

# Why An Individual Becomes a Slave Under Communist Regimes

**Meghna Nair and Pragti Rathore**

The origin of the word Communism can be traced to the word commune, when the French philosopher and writer Victor d'Hupay who, in his 1777 book "Project" defined the communist lifestyle as a "commune" (a "communal") and advises to 'share all economic and material products between inhabitants of the "commune", so that all may benefit from everybody's work'

Communism is any form of government characterized by shared ownership of all property and nonexistence of social classes, money and the state. Under capitalism, the price system is followed as a means for allocating scarce resources. Communism rejects the price system. Under capitalism, goods are exchanged between the buyers and sellers on a mutually agreed-upon price and production levels are similarly determined. In a communist economy, however, the state solely decides what and how much is to be produced. This unvaryingly leads to shortages of some goods and surpluses of others, which are not economically desirable.

Capitalism functions on the idea of incentives. People are motivated by incentives: workers by salaries and wages and owners by profits. Communism eradicates incentives. Because the State controls production, there is no incentive to work harder to achieve higher wages, nor are citizens incentivized to undertake the entrepreneurial risks necessary to earn

profit. Therefore, communism leads to a stagnation of economic activity.

A stagnant economy leads to a reduction in prosperity for society. It causes industry to use inferior methods, leading to a decrease in technology. The result is decaying industry and infrastructure-basically a poorer society overall.

Most importantly, communism reduces personal freedom. To meet pre-decided production goals, the citizens of a communist regime are forced to follow government commands. Travel into and out of the country is severely constrained and political dissention is suppressed by militaristic police.

People are not permitted to own their own businesses or manufacture their own goods. Decisions regarding how much to produce are left to the government's will, which can lead to overproduction or underproduction. People's compensation is also determined by the government.

The result of all this is basically that the individual acts like a Slave to the state, there is no political, ideological, social or economic freedom. Everything is determined by the enslaver - the socialist state.

## Slavery under Capitalism

By listing out the drawbacks of communism, I don't aim to say that Capitalism is the best form of government guaranteeing economic freedom. Even under Capitalism form of market, the individual becomes a slave to the capitalist instruments of market- the invisible hand, the wage rate, etc.

Slavery is an outflow of the current world/money system followed by us, basically Capitalism, which creates an environment with such economic discrepancies where you have a small percentage of the population with all the resources, money and power, while the majority is fighting and finding a way to just provide themselves with basic survival requirements. By Economic Slavery, I do not mean citizens on the brink of survival, starving to death. It exists at any point when one individual uses their advantages to control and enslave another.

An individual fighting for Survival, for their basic survival needs, does not have the choice or option to decide what job they will do. They do not have the time to ponder other options as bills must be paid. And because of this, the workers will agree to any kind of wage provided to them by the employers, however less they are.

This is the reason an individual becomes a slave even under a capitalist form of market.

## Socialism in the Soviet Union with a specific emphasis on the economy

The **economy of the Soviet Union**, from 1949-1991, was based on a system of state ownership of the means of production, cooperative farming, industrial

manufacturing and centralized administrative planning. The economy was characterized by government control of investment, public ownership of industrial assets, macroeconomic stability, negligible unemployment and high job security.

Beginning in 1928, the entire economy was guided by a series of Five-Year Plans, with a brief attempt at seven-year planning also. By the 1950s, the Soviet Union evolved from a mainly agrarian society into a chief industrial power.

Based on a system of state ownership, the Soviet economy was managed through 3 bodies- *Gosplan* (the State Planning Commission), the *Gosbank* (the State Bank) and the *Gossnab* (State Commission for Materials and Equipment Supply). For every enterprise, planning ministries, also known as the "fund holders" or *fondoderzhateli* defined the mix of economic inputs such as labor and raw materials, a schedule for completion, all wholesale prices and nearly all retail prices. The planning process was based around material balances—matching economic inputs with planned output targets for the planning period. Due to ideological reasons, the range of mathematics used to assist economic decision-making from the 1930s to the 1950s was extremely restricted.

Industry was long focused after 1928 on the production of capital goods through metallurgy, machine manufacture, and chemical industry. The capital goods were known as *group A goods*, or *means of production*. This stress was based on the apparent necessity for a very fast industrialization and modernization of the Soviet Union. After the death of Stalin in 1953, consumer goods, which were the *group B goods*, received somewhat more emphasis due to the efforts of Malenkov. However, when Khrushchev consolidated his power by sacking Malenkov, one of the accusations against Malenkov was that he allowed "theoretically incorrect and

politically harmful opposition to the rate of development of heavy industry in favor of the rate of development of light and food industry.” Therefore capital goods were again prioritized from 1955 onwards.

