

Regional Industry in the Period of Nationalization: Based on the Materials of Tatarstan Republic (Russia)

Almaz Rafisovich Gapsalamov

Elabuga Institute of Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Elabuga, Tatarstan, Russia

Abstract: The study of issues related to the problems of separate republics functioning in the past is becoming more actual nowadays. On the basis of archive data the nationalization processes proceeding in the Kazan region in 1917-1921 are presented in the article. Special attention in the study is paid to the questions of nationalization on the state level and the reflection of these processes in the provinces. The conclusions have been made that in the conditions of internal complex issues (the general economic decline, caused by the first World War and revolutions, civil war), enlarged by unresolved manufacturing problems (the sabotage, lack of qualified personnel, raw materials, lack of discipline), to retain the power the Bolsheviks chose the centralized management which reflected in the processes of nationalization, confiscation and sequestration. In the process of nationalization of enterprises the two stages can be pointed out: the first period (late 1917-1918) was characterized by the slow rate nationalization of enterprises which was due to the weak power of the Bolshevik leadership and the threat from the White Guard forces and the second period (1919-1921) was characterized by the rapid rate of nationalization, advancing the average rate in the country.

Key words: Nationalization • Management • Industry • The Kazan region • The republic of Tatarstan

INTRODUCTION

The Bolsheviks, coming to power in 1917, faced with great difficulties in the realization of political and socio-economic policy of the country development. The difficulties were defined as the lack of experience of state-building, the lack of economic resources and political authority, the civil war and etc. It explained the tight state line conducting in the industry which aimed not only at the power retention but an effective economic mechanism creation as well. The task was difficult but feasible. To do that the leadership needed to mobilize all available economic resources in the country in the same "hands", to ensure total control over them. That thesis was confirmed by the words of A. Rykov at the II Congress of national economy councils where he told that "... the nationalization itself did not pass accidentally, but it was carried out together with the systematic organization of certain industries into one organic unit with a general central management" [1]. All this resulted in the massive transition of private enterprises to the government property in the post-revolutionary period.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The chosen theme is investigated on a large and diverse range of sources, the part of which is introduced in the scientific revolution for the first time. An important data source of research materials became the documents from the archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. During the work the funds of NA of RT (National Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan), CSA of HPD of RT (Central State Archive of historical and political documents of the Republic of Tatarstan) were used. At the same time there were used documents on assembly materials, business documents, monographs. A special place in this article was paid to foreign materials. In particular there were Britannica Encyclopedia, the work of Murray Bookchin [2], Alan T. Peacock, Jack Wiseman and [3], J. Nalbandian Rare Stamps [4] and others.

There are only a few researches on this issue. Most of the researches and articles in newspapers and magazines are devoted to the issues of nationalization conducting in the developed and developing countries of the world on the present stage [5].

Work on the article required the use of a number of traditional and special methods of investigation, including analytical, contextual, historical retrospective, systematic and structural. The sufficient amount of sources containing statistics involved the use of mathematical methods.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Today there are a lot of definitions of the word nationalization. One should understand the following:

- Barron's Finance and Investment Dictionary: nationalization – takeover of a private company's assets or operations by a government. The company may or may not be compensated for the loss of assets. In developing nations, an operation is typically nationalized if the government feels the company is exploiting the host country and exporting too high a proportion of the profits. By nationalizing the firm, the government hopes to keep profits at home. In developed countries, industries are often nationalized when they need government subsidies to survive as is the case in the United States in 2009. [6]
- Columbia Encyclopedia: nationalization, acquisition and operation by a country of business enterprises formerly owned and operated by private individuals or corporations. State or local authorities have traditionally taken private property for such public purposes as the construction of roads, dams, or public buildings. Known as the right of eminent domain, this process is usually accompanied by the payment of compensation. By contrast, the concept of nationalization is a 20th cent. development that differs from eminent domain in motive and degree; it is done for the purpose of social and economic equality and is usually, although not always, applied as a principle of communistic or socialistic theories of society. [7]
- Wikipedia on Answers.com: Nationalization (British English spelling nationalisation) is the process of taking a private industry or private assets into public ownership by a national government or state.[4] Nationalization usually refers to private assets, but may also mean assets owned by lower levels of government, such as municipalities, being transferred to the public sector to be operated and owned by the

state. The opposite of nationalization is usually privatization or de-nationalization, but may also be municipalization. Industries that are usually subject nationalization include transport, communications, energy, banking and natural resources, though there are other areas and there have even been calls for the nationalization of the legal service [8].

