR there were many objections to the “garden-towns” through the party line. It was pointed out that with modern human growth, settlements with a large area of green space and small construction could not accommodate a cash contingent of people around the globe and that the social division of labor, eliminated by the garden city, is closely linked to the geography of the fossil world. In addition, it was stated that the individual comfort created by single-storey or double-deck cottages as the recommended type of dwelling in the garden city does not correspond to the ideas of collectivism and, in particular, does not allow women to be free from the fetters imposed on it by the private consumer economy. The cottages of the garden city are supposedly adapted only for the family, which will be decomposed under the socialist system. Finally, they also objected to the reference to the insufficient profitability of small buildings compared to large ones.”.

Howard's original plan is unique and relevant to our day, since in Russia we ended up in a capitalist inner environment. L.A. Velikhov writes: «Ebenezer Howard's plan is briefly as follows. In a healthy, dry rural area, the organizers of a prominent social position and impeccable reputation acquire a plot of land through low-interest mortgage loans in the healthy, dry countryside ... A wide glass arcade - “crystal palace” - refuge is located around the central park (except for the intersection of boulevards) where citizens are in rainy weather, as well there ia a the location of the best shops and the winter garden ... Residential buildings (one-story or two-story cottages) are located on radialnyh and on concentric boulevards.

On the outer belt of the city are factories, warehouses, forest yards, and so on. All of them are turned to the railroad encircling the entire city, and are connected by branches to the main railway line cutting through the estate ... Howard

sees his common goal "to raise the level of health and well-being of all workers through and by natural and productive (economic) combination of urban and rural life on land belonging to an independent urban community."». The last phrase repeats the wording of the basic law of socialism from the first constitution of the RSFSR. It has been 100 years since the beginning of the first experience of socialist construction and the transformation of agriculture. Overcoming the leftist bends occupied more than 30 years, however, was not brought to an end due to the destruction of socialism.

The accumulated historical experience and needs of modern Russia in accelerated modernization development allow us to present the agro-city as an island of the whole archipelago of new industrialism. A new social structure will be formed in this island. Now much is written about the "deep-situated nation." They talk about the invariant people in relation to the long upper state. The Soviet political system and the social structure of a homogeneous non-antagonistic socialist society fused with it looked like this: 2 + 2 + Personal subsidiary plot. Two classes (working class and peasantry) plus two social groups-strata (intelligentsia and employees) plus "Personal Subsidiary plot". There are no oligarchs and rogue paupers, corrupt politicians and hired political activists, no gangsters and those old men and young parents with many children who are eating expired products from the waste, bourgeois nationalists and left-wing fascists, eurosceptics and Euro-atlantists and a lot of any social waste of the end of history.

In the late bourgeois society, the social structure of the decaying Roman empire is formed: nobili (oligarchs and federal deputies), patricians (city nobility and deputies), plebs (citizens and villagers as electorate), okhlos (lumpen proletariat, criminals). This indicates that late capitalism repeats the vices and flaws of the late slavery of the Roman Empire. As you know, she did not die from the slave revolution, which was not and could not be. The empire perished from the economic inefficiency of the colonic labor, which turned into labor of dependent peasants with small-scale land-use. Naturally, humanity began to look for opportunities for non-capitalist development, moving away from the Proudhonist utopias of workers' money and labor markets.

The first ever collectivization of agriculture in Marxist science was called the socialist revolution in the countryside, and in fact it turned out to be the second edition of serfdom in Russia, because the Trotskyist ideologues of collectivization were cut off from the Russian countryside did not know neither history development, nor traditions, nor needs, nor psychology of the Russian peasantry. In the twenties, were published books written by the Russian economist A.V. Chayanov about agricultural cooperation. Works of a scientist did not meet the interests of the ruling political clan. His books were found to be contrary to the spirit and letter of Marxism, for the author allowed the existence of a personal farm among peasant cooperatives and insisted on the self-government of cooperative farms.

Especially suffered the bureaucracy of the socialist state (and Lenin called it "semi-state") injured by an artwork AV Chayanov "Journey of my brother Alexei in the country of peasant utopia." The fate of the author and his books were tragic.