Most information in the Soviet economy flowed from top down. There were several mechanisms in place for producers and consumers to provide input and information that would help in the conscripting of economic plans, but **the political climate was such that few people ever provided negative input or criticism of the plan. Thus, Soviet planners had very little authentic feedback that they could use to determine the success of their plans.**

This meant that economic planning was often done based on defective or outdated information, particularly in sectors with large numbers of consumers. As a result, some goods tended to be under produced, leading to shortages, while other goods were overproduced and accumulated in storage- a situation of surplus. Low-level managers often did not report such problems to their seniors, depending instead on each other for support. Some factories developed a system of barter and started exchanging or sharing raw materials and parts without the knowledge of the authorities and outside the limitations of the economic plan.

Heavy industry was always the focus of the Soviet economy, even in its later years. It received special attention from the planners, combined with the fact that industrial production was relatively easy to plan even without minute feedback-this led to significant growth in that sector. The Soviet Union became one of the leading industrial nations of the world. Industrial production was quite high in the Soviet Union compared to Western economies. However, the production of consumer goods was disproportionately low. **Economic planners also made little or no effort to determine the wishes of household consumers,** resulting in severe

shortages of many consumer goods. Whenever these consumer goods would become available on the market, consumers routinely had to stand in long queues to buy them. A black market developed for goods that were particularly sought after but constantly under produced, like cigarettes.

The major strength of the Soviet economy lied in its enormous supply of oil and gas, which became much more treasured as exports, after the world price of oil skyrocketed in the 1970s. The Soviet economy in its final decades was "heavily dependent on vast natural resources like oil and gas." However, world oil prices collapsed in 1986, putting very substantial pressure on the economy. After coming to power in 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev began a process of economic liberalization that moved the economy towards a mixed economy. At its dissolution at the end of 1991, the Soviet Union left the Russian Federation a growing pile of \$66 billion in external debt, and with barely a few billion dollars in net gold and foreign exchange reserves.

### **The Perestroika: the dismantlement of the Soviet economic system (1985-1991)**

The period from 1985 to 1991, corresponds to a period of economic recession for the Soviet Union. The average per Capita GDP was growing at a rate of -1.3 %

The accession of Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985 marked the beginning of the Perestroika period. Perestroika means restructuring in Russian, and this is what Gorbachev set out to achieve. The economic reforms implemented were intended to profoundly change the Soviet system. According to Gorbachev, the 2 main goals of the Perestroika reforms were to halt the slowdown trend of Soviet economy and to raise the life standards of

the citizens. Soviet reformers considered that these two interrelated objectives could be attained through the solving of the problem of the 'relaxation of discipline' and a change in the means of coordination of the economic system. They thought that the inflexible central economic planning must be softened, and a certain degree of decentralization was required, along with direct participation of the workers to the management of the enterprises. But, the most radical change in the functioning mode of the Soviet economy intended by the Perestroika was the creation of a private sector and the introduction of market mechanisms.

A number of laws and decrees were passed to implement the reform program. The Law on State Enterprise, which granted considerable independence to state enterprises, was adopted in 1987. The Law on State Enterprise defined that 5 year plans were becoming indicative and not obligatory any more. Enterprises were given target for the value of their output by the State but detailed plans of inputs-outputs for each company were no more there. Government contracts were replacing state orders and only a portion of the production of enterprises was bought by the State. The remainder of enterprise output was sold through wholesale trade directly between the companies. Thus, Soviet enterprises were free to determine the nature of share of their output. The pricing system was no more entirely controlled by the Gosplan. A rising number of prices could be set freely, even if the price of basic and strategic goods, like energy, raw materials, health sector, remained under State control. Moreover, Soviet enterprises were permitted to choose the buyers of the remainder products. The self-financing of the enterprises was also adopted and implemented through retained earnings and bank loans

The autonomy of the state enterprises had many negative effects on the operation of

the Soviet economic system. It disordered the coordination of the economy previously guaranteed by the Gosplan, which was gradually losing its control over the Soviet Economy. It created bottlenecks and expanded the shortages. The Labor Councils also took advantage of the autonomy by increasing the share of profits going to the incentive funds at the expense of investment. Thus, the share of profits taken by the enterprises going to incentive funds represented 82% in 1988 and almost 95% in 1989. Wages were raised by this increase in incentive funds. Thanks to the Glasnost<sup>20</sup>, strikes became allowed. It caused a surge of workers strikes which led to other wage increases. Soviet system had started behaving like a capitalist economy.