The following definition is also of great interest: Nationalization, alteration or assumption of control or ownership of private property by the state. It is historically a more recent development than and differs in motive and degree from "expropriation" or "eminent domain", which is the right of government to take property for particular public purposes (such as the construction of roads, reservoirs, or hospitals), normally accompanied by the payment of compensation. [9]

The common feature for all definitions is the fact that the state confiscates (or buys out) enterprises from private persons. The most evidently these processes were in Russia in the period when Bolsheviks came to the power in 1917.

In the first few post October months of 1917 there was a long period of transition from capitalist relations to socialist ones. In the conditions of real control levers absence to conduct the nationalization was extremely difficult and inefficient. In addition to it the problem was of international significance. The general capital of main industry branches belonged to the foreign banks (it was 52% of foreign capital in the mining, metallurgical and metal-working industries, 100% in the steam locomotive, 90% in electric and electronic companies, etc. [10, pp: 152]). The fear of foreign aggression, the possibility of import banning of required tools and equipment to the country as well as cash resources held the Bolshevik leadership from the global nationalization.

At the end of 1917 it was preceded by a huge preliminary work focused on the recording of all existing factories and plants. When studying the enterprises the attention was paid to their technical and financial situation, to the structure of an enterprise, economic ties established between that enterprise and other plants and factories.

At the same time those companies which had the fate of being nationalized, fell immediately under the harsh repressive measures. The large and medium-sized enterprises of metallurgical industry were nationalized before the supreme council of national economy formation

and afterwards such enterprises like leather, textiles, chemicals, energy engineering, fuel, distilling and alcohol-cleaning production, etc. In addition to these sectors the enterprises of confectionery industry in Moscow and Petrograd were transferred to the state property [11, pp: 9-10, 121-134].

These actions were essentially spontaneous and did not have clear goals and objectives. Small, unprofitable or ill-equipped companies were nationalized in some cases.

However, the first experience was taken into account. In January 1918 the Supreme council of national economy which was controlled by the Council of People's Commissars prepared the plans for the nationalization of industry branches. Special orders were worked out on the nationalization of oil, coal, metallurgy industry. The Soviet government accelerated the process of nationalization of separate enterprises in different industrial branches the owners of which refused to carry out the requirements of workers' control bodies. The Council of People's Commissars provided the local authorities with a wide initiative.

The starting point for the beginning of mass nationalization was the adoption of the Decree (June 28, 1918) on the nationalization of general industrial branches. The Decree indicated what kind of enterprises were to be nationalized. Special attention was paid to the macroeconomical importance of industrial segments; to the scale, grade of concentration and the peculiarities of industry; the enterprise importance in that segment of industry; the scale of enterprise by the nominal capital volume and by some other parameters.

On the regional level the process of nationalization was conducted on the all-Russian scenario which meant the confiscation that banking institutions suffered from as well as the manufacturing enterprises which were of great importance for the government.

During the October Revolution in Kazan province the Red Guards managed to capture the post office, the telegraph station, the railway station, the depot, as well as the office of the State Bank. Almost immediately there were commissioners to coordinate the work of the bank and prevent sabotage. [12]

Later on there were occupied and sealed many private banking institutions, such as the Kazan city's public bank, the Kazan Branches of the North, Russian-Asian, Azov-Don, the Petrograd international commercial, Volzhsko-Kamsky, the Kazan merchant banks in Kazan [13; 14, pp: 120]. Following it there was started the

governmentalization process of the Kazan branch of the Noble Land and the Peasant Land Bank [15, pp: 17], of the Elabuzhsky commercial bank (it was converted into a branch of the State Bank [16, pp: 331]), of the Elabuzhsky Farmers Bank branch, the Chistopolsky branch of the Russian Bank for the Foreign Trade (renamed into the second branch of the State Bank [17, pp: 39; 14, pp: 121]). Instead of the seven there were left only three branches in Kazan – these were the State, the 1st People's Bank (formerly the Merchant Bank) and the 2nd People's Bank (formerly the Volzhsko-Kamsky Bank). More over the branch of the State Bank began to play a dominant role.