And at the same time, the fate of the Russian village as a result of the Trotskyist inflections of the total socialization of

property and social experiments, as it was then expressed, "leftist headbangers", turned out to be tragic. The village became a rail on the road to socialism of the second historical model. In the following forms of socialism, the integration of city and village will follow the path of civilizational neoinustrialism, in which transport and technical systems will acquire a new look within the framework of the sixth technological order [2].

It is necessary to draw the attention of researchers of agro-cities to the fact that in the Russian, and then in the Soviet peasant collective farms, there were complexes of social infrastructure as a prerequisite for agro-urban life. S.G. Kara-Murza paid special attention to this circumstance.

R. Vakhitov writes in the article "The Apology of the Soviet Mind," dedicated to the 80th anniversary of the journalist-researcher of the Soviet civilization, chemist by training and natural scientist S.G. Kara-Murza: "The reasoning of Kara-Murza that "Soviet civilization" have the special social infrastructure of Soviet enterprises, which were self-closed social worlds - with their own polyclinics, sanatoriums, youth camps, so that workers are provided with everything, is interesting and still not appreciated. The liberals criticised them mercilessly, crying out that they contradict economic logic." [3]. All the fundamental research of the Soviet civilization is presented by the author in two volumes, since the pre-war and post-war civilization had some basic differences, and serious changes took place in the Great Patriotic War. In the community, each large family had a warm log hut, and the family itself was an elementary unit of the peasant traditional society-community, just as the production collective became the basic unit of the whole socialist society. At the same time, it is still erroneously considered that the family was the main unit of socialist society.

The Soviet "Law on Labor Collectives", adopted in 1983, stated that the labor collective of an enterprise, institution, organization is the main unit of socialist society and, in accordance with the USSR Constitution, exercises broad powers in the political, economic, in social life of the country. Western economists associate criticism and rejection by the masses of the role of the market with the fact that the defenders of traditional civilization are simple conservatives and they protect *Gemeinschaft*. In the the book by D. Durand "Communism by your own hands. The image of agrarian communes in Soviet Russia" [4], I. Gordeeva titled her preface to this edition of the French historian: "The communal myth and community experiment in the history of Russia in the XIX - early XX century". It is obvious that the representative of the European University in St. Petersburg should think and write about the origins and traditions of Soviet civilization as a myth: "In his book "Communion and Society" (1887) Tannis pointed out that in modern Europe, his position in society and the nature of his relations with other people is radically changing, increasingly turning from organic, emotional, direct, personal and self-valuable into mechanical, rational-contractual, formal-legal, market, anonymous relations. He called the first type of connections between people "Gemeinschaft" ("community", "commune"), and the second - "Gesellschaft" ("society"). [5]."

We have already paid attention to the fallacy of such formulations in our book "Social Utopia and Antiutopia" [6]. The author of the preface gives a detailed description of

the evolution of such a people's-intellectual myth in Soviet Russia leads to a tough conclusion: "In the 1930 s, the peasant communal and proletarian collectivist utopias degenerated into a state-bureaucratic utopia." [7]

Economists are used to considering two scenarios: a community in which there is no surplus and no one is rich. It's commune. As writes C. Wheelan, an author of "Naked economy. Undressing the dismal science", in the second version the inventor of the plow appears, and history ends with the appearance of firefighters, professional baseball players and even engineers. This is society. The difference between the first and the second – human capital and should strive on the model of America to the second option. It's very simple – it is the ideology of modernization and destruction of the commune. [8].

D. Durand writes in conclusion: "The materials reviewed give us a vivid picture of how the authorities inscribed communes into their plans for transforming the village and how the peasants used communes for their own purposes." [9]. The author makes the separation of state power and the people and demonstrates a lack of understanding that the Soviet power is people's power. The author imagines that the cunning peasants sought the power to bypass and use the communes for their own purposes. Literally in the spirit of V.V. Mayakovsky - the poet used an image of a peasant - "a cunning father sits," who "plow the land, write the poems."

So, the Soviet enterprises-worlds did not contradict the whole logic of "oikonomics" and the communal life inscribed in it, but on the contrary they corresponded to it in detail, that is, adjusted to it, entering into rapport, that is, found themselves in a mirror-like relations. It's just that in the capitalist world economy is called chrematistics, when all other types of management are rejected, refusing at all them because of their meaning and logic. On the contrary, the breaking of Soviet civilization as a special world-economy implied the introduction of market principles of living arrangement, in which chrematistics are called economies, and all other types of management are rejected, as if they were barbaric, traditional and backward.