The augmented increase of real wages, in a context of growing shortages, aggravated the problem of excess demand in the USSR. It also added to the growing inflation in the country.

Before the Law of 1987, the Soviet State had had a total control over the enterprises, gaining from them whatever revenues were required for the central budget. But, the situation transformed with the adoption of the enterprise autonomy since the State could no longer collect whatever tax it wished to. Thus, the growing size of the incentive funds also meant that the share of profit paid to state budget was dropping. It intensified the increasing state deficit.

The freedom to determinate the prices of products out of the state contract disorganized the pricing system. The consumer goods enterprises, which had become profit-seeking because of their newly acquired autonomy, shifted their manufacture from basic goods to more profitable 'new products'. After all, these 'new goods', for which State controlled prices did not exist, were higher-priced and carried a larger markup. The effect was a rising shortage of basic consumer goods. The activity of the illegal secondary markets was also growing fast. 'Backdoor

channels' for people to pay above fixed retail prices of basic products had come up. Many goods had, at the same time 3 kind of prices-a state price, a free-market price and a black market price. Statistics by the state did not take into account the 'new goods' and the products sold on the black market, so they did not capture the veiled inflation and official records did not show the inflationary process in development. The prices were also affected by the place of residence.

The cooperatives were intended to be small-scale businesses offering goods and services which were not provided by big State enterprises. But, cooperatives started having all kinds of activities and many of them became big companies with operations in trade and finance. So, the Law on Cooperatives led to the birth of a lot of capitalist firms. The success of the cooperative model is shown by the fact that, by July 1989, barely one year after the approval of the law, almost three million people were working in cooperatives. At the end of 1991, this number had grown to more than 6,2 million. Many cooperatives were started by the managers and employees of the state companies. They usually bought goods produced by their own enterprise at Comecon controlled prices, manufactured them in the cooperative, mostly without any significant alteration, selling them at much higher free prices. These practices led to even more shortage of consumer goods in the USSR. As you can see, many State enterprise managers became real capitalists and accumulated huge wealth thanks to their 'cooperative activity'. This consolidation of wealth in the hands of State managers increased even more thanks to the decentralization of foreign trade. A decree in December 1989 had removed State controls over foreign trade. So, many cooperatives bought goods, specially raw materials, metals, oil, at the low State domestic prices and sold them

abroad for hard currency. It was very lucrative and some managers enriched themselves a lot, creating a group of wealthy capitalists for whom proceeding to capitalism was considered necessary to the survival of their new businesses. They played a central role in the disintegration of the USSR by financing the pro-capitalist coalition and expanding the imbalances that already existed in the Soviet economy. The partial freedom of State enterprises to set prices and the total one of Cooperatives was a disruption to the Soviet distribution system. State enterprises and cooperatives wanted to earn higher profits, so they took advantage of the free price-setting to increase prices. So, thanks to the increase in profitability and their autonomy, cooperatives and State enterprises could increase their employees' wages. The result was a differentiation in wages of State enterprise employees depending on the extent of their free price-setting. Cooperatives, which had an entirely autonomous price-fixing, offered the highest wages. Average wages were also higher in cooperatives than in State enterprises.

The structural external vulnerability of the Soviet economy worsened during the Perestroika. World oil prices reduced sharply in 1986 and remained very low so that Soviet current balance of payment fell sharply during the Perestroika. Because of the overuse of the most productive deposits, Soviet oil production became much more unsustainable. This led to a drop in "official" oil exports increasing the problems with hard currency. The deficit in the current account of the balance of payments also increased because of the growing domestic needs for consumer and agricultural goods due to the shortages. Finally, the exports fell by 44% in value in 1991 compared to 1990 figures. Moreover, the fall of communism in Central and Eastern Europe marked the end of the

Comecon, which impacted Soviet foreign trade much more inversely.