In November 1917, the working section of the Kazan Council requisitioned the Paratsky Iron Works plant which belonged to Benoit the French citizen [18, pp: 72]. November 30, 1917 the Kazan Council of Peasants' Deputies decided to commandeer a number of enterprises of Laishevsky, Spassky and Sviyazhsky counties. In December 1917 the Menzelinsky Council issued decree to nationalize the trade and industrial enterprises of the county. December 31, 1917 the Kazan Council of Peasants' Deputies took the calc-silicate plant which belonged to A. V. Afanasyev near Kazan in its charge. January 7, 1918 the Executive Committee of Kazan Council decided to nationalize sewing shops of manufacturer Shabanov [18, pp: 647-648]. In March - April of 1918 the Council municipalized also the printing houses of the Kazan provincial government and zemstvo, the municipal sawmill of municipal economy council [19, 8, pp: 132-133]. March 12, 1918 the ship repair facility which belonged to Provatorov was nationalized Shipyard (from the other sources [20, pp: 44; 21], it happened January 16) [22]. Based on the resolution of the Executive Committee of Menzelinsky district of peasant deputies as of June 25, 1918 there were nationalized all trading, grain companies of the Menzelinsky County, "Trade Houses" of Khalfin brothers, Seitbadalov brothers, G. Zaynetdinova, Galeev brothers, H. Shagiahmetova and others [23].

The nationalization reached its grate ranges in Elabuzhsky county. The Elabuzhsky Council of Deputies headed by S.N. Gassar nationalized industrial enterprises of Stakheev in March 1918, confiscated all timber trade enterprises, the Syuginsky glass factory in April, 10 [24]. Bondyuzhsky and Kokshansky chemical plants belonging to P.K. Ushkov were nationalized simultaneously [25].

Despite the good results, in general the nationalization of Kazan province industry at the end of 1917 and the first half of 1918 went at a much slower rate compared to other industrialized areas of the country.

During that period only 50 enterprises were nationalized. That was due to the fact that structurally the organizational arrangements for the establishment of local councils of the national economy began much later there than in other areas, a lot of manufacturers made sabotages against the measures of the Soviet power, an important reason of it became the fight with the Czechoslovak rebellion.

More widely and systematically the nationalization of enterprises and other institutions began after the expulsion of beloczechs. Many manufacturers came down the side of the White Guard troops, leaving about 40 factories and plants [26].

In the first half of 1919 the nationalization of oil and food enterprises was already completed in most cases, in September all milling plants that supplied the Red Army with shoes (Alafuzov's factory in Kazan, the factory of Komarov in Kukmor, etc.) moved to the Bolsheviks' hands, all tobacco production was nationalized (3 tobacco factories of Srogovich, Eckert and Geist [27]). The Kazan Council of National Economy decided to sequester (sequestration is a transfer of property to a third party for safekeeping before a dispute settlement between two other parties on the right to that property [28]) the brew-house of Alexandrov and the yeasty-still houses number 7 and 19. It was decided to sequester all other small outfit studios [29] which were in Kazan.

As the experience showed initially the nationalization of industrial enterprises was carried out on its own initiative without any agreement with the central government. The situation was changed after the publication of Supreme Council of National Economy Resolution "The procedure of enterprises disposal" [30] according to which except the Council of People's Commissars the right of disposal of industrial enterprises in favor of the state – such as confiscation, requisition, sequestration, nationalization – was used only by Supreme Council of National Economy as the central authority, regulating and organizing the entire production of the republic and controlling all enterprises. None of the institutions - including military departments, extraordinary commissions as well as local institutions and organizations - were allowed to dispose industrial enterprises without preliminary approval by the Council of People's Commissars or the Presidium of the Supreme Council of National Economy.

Small industrial enterprises got a definite integrity. For example, Resolution # 14 "Collaboration measures of domestic industry" was adopted, at a meeting of the workers' and peasants' government 6 May 1919, later it

was legislated by the Decree of All-Russian Central Executive Committee [31; 32], according to which small handicraft enterprises and craft industry were not allowed to be municipalized, nationalized or confiscated, only in very exceptional cases and on special decrees of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of National Economy.

