

## MARXISM AND WAR!

Leonid Razvozhayev

### Introduction

This brochure should have been published at least two years ago. However, back then, I imagined the war in Ukraine would soon end and become a thing of the past.

Nevertheless, the conflict has become protracted, and debates about the Marxist assessment of the SVO continue to rage. Moreover, in my opinion, opponents of the SVO on the left are becoming increasingly rigid and aggressive, and this is quite likely due to the large-scale funding of their organizations and media channels, which, under the guise of anti-war propaganda, are openly working for the imperialist bloc of Western countries. The latter, in turn, are pursuing an aggressive expansionist policy throughout the world, including in Ukraine, where they have provoked an armed confrontation between fraternal peoples, but in fact, parts of a single nation!

This brochure contains numerous articles by me, as well as several by my comrades, devoted to the Marxist analysis of the Soviet Military District. These texts contain hundreds of quotations and references to classic Marxist works, revealing their approach to phenomena such as war and related issues.

The brochure's primary goal is to provide answers to moral and, more importantly, fundamental theoretical questions about Marxism's approach to this war. The reader will discover here sometimes unexpected perspectives on the interpretation of war by Lenin, Marx, Engels, and other thinkers.

Without a doubt, so-called "non-warists" on the left are often simply unfamiliar with these contexts and with Marxism's profound methodological approaches to assessing such phenomena. My opponents often rely solely on superficial clichés, false analogies, or memorized quotations related to other types of war, portraying the classic Marxists as pacifists or even narrow-minded idealists. This is not true. Marx, Lenin, Engels, Stalin, Mao, and others were not idealistic romantics. In every historical phenomenon, they sought to discern its potential for dialectical movement forward, developing appropriate tactics.

This brochure is structured into seven thematic sections. In each, I have grouped my articles and posts published since the inception of the SVO. Some works are interdisciplinary in nature and intersect with the themes of other sections.

In addition to simply reproducing the texts, I have provided commentary that updates and deepens the issues raised.

Following is a list of the key aspects that will be discussed in this brochure.

1. What types of wars can communists, in other words, Marxists, support, according to the classics of Marxism-Leninism? Is the defense of the bourgeois Fatherland important to Marxists? Proof that this war is a war of national liberation and anti-imperialist war.
2. Can communists support the bourgeoisie or bourgeois authorities waging a just war?
3. What is annexation?
4. Who is an imperialist today?
5. War as a phenomenon!
6. Support for the Central Military District in the interests of the working class.  
Essentially, it is class struggle and a stage of socialist revolution in the world!
7. What practical results do we expect from the position on the Central Military District?

1. What types of wars can communists, in other words, Marxists, support, according to the classics of Marxism-Leninism? Defense of the Fatherland!

Below I publish a number of excerpts from Ilyich's letters to his comrades, in which he expresses extreme surprise that some of his fellow party members believe that for communists, there are no just wars other than class wars. Lenin, to put it mildly, is shocked by this interpretation of Marxism. Further—in letters and in a number of articles—he polemicizes against such ultra-leftists who consign the concept of the Fatherland to the dustbin of history!

So: My article, written on March 23, 2023!

"To Zinoviev.

We are not at all opposed to the "defense of the fatherland" in general, nor to "defensive wars" in general. You will never find such nonsense in any resolution or article of mine. We are against the defense of the fatherland and defense in the imperialist war of 1914-1916 and in other imperialist wars typical of the imperialist era. But in the imperialist era, there can also be "just," "defensive," revolutionary wars: namely: 1) national; 2) civil; 3) socialist, etc." Written in August 1916. Sent from Flums to Hertenstein (Switzerland).

First published in 1932 in Bolshevik magazine, issue 22.

I have already repeatedly published Lenin's opinion, based on the examples of Marx, Engels, and others, that the concept of defending the fatherland, even a bourgeois one, is not foreign to Marxists. This applies, of course, to progressive and defensive wars. Without a doubt, today the proletariat of Ukraine and Western countries must advocate for the defeat of their imperialist governments, and in Ukraine, for the defeat of the Nazi government. This, as they say, is a fact. However, if there is an imperialist side in a conflict, can there be another side that is not imperialist? This is, after all, a rather serious question.

After all, we seem accustomed to a certain stereotype: if a war is waged by imperialists, then all parties to the conflict are imperialists. After all, that's how it was in the First World War, and we love that

historical era so much that it's hard for us to resist the idea that at some point things could be different...