Thus, in 1991, the USSR was in a crucial economic situation. Unable to respond to domestic needs for consumer and agricultural goods, central Soviet institutions had no more control on the economic and political system. GDP per capita, which had decreased by 3.1% in 1990, dropped by 6.8% in 1991. Inflation could not be kept under check. The price system was totally disorganized. The birth of a capitalist market had enabled the accumulation of a huge wealth by an elite group of State managers. The distribution system of the Soviet State had become very unequal. Most political leaders aimed to realize the 'transition to a market economy'. Instead of restructuring, The Perestroika had destroyed the Soviet system because of the lack of a coherent reform program by Gorbachev. Perestroika was reactive and fragmented; each reform was simply a response to pressures created by the previous stage of reform.

Finally, the complex demands of the modern economy and inflexible administration dazed and constrained the central planners. **Corruption and data fiddling became common practice among the bureaucracy by falsely reporting fulfilled targets and quotas**, thus ensconcing the crisis. From the Stalin-era to the early Brezhnev-era, the Soviet economy grew much sluggishly than Japan and slightly quicker than the United States. GDP levels in 1950 (in billion 1990 dollars) were 510 (100%) in the USSR, 161 (100%) in Japan and 1456 (100%) in the US. By 1965 the corresponding values were 1011 (198%), 587 (365%), and 2607 (179%). The Soviet Union upheld itself as the second largest economy in both nominal and purchasing power parity values for much of the Cold War until 1988, when Japan's economy surpassed \$3 trillion in nominal value.

**The power of the Central State, which treated citizens as it's slaves, led to the growth of the Soviet economy in the initial years and for much of the period of the Cold War. But it was these reasons that led to the ultimate demise of this modern slave regime- citizens realized that they were being treated as second-class individuals. Their basic rights as human beings- democracy, free speech were being taken away. The ultimate result was the dissolution of the Soviet Empire.**

## Socialist Economy in China

From its founding in 1949 until late 1978, the People's Republic of China was a Soviet-style centrally planned economy. Following Mao's death in 1976 and the consequent end of the Cultural Revolution, Deng Xiaoping and the new Chinese leadership began to reform the economy and move towards a more market-oriented mixed economy under one-party rule. Agricultural collectivization was dismantled and farmlands privatized, while foreign trade became a major new focus, leading to the creation of Special Economic Zones (SEZs). Inefficient state-owned enterprises (SOEs) were restructured and unprofitable ones were closed outright, resulting in massive job losses. Modern-day China is mainly characterized as having a market economy based on private property ownership, and is one of the leading examples of state capitalism. The state still dominates in strategic "pillar" sectors such as energy production and heavy industries, but private enterprise has expanded enormously, with around 30 million private businesses recorded in 2008.

The economic model currently employed by the People's Republic of China is based on the dominance of the state-owned

sector and an open-market economy, and has its origins in the Chinese economic reforms introduced under Deng Xiaoping. The ideological rationale is that China is in the primary stage of socialism, an early stage within the socialist mode of production, and therefore has to adapt capitalist techniques to thrive. Despite this, the system has widely been cited as a form of state capitalism.

After the Great Leap Forward (1958–1961) and the ousting of the Gang of Four from power, Chairman Deng Xiaoping was willing to consider market-based methods of economic growth so as to revitalize China's economy and find an economic system compatible with China's specific conditions. However, in doing so, he remained committed to the centralized control and the one-party state central to Leninism.

The socialist market economy was a concept introduced by Deng Xiaoping in order to incorporate the market into the planned economy in the People's Republic of China. Following its implementation, this economic system has supplemented the centrally planned economy in the People's Republic of China, with high growth rates in GDP during the past decades having been attributed to it. Within this model, privately owned enterprises have become a major component of the economic system alongside the central state-owned enterprises and collective / township village enterprises.

There are some similarities to Western mixed economies, with some fundamental differences. The fundamental distinction between the Chinese and Western mixed-market economy models lies less in the implementation of the mixed economic model but rather in the degree of state-ownership and underlying authoritarian political philosophy, which eschews

Western notions of democracy, individual rights, and the rule of law.

This type of economic system is defended from a Stalinist perspective which states that a fully developed socialist planned economy can only come into existence after first establishing the necessary and comprehensive commodity market economy and letting it fully develop until it exhausts its historical stage and gradually transforms itself into a planned economy (the Stalinist Two-Stage theory of revolution). Proponents of this economic model distinguish it from market socialism: market socialists believe that economic planning is unattainable, undesirable or ineffective, and thus view the market as an integral part of socialism, whereas proponents of the socialist market economy view markets as a temporary phase in development of a fully planned economy.