As a result, at the state level by 1921 there was an impressive picture where the majority of large, medium and small enterprises of the country were nationalized. In the summer of 1918 at the first All-Russian Congress of Economic Councils there was made a public report which stated that under the control of the Supreme Council of National Economy there were 513 [33; pp: 20] industrial enterprises (the information might not be correct as at that time the Supreme Council of National Economy did not have accurate data on the nationalization process conducting in the provinces as the reason was the lack of strong relations with all districts of the country).

According to the Central Statistical Office, the 3134 enterprises in the country were transferred to the State [34] in 1918; based on the industrial census the 1145 factories and plants were nationalized by June 1918 and it was 1877 [35] by the end of 1918. The Scientist I. M. Mikheev cited the figures showing that the 1553 industrial enterprises were nationalized up to the end of June 1918 and it was only 3668 [36] by January 1 of 1919 - (later on these data were reproduced in other publications [37, pp: 42]).

Afterwards the data were changed several times [38, pp: 140-141]. The current literature indicates the following figures: in the process of nationalization 4547 out of 6908 industrial enterprises reporting to the Supreme Council of National Economy were nationalized [39, pp:541; 33, pp: 20] by November 1920.

There are only indicators of large-scale production in the data taken into account, however, to understand the scale of these processes it is necessary to analyze the total number of large and small enterprises of that period. The census of industrial enterprises conducted over the whole territory in 1920, which was under the Soviet regime that time (practically including all areas which became the Soviet Union later, with the exception of Eastern Siberia), showed the existence of 404 thousand factories and plants, the 350 thousand of which functioned. About three-quarters of them were individual or family enterprises and only 26% used the hired labor. The total number of hired worker in industry was equal to 2,200 thousand or 89% of all workers employed in the industrial production, 1,410 thousand of which worked in the so-called large enterprises which had more than 30 workers.

The total number of industrial enterprises, nationalized on the basis of the decree of November 1920, was 37 thousand, employing 1,615 thousand people; in addition, 230 thousand workers were working on cooperative industrial enterprises [39, pp: 165-178]. These figures proved eloquently the mass nationalization process.

What was the situation like in the Kazan region? According to the speed of nationalization conducting the figures of a province exceeded the national average figures in autumn 1918 (there were nationalized 60.9% enterprises to the total number of disposed ones, while in the country there were 38.4% [14, pp: 147]). By the beginning of 1919 among all enterprises which provided information workers took part either in management or in control on 113 enterprises (95.5% of all workers). At 40 enterprises where workers participated neither in management nor in control, were employed only 897 people, representing only 4.5%. The workers were involved in the control on 54 companies. They checked reports, office and account books, accounts, participated in control commissions, supervised booking, distribution and progress of the work and many others [40, pp: 29]. By the beginning of 1921 there were in the republic: in Kazan - 99 nationalized enterprises, private - 5, in cantons - 228 nationalized, private - 15 [41].

After the ownership changing the management of newly joined companies took usually the relevant departments of the Supreme Council of National Economy, the People's Commissariat of Food, the People's Commissariat of Railroads; the direct management at places which were the Council of workers and peasants' deputies, trade unions, economic councils. In the period from November 1917 to March 1918 522 (87.7%) out of 595 acts on enterprises disposal was related to local councils, economic councils and trade unions (Table 1) [42, pp: 99-100].

Until the special order of the Supreme Council of National Economy all nationalized enterprises were

recognized like leasing use without consideration of the former owners. The Council of People's Commissars determined that "since the announcement of the decree board members, directors and other responsible disposers of nationalized enterprises were responsible to the Soviet Republic for the safety and security of enterprises as well as for their proper work." The entire staff of factories and plants was declared in the service of the Republic and in case of its post deserting it was responsible for it before the court of the Revolutionary Tribunal [14, pp: 128]. For these purposes the Supreme Council of National Economy was instructed to develop and distribute to all nationalized enterprises the instructions about management organization in them [43].

The direct control over enterprises was assigned to the departments of workers' control and also to specially created boards. However, within a short period of time the necessity appeared to transfer these functions to other bodies. The Workers' control in the form arranged after the events of February-October 1917 did not correspond to the situation.

On the first Provincial Congress of council of national economy a question about organizational belonging of nationalized local enterprises was considered which for the Kazan province were the timber and leather industry, chemical industry and mechanical manufacturing. The management of nationalized enterprises was supposed to be carried out by the provincial and district councils of national economy with the help of created plant managements. In its turn they worked according to the existing regulations, developed at the congresses of the council of national economy. The Kazan council of national economy reserved the right of technical and financial control over the activities of the nationalized enterprises, obliging the later for regular reporting. Local councils of national economy had the right of supervision and fulfilling tasks of the center [44].