But in this letter, Lenin makes it clear that... "But in the imperialist era, there can also be 'just,' 'defensive,' revolutionary wars: 1) national; 2) civil; 3) socialist, etc."...

Therefore, communists are not against defending the fatherland in general and always!!!

Communists are against defending the fatherland in unjust wars!!!

And here, in another letter, Lenin clearly explains why the Bolsheviks now, during the First World War, are against defending the fatherland. As we can see, there is no analogy with today's situation and his arguments!

In fact, now everything is the opposite:

TO V. A. KARPINSKY. JANUARY 19, 1917

"Engels was the father of 'passive radicalism'?? Wrong! Nothing of the sort. You'll never prove it. (Bogdanov and Co. tried, but they were disgraced.) In the imperialist war of 1914-1917, between two imperialist coalitions, we must be against 'defense of the fatherland,' for (1) imperialism is the eve of socialism; (2) imperialist war is a war of thieves for booty; (3) both coalitions have an advanced proletariat; (4) in both, the socialist revolution is ripe.

That is the only reason we are against 'defense of the fatherland,' that is the only reason!!"

Written January 19, 1917, Sent from Zurich. In Clarens (Switzerland)

First published in 1949

So, in Ukraine, Russia is waging a progressive war because it is a war of national liberation. This war is also defensive, as Russia is defending itself against Western imperialism. Moreover, Russia is fighting not only against the national oppression of tens of millions (Russians and Russian-speakers) and Ukrainians by Western Ukrainian Nazism, but also against the very rehabilitation of Nazism in its monstrous manifestations!

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_163168\\_r163242](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_163168_r163242)

A little about wars from Ilyich!

Marx and Engels said in the Communist Manifesto that workers have no fatherland. But Marx himself called for national war more than once: Marx in 1848, Engels in 1859 (the end of his pamphlet "Po and Rhine," which directly inflames German national sentiment, directly calls for national war). Engels in 1891, in view of the then-looming and imminent war between France (Boulangier) and Alexander III against Germany, openly recognized the "defense of the fatherland."

Were Marx and Engels muddleheads, saying one thing today and another tomorrow?

(Here Lenin once again warns leftists against the overly profound disease of denying the defense of the fatherland in general, including the bourgeois one.)

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_137542](https://vk.com/wall7006326_137542)

Another text of mine, written on October 13, 2022.

I previously published excerpts from this letter from Lenin to Armand. But the left-liberal lunatics still haven't calmed down and are spouting their filth at us Marxists, claiming we're social chauvinists, etc.

These fools don't realize that they've thus labeled Marx, Lenin, and Engels as social chauvinists too :-)))

Here's the letter, the one where Lenin directly explains how to approach a conflict like the one currently unfolding in Ukraine, and how Marx and Engels approached such conflicts! .....

"Generally speaking, it seems to me that your reasoning is somewhat one-sided and formalistic. You've taken one quotation from the Communist Manifesto (workers have no fatherland) and want to apply it seemingly without reservation, even to the point of denying national wars.

The entire spirit of Marxism, its entire system, demands that each proposition be considered only (a) historically; (b) only in connection with others; (g) only in connection with concrete historical experience.

Fatherland is a historical concept. Fatherland is another matter during an era, or more precisely, at the moment of the struggle to overthrow national oppression. It's quite another matter at a time when national movements are far behind. For the "three types of countries" (§6 of our theses on self-determination), the proposition about fatherland and its defense cannot be applied equally under all conditions.

The Communist Manifesto states that workers have no fatherland.

True. But that's not all it says. It also says that the proletariat's role in the formation of national states is somewhat special. If we take the first proposition (workers have no fatherland) and forget its connection with the second (workers are constituted as a class nationally, but not in the same sense as the bourgeoisie), then that would be profoundly incorrect.

What is this connection? In my opinion, it lies precisely in the fact that in a democratic movement (at such a moment, in such a specific situation), the proletariat cannot refuse to support it (and therefore, to defend the fatherland in a national war).

Marx and Engels said in the Communist Manifesto that workers have no fatherland. But Marx himself called for national war more than once: Marx in 1848, Engels in 1859. (The end of his pamphlet "Po and Rhine," which directly inflames German national sentiment, directly calls them to a national war.) Engels in 1891, in view of the then looming and impending war between France (Boulangier) and Alexander III against Germany, openly recognized the "defense of the fatherland."

Were Marx and Engels muddleheads, saying one thing today and another tomorrow? No. In my opinion, recognizing the "defense of the fatherland" in a national war is entirely consistent with Marxism. In 1891, German Social Democrats would indeed have had to defend the fatherland in a war against Boulanger and Alexander III. This would have been a unique version of a national war.