Despite the official designation of "socialism", analysts often describe the Chinese economy as a form of state capitalism.

**The Chinese economy does not constitute a form of socialism when "socialism" is defined variously as a planned economy where production for use has replaced production for profit; when it is defined as a system where the working-class is the dominant class (controls the surplus value produced by the economy); and when it is defined as self-management or workplace democracy. The study also found that as of 2006 capitalism was not the dominant mode of organization in the Chinese economy, suggesting that China is still a partially pre-capitalist agrarian system with almost 50% of its population engaged in agricultural work.**

By 2005 the market-oriented reforms, including privatization, were virtually halted and partially reversed. In 2006, the

Chinese government announced that the armaments, power generation and distribution, oil and petrochemicals, telecommunications, coal, aviation and shipping industries had to remain under "absolute state control" and public ownership by law. The state retains indirect control in directing the non-state economy through the financial system, which lends according to state priorities. Liberalization continues to be rolled back in the state-sector by the consolidation of state enterprises into large "national champions" with the goal of consolidating efforts and creating internationally competitive national industries.

The state sector is concentrated in the 'commanding heights' of the economy with a growing private sector engaged primarily in commodity production and light industry. Centralized directive planning based on mandatory output requirements and production quotas has been superseded by the free-market mechanism for most of the economy and directive planning in large state industries. A major difference from the old planned economy is the restructuring of state companies along a commercial basis, with the exception of 150 large state-owned enterprises that remain and report directly to the central government, most having a number of subsidiaries.

By 2008, these state-owned corporations have become increasingly dynamic largely contributing to the increase in revenue for the state. By 2009 the government considered a state insurance scheme to expand healthcare coverage. The state-sector led the economic recovery process and increased economic growth in 2009 after the financial crises, partially because most of the Chinese stimulus package was directed towards these state-owned firms. The state-sector makes out 40 to 50 percent of China's GDP.

A thorough analysis of the Vietnamese Economy and justifying our hypothesis of whether or not it perpetrates Slavery:

Growth in the Vietnamese Economy in the last five years has been quite high, with due credit given to the four main causes for the same:

1. Increasing Foreign Direct Investment
2. Free Trade Agreements
3. The Trans Pacific Partnership
4. And an ever increasing rate of Exports and a shift in the constitution of the same's demand.

Vietnam is the 28th largest Export Oriented Market in the World and the 93rd most complex market. Majority of the Export Market constitutes Broadcasting Equipment, Computers, Raw Petroleum and Leather primarily to the United States of America, China, Japan and South Korea. This has been seen as a positive change and a measure of its growth from its initial export focus, which was of shoes, garments and the like. The Vietnamese Economy imports steel, telephones and its equipment and integrated circuits. While a majority of Vietnam's Exports are to China which constitutes around 10% of its whole, roughly 30% of its Imports are from China too, the majority of which is made up of machinery. To the USA its main exports are textiles. However even though we see the quality and quantity of Exports rising throughout the years, 2015 saw Vietnam with a deficit of 3.5 billion US Dollars, which came as quite a shock for a country that had seen a surplus in its net exports for the last three years.

Foreign Direct Investment in this Asian Economy has been remarkable with 2015 receiving 14.5 billion US Dollars, a 17.4% increase from the previous year. Investment has primarily been in the processing and the manufacturing sector. This has been looked at with great awe and positivity, keeping in mind the market slowdown in South East Asia and China.

On the Economic Complexity Index, Vietnam has a score of -0.456 making it the 93rd most complex economy in the

world, with a total of 258 products being exported each year. Vietnam also has a Revealed Competitive Advantage which means that its share of Global Exports is greater, and in Vietnam's case, much greater, than what is expected from it, given the size of its economy.

The last few years have seen the Domestic Economy booming to quite an extent too, thanks to low inflation and an extremely accommodative Monetary Policy. The Central Bank has been following a path of Expansion and has been increasing the money supply to boost domestic demand and activity, and this has been proven to be successful. 2015 saw a 6.7% increase in Vietnam's real GDP, surpassing its target of 6.2%. The industrial and Construction Sector have been the key contributors to this growth with growth rates of 10.6% and 10.8% respectively. The Service sector saw an increase of 6.3%, which was seen as a good indicator of the Economy's success too. Domestic Capital investment saw an increase by 9%. Agriculture which contributes to only 17% of the Real GDP of Vietnam includes 46% of the country's entire Workforce.