Table 1: The number of legislative acts of Soviet institutions as to industry nationalization

| Institution Name | Enterprises nationalized | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | November-December 1917 | January-March 1918 | April-July 1918 | after July 1918 |
| Council of People's Commissars | 10 | 17 | 247 | 177 |
| Supreme Council of National Economy | 4 | 12 | 104 | 164 |
| Local Councils | 136 | 208 | 251 | 197 |
| Local Economic Councils | 18 | 56 | 264 | 417 |
| Trade Unions | 3 | 14 | 24 | 20 |
| Others | 23 | 94 | 56 | 96 |

An important feature fixed by the Congress was the fact that all enterprises confiscated or nationalized by other rather than the central authorities and councils of national economy had to be transferred immediately to the jurisdiction of the provincial council of national economy. In future the right to impose confiscation, sequestration or requisition on industrial enterprises had to belong to the council of national economy only.

Since the autumn of 1918 after forcing out of Czechoslovakian corps the Kazan council of national economy issued a Decision (dated October 2), "The enterprises left by owners" by which these enterprises belonged temporarily to the Department of nationalized enterprises management of governorate council of national economy. All technical personnel and employees were to continue working on the same conditions as before the intervention. Plant managements were established to prevent a plunder of plant's property and suspension of production. They consisted of 1-3 members from that plant or factory elected by the factory plant committee or by the general meeting of workers; of 1-3 representatives from the corresponding trade unions; of 1-3 officials and specialists from that enterprise; and a representative of the council of national economy. The stuff of a plant management was approved by the Department of nationalized enterprises management of Kazan council of national economy. The total number of members of a plant management had not to exceed 5 people for a simple enterprise and 11 people for a complex, combined one. A plant management was elected for a term not exceeding 6 months. It was responsible for budgeting, a plan for expansion and reequipment, supplying of enterprises; development of internal regulations; collection of materials on the cost of production and payment of labor standards; the appointment of responsible heads for the technical part of an enterprise and its departments; the supervision of estimates and plans implementation by heads approved by the appropriate authority; the care about the life of enterprise employees [45]. All estimates, plans, reports and periodic reports about the activities of a plant management plant were provided to the Department of nationalized enterprises management, which had the right of supreme control over the activities of a plant management. In cases when it was unable to cope with a task of an enterprise leading or its activity contradicted to the public interests, the department was granted with the right of decision prohibition of a plant management and its dissolution. Plant managements in enterprises were organized (led by the governorate council of national economy) directly by factory-plant committees [46].

In addition to the control of a council of national economy, local control commissions were set up in nationalized enterprises after the second Congress of councils of national economy. They took the responsibility of supervisory functions on enterprises management and plant management activities. Their main tasks were compilation and data systematization related to the enterprises activities and providing of that material to the production control department of their union; raising the question to the Union on the appointment of an audit in the enterprise if necessary (in exceptional cases, the Control Commission could appoint an audit itself) and so on [47].

The structure of local control commissions included representatives of union enterprises and persons elected by the general meeting of the plant. The members of the local control commission, delegated by the industrial union, retained their functions for an extended period; those members of the committee who were chosen by the general meeting of the plant workers used to be replaced in a short time.

All-Russian Center of workers' control was established as the department to coordinate local control commissions of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions. Its responsibilities included: development of regulations, which were to detail the rights and duties of the lower control bodies and their precise organization.

With the start of the new economic policy the attitude of the managing board to the nationalization was rapidly changed. That was due to the catastrophic situation in the country. Under the conditions of economic and political recessions to centralize all industry became unprofitable. Serious difficulties appeared on the nationalized enterprises: new managers had no experience of work, sabotage of the former owners and workers, manpower problem, non-attendances, lack of raw materials, etc. All these finally changed the attitude of the Bolsheviks to the issue.

Starting with 1921, to conduct nationalization of a separate enterprise required a special resolution of higher central bodies of the Republic (Supreme Council of National Economy Presidium, Council of People's Commissars, the Soviet of Labour and Defence). All enterprises that were under the influence of the Supreme Council of National Economy Resolution as of November 29, 1920, which were not actually nationalized, were considered to be non-nationalized since 17 May 1921; restoration of rights of the former owners was to be conducted immediately.