Known dissident sociologist A.A. Zinoviev noted that Soviet intellectuals "perfectly understood the essence of the collective farms and saw their doom." His colleague, the front-line soldier V. Dobrokhvalov, considered that "agricultural enterprises like urban factories and plants should become the future of the Russian countryside, i.e. the collective farmers should be replaced by agricultural workers, and small villages should be replaced by a large urban-type settlements. Khrushchev's idea of agro-towns was not his personal invention. Many thought about it then. Gerasimov considered the idea of agro-cities premature and even adventurous. He developed ideas that have now become fashionable among the Gorbachev theorists. In particular, he considered one of the ways to improve the lives of peasants (and, as a result, of urban residents) the creation of a network of farms around cities that supply food for an urban markets and agricultural stores without any intermediaries. I criticized the ideas of both. But not in the sense of denial. I simply focused on the real conditions and

consequences of the implementation of the two programs. To create agricultural cities simply do not have enough money. You can build for example a few. By the way, they already existed in the form of large state farms. But this is still an unreal way for all agriculture. As for private household plots, on the experience of which the supporters of the farmers' path based their programs, this path was not suitable at all for villages distant from cities, and for near-town districts it concealed hidden dangers in the form of increased of criminal gangs and price gouging in the markets. And the economic advantage of this path was illusory. On this way, high productivity was achieved due to hard labor in small personal areas. In areas of larger size this no longer is possible. In addition, young people are trying to get rid of this way of life." [10].

A.A. Zinoviev criticized A.I. Solzhenitsyn image of the Matrena invented by him, opposed to him the real Matrenoduru. A.A. Zinoviev argued that "the Russian people have already chosen their historical path. And you by no means can force him to return to the past. No matter how cruel and tragic was Stalin's way of collectivization, from a sociological point of view, it corresponded much more to the historical trend of the people's evolution than any attempts to keep it in the position of an industrious producer of cheap potatoes and cabbage who is living only for supplying the urban dreamers." [11]. We must agree with this profound conclusion which is now confirmed by all historical practice and which was made by an outstanding thinker, researcher of the "global human society" and the phenomenon of "Westernism" already in 1988.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. A. Velikhov, "Basics of urban economy. The general theory of the city, its management, finances and methods of management," part 1. M., L.: State publishing house. 1928. p. 10, 1928.
- [2] See: S. G. Kara-Murza, "Jews, dissidents and Eurocommunism." M.: Algorithm, 2001. pp. 40 - 41., V. V. Miloserdov, "The peasantry of Russia in the global world," Ekaterinburg: ed. USACA, 2009.
- [3] R. Vakhitov, "Apology of the Soviet mind. On the 80 th anniversary of Sergei Georgievich Kara-Murza", <http://www.sovross.ru/articles/1795/42660>
- [4] D. Durand, "Communism by your own hands. The image of agrarian communes in Soviet Russia". St. Petersburg: European University at St. Petersburg, - 246 p., 2010.
- [5] I. Gordeeva, "Preface. Communal myth and community experiment in the history of Russia in the XIX - early XX centuries"// Durand D. Communism by your own hands. The image of agrarian communes in Soviet Russia". St. Petersburg: European University in St. Petersburg, 2010, p. 5.
- [6] S. N. Nekrasov, N. N. Naturalnova, "Social utopia and antiutopia," Ekaterinburg: publishing house IMIR, - 224 p., 2003.
- [7] I. Gordeeva, Ibid, p. 43.
- [8] C. Wheelan, "Naked economy. Undressing the dismal science", M.: ZAO Olimp-Business, p. 368, 2007.
- [9] D. Durand, Ibid, p. 138.
- [10] A. A. Zinoviev, "Russian destiny, confession renegade". M.: ZAO Publishing House Tsentrpoligraf, p. 506, 2000.
- [11] A. A. Zinoviev, "On the way to the super-community". M.: ZAO Publishing House Tsentrpoligraf, p. 638, 2000.