September-December 1916

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_146859](https://vk.com/wall7006326_146859)

The following is a text written by me on January 10, 2023. It's written in a mocking tone directed at the non-war leftists. But they generally behave extremely aggressively and obscenely, and usually turn out to be either ignoramuses or, as I suspect, well-paid provocateurs working for their Western masters. So I see no point in reducing the intensity of the discussion!

Ilyich is once again engaging in polemics with his misguided contemporaries and ripping apart today's rosy leftists like Semin, Batov, and Rudoy.

So, volume 30 of the Collected Works, the work "ON THE EMERGING TREND OF 'IMPERIALIST ECONOMISM'":

...

§ 4. "From self-determination follows the defense of the fatherland," the author stubbornly insists. His mistake here is that he wants to turn the denial of the defense of the fatherland into a cliché, deriving it not from the specific historical peculiarities of this war, but "in general." This isn't Marxism.

The author has long since been told, and he hasn't refuted it: try to come up with a formulation for the fight against national oppression or inequality that doesn't justify "defense of the fatherland." You won't be able to do it.

Does this mean we're against the fight against national oppression if defense of the fatherland can be derived from it?

No. For we're not "in general" against "defense of the fatherland" (see our party's resolutions\*), but we're against embellishing the current imperialist war with this deceptive slogan.

The author is fundamentally incorrect, unhistorically, in his desire (but inability; he's been struggling for a whole year...) to raise the question of "defending the fatherland."

...

So, as we see, Lenin is not against defending the fatherland!!! He is only against it in a specific imperialist war and in similar unjust wars!

But Russia's war with the collective West, with Western ultra-imperialism, is not imperialist on Russia's part! I have proven this millions of times, from a purely Marxist standpoint, of course.

So, gentlemen, pink leftists, read Lenin and acknowledge your opportunism!

P.S.

This text was co-authored.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_155359?w=wall7006326\\_155359](https://vk.com/wall7006326_155359?w=wall7006326_155359)

Below is a text co-authored by me and citizen G. on December 12, 2022. This text demonstrates how important the issue of supporting national liberation wars is for Marxists! In this case, precisely as a matter of moral consideration! But there are other factors, which we will examine below!

Here, a comrade has published a text based on Lenin's work, in which he explains in simple terms that the presence of imperialist interests of other countries and forces recedes into the background if a national liberation struggle is underway! That is, the national liberation struggle of southeastern Ukraine and for the liberation of southeastern Ukraine trumps other goals, even predatory ones, if they exist! In other words, when it comes to supporting one side or another in the conflict, we must first and foremost support the oppressed, in this case, the Russian-speaking inhabitants of Ukraine, who are oppressed by Ukrainian Nazism!

In leftist circles, one often hears debates about whether the confrontation in Ukraine is a national liberation struggle or an imperialist war. Here I'd like to cite an example from Lenin's "On Junius's Pamphlet," specifically the following quote:

"England and France fought the Seven Years' War over colonies, i.e., they waged an imperialist war (which is possible on the basis of slavery, on the basis of primitive capitalism, as well as on the basis of modern, highly developed capitalism). France is defeated and loses part of its colonies. Several years later, the national liberation war of the North American States against England alone begins. France and Spain, which themselves continue to own parts of what is now the United States, out of enmity toward England, i.e., out of their imperialist interests, conclude a friendly treaty with the United States, which has rebelled against England. French troops, together with American troops, defeat the English. We are faced with a national liberation war in which imperialist rivalry is an incidental element, of no serious significance."

And here I'd like to ask a question. If Lenin believed it possible that the national liberation struggle and the interests of individual imperialists could coincide, isn't the presence or absence of Putin's imperialism insignificant, by this logic, against the backdrop of the national liberation struggle in Donbas?

P.S. This post is for discussion. I welcome opinions and comments.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_153452](https://vk.com/wall7006326_153452)

Following is Lenin's famous text, which is nothing less than patriotic!!!

November 28, 2022.

Leftists often use Lenin's phrase, appropriately and inappropriately, that "...the bourgeoisie will betray the homeland and resort to any crime, if only to defend its power over the people and its income."

But not everyone understands the context. The point is that Lenin wrote this in the "DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION" of September 10-14, 1917, Old Style.

Below, I'm publishing the very paragraph where this phrase is used. And what do we see there? What we see is Lenin lamenting