According to the Decree "Non-nationalized enterprises" [48] the nationalization was considered to be carried out only if the following specific actions were done by the committees' heads and the provincial councils of national economy:

- If an enterprise was adopted or submitted to the jurisdiction with some special transfer acts (for example, keys were taken from the former owners, an inventory and materials were taken, etc.);
- If a plant management was arranged or a head was appointed or production plan was scheduled;
- If expenses on administration and plant security were included into the budget of a head's committee or a council of national economy;
- If the nationalization of an enterprises was started before 17 May 1921.

The principles proclaimed by the decrees of All-Russian Central Executive Committee and Council of People's Commissars as of May 17, 1921 "Nonagricultural producers' cooperatives and handicraft and light industries" were to be applied in relation to non-nationalized enterprises.

In 1921, the government decided to do a partial denationalization of industry. It was not a random move. In addition to all other reasons which caused a general economic recession Tatar ASSR had its own specific ones (for example, starvation). It led to the fact that in summer months of 1921 the industry of the republic underwent a strong crisis. In these heavy conditions it was required to restore the industry on a new basis. Among the factories and plants it was necessary to select the largest, the best preserved and the most viable enterprises, leaving them in the service of the government, all other enterprises depending on the available resources were to be either preserved, or to be rented out or to be liquidated (more detailed information is given in the third paragraph).

The factory "Schetkist" could be marked out among the denationalized enterprises, which was returned to its former owners who were the Latvian nationals. The work of that institution was authorized under the following conditions: to keep the right of the total control over the factory production by Tatar council of national economy; unconditional transfer of all produced goods based on definite conditions. Some of the enterprises were transferred to other departments to make the management easier. Among these enterprises the chemical plant partnership of P.K. Ushkov could be noted which passed to the Kazan gunpowder factory # 40.

Among the large enterprises which went out of Tatar council of national economy authority were:

- Aleksandrovsky Lumber mill which was conveyed to the Chuvashia region;
- Bondyuzhsky and Kokshansky plants were transferred to the self-supporting basis and entered into a special control of Glavkhim called "Bondyuzhskaya group of plants named after L.Y. Karpov" and etc.

All other enterprises were divided by Tatar council of national economy into 3 categories:

- left in the service of the government and liable to immediate launch into action;
- left under the control of the government but doomed to temporary inactivity and was liable to launch into action;
- all other enterprises that were not of much importance from the government's point of view and could be transferred to rental use [49; 50, pp: 66].

On that the process of nationalization was completed. In recent years, the nationalization was carried out partially but these were only singular examples. Too often the leadership went out of the way of nationalization but on the way of partial confiscation of property.

CONCLUSION

The investigation of nationalization process which took place in the Soviet Russia in 1917 – beginning of 1921 has given us the possibility to make a series of important conclusions. First of all, we must point out the necessity of such actions done by the leadership of the Soviet Russia. Under the conditions of challenging internal problems (the general economic decline caused by the first World War and revolutions, the civil war), complicated by unresolved industrial issues (sabotage, lack of skilled stuff, raw materials, lack of discipline), to retain power the Bolsheviks chose the way of management centralization which was reflected in the processes of nationalization, confiscation and sequestration.

In a relatively short time, a significant part of the large and medium-sized enterprises went into the hands of new government, the majority of the adult population of the country worked in the nationalized enterprises.

The change of legal form of enterprises led to a reorganization of the management system. If initially after the nationalization the management was in structures which conducted itself the nationalization (these were diverse groups such as the Soviets of Workers 'and Soldiers' Deputies, trade unions, etc.), afterwards it gradually passed to the authorities, which led the economy of certain regions directly.

REFERENCES

1. The banner of the revolution, 1919. January 24.
2. State Capitalism in Russia. Date Views 6.08.2013 <http://www.marxists.org/archive/bookchin/1950/state-capitalism.htm>.
3. Peacock, A. and J. Wiseman, 1961. The Growth of Public Expenditure in the United Kingdom. Princeton University Press. Date Views 6.08.2013 <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c2309.pdf>.
4. Bloomberg News: Venezuela Decrees: Nationalization of Nation's Gold Industry. Date Views 6.08.2013 <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2011-09-19/venezuela-decrees-nationalization-of-nation-s-gold-industry.html>.
5. Nalbandian, J., Nationalisation of industries after world. Date Views <http://www.orgsun.com/travel/england/a-glimpse-of-britain/britain4.php>.
6. Nationalization. Date Views 6.08.2013 http://www.answers.com/topic/nationalization#cite_note-2.
7. Wikipedia on Answers.com: Nationalization. Date Views 6.08.2013 <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationalization>.
8. Nationalise The Legal Service? Date Views 6.08.2013 <http://robertnielsen21.wordpress.com/2012/11/26/nationalise-the-legal-service>.
9. Nationalization. Date Views 6.08.2013 <http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/405796/nationalization>.
10. Kara-Murza, 2002. Year the Soviet civilization. From the great Victory to our days. Vol.1. Moscow.
11. Collection of decrees and resolutions of the national economy. Vol.2. Moscow, 1920.
12. True, 1917. December 16.
13. Working file, 1917. December 17.
14. Nazipova, K.A., 1976. Nationalization of industry in Tatarstan (1917-1921). Moscow.
15. Adrianov, N., 1958. The October revolution and the scrapping of the state apparatus in Tatarstan. Kazan.
16. Establishment and strengthening of Soviet power in Vyatka province. Compilation of materials. Kirov, 1957.
17. Sketches of the history of Udmurt ASSR. Vol.2. Izhevsk, 1968.
18. From the history of the struggle for Soviet power in November 1917-February 1918). Sat. historical documents and materials. Moscow, 1949.
19. The banner of the revolution. 1918. April 12.
20. List of nationalized enterprises of the RSFSR in 1919. Moscow, 1920.
21. Soviet power. 1918. June 26.
22. Andrianov, N.A. and K.A. Fat, 1962. Formation and strengthening of the power of the Soviets in Tatarstan. Kazan.
23. Central state archive of historical and political documentation of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. 36. Inventory. 38(224): 46.
24. Popular will, 1918. June 29.
25. The national archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. R-1296. Inventory. 2(100): 20.
26. The banner of the revolution. 1919. March 19.
27. The banner of the revolution. 1919. January 15.
28. Pravoteka.ru Portal of legal aid. Date Views 3.12.2012 <http://www.pravoteka.ru/enc/%D0%A1%D0%B5%D0%BA%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%81%D1%82%D1%80>.
29. The banner of the revolution. 1919. April 3.
30. The national archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. R-787. Inventory. 1. Case. 1. Page. 106, 2, 14.
31. The national archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. R-787. Inventory. 1(1): 5.
32. The Banner of the revolution. 1919. May 27.
33. Bakulin, V.I., 1992. On the ways of intensification of production (from the experience of the 20-ies). Ekaterinburg.
34. Statistical Yearbook, 1918-1920 Vol. 2. Moscow, 1922.
35. The Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Vol. 41. Moscow, 1939.
36. The development of the Soviet economy. Moscow, 1940.
37. Morozov, V.M., 1957. Creation and strengthening of the Soviet state apparatus (November 1917-March 1919). Moscow.
38. Gladkov, I.A., 1959. Essays on the construction of the Soviet planned economy in 1917-1918. Moscow.
39. Carr, E., 1990. The History of Soviet Russia. The Bolshevik revolution, 1917-1923 Vol.1. Moscow: Progress.
40. Andrianov, N.A., 1962. Restoration of Soviet power and strengthening its apparatus in Tatarstan. Kazan.
41. The national archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. R-732. Inventory. 1. Case. 625. Page. 24, 25.

42. Drobizhev, V.Z., 1966. Headquarters of the socialist industry (essay on the history of the Supreme economic Council. 1917-1932). Moscow.
43. Collection of the codes. 1918. # 47. Article 559.
44. The national archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. R-732. Inventory. 1. Case. 6. Page. 3, 69.
45. The banner of the revolution, 1918. October 2.
46. The banner of the revolution, 1919. February 13.
47. The national archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. R-732. Inventory. 1. Case. 1. Page. 19.
48. Economic life. 1921. August 16.
49. The national archives of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fund. R-787. Inventory. 1. Case. 101. Page. 31, 32.
50. Kolomits, O.G., 1995. NEP in the industry of the Tatar Republic (1921-1926): thesis PhD. Kazan.