The Trans Pacific Partnership too, has contributed quite a bit to the growth of the Vietnam's economy and the jobs it provides. This partnership which focuses on a "Made in America" ideal, has helped and contributed to Vietnam's growth in 2015, which has been the fastest in the last seven years. However its banking sector is one of the few sectors that have not been a part of this progress and seen sluggish growth.

Coming back to the country's foreign investment, while the ever increasing investment has been seen with much awe, all over the globe, this has been in spite of the country's extremely poor infrastructure. Rocky roads and small mismanaged ports, which would usually be deterrents to investment by investors

has not exactly been so. Low cost- high manual labour and a good demographic structure and a comparatively stable political environment (all thanks to its Socialist and Communist structure) have overshadowed the aforementioned negatives. With 70% of the population within working age, and 58% of the country's population below 35 years of age, this has worked in favour of Vietnam's economy. With average monthly wages as low as \$197, which is half of that of Thailand and less than one third of that of China (with an average monthly wage of \$613), makes us wonder whether its political structure has anything to do with the same.

Is this the Slavery that we have been referring to in our paper?

While in most capitalist production models, labour is referred to as an input and treated the same as any other commodity required to produce output, as seen as in the simple  $Y = A \cdot f(K, L)$  relationship, labour is remunerated as per its labour power. However in a socialist economy, labour, and man himself is referred to as a property of the state. With remuneration depending on the share of social product an individual contributes to, as well as the quality and quantity of product he produces. Those familiar with the piece rate and time rate system of wage, this is the wage rate system that most Socialist country's follow. In their constant struggle against the Bourgeois, the writers believe that labour in a Socialist economy has been identified with modern day slavery, with physical and laborious work being the benchmark of reward. Handwork is rewarded and looked at preferably over mental and brain work, which is expected to be left to the state. Decision making is the responsibility of the state and the state alone, as we see is substantiated in the fact that manual work as put in my miners and the like is rewarded with higher wage than workers with administrative and managerial duties.

Hours and effort over skill, which is a scary idea to understand and an unfamiliar thought to comprehend when coming from countries with that follow a layered and more right wing approach. One cannot help but compare this with the century old concept of physical slavery where men belonged to their owners, but instead here man belongs to the state. His mind and his body alike are properties of the state, like any other state owned commodities, which in our opinion takes away a man's individuality. One can however say that while this is the ideal that Communism and Socialism were based and founded on, this is rarely the practice nowadays. This isn't what we're questioning. A form of government, in which the state decides that it is the duty of man to work and contribute to his share of social product, overshadows the various benefits provided by a Socialist government. Where time rate and piece rate system are the methods followed, leisure isn't respected and a man's choice to do the same, punished. An economy where you are not your own person is in our opinion, slavery in its truest sense.

The question that arises however is this: When pitted against the growth structure of a similar scaled Capitalist country, where does Vietnam lie? Will its principals of what we're referring to "Slavery" actually benefit the economy in the long run, or slow down?

Let's put it in comparison to a slightly more independent and privately controlled economy, which for our convenience has been Sweden. Sweden we see has over decades performed remarkably well, with an extremely open market system and has been free of corruption and any influence that may have had any negative consequences on its performance. With a rule of law which for years has been extremely stringent, and with strict property rights and contract enforcement, the financial sector has gained much

stability over the last few years. The one thing we would like to point out in this case is that the Swedish economy which for years had been looked at as a socialist economy, with a socialist government, is now looked at as classic example of model capitalism, and that we believe, has made all the difference. With close to 53% of GDP spent by the Government as Public Spending, this recently turned capitalist economy has had one of the lowest levels of national debt and inflation.

As quoted from Scott Sutherland's paper based on the same, *"Sweden's present economic and social prosperity was built on the lessons learned from the financial crisis in the early 1990s. Governments pursued reforms and fiscal sustainability became institutionalized. Stable economic policies combine with competitiveness, innovation and an open approach to trade to make Sweden a model for economic success."*

So while what we can give you, is only a glimpse into our perspective on Slavery in the modern world, i.e. the 21st century and beyond, we substantiate the same with our analysis of the Vietnamese economy and how we believe that the Socialist model in this country has been the reason for its halt-and-break slow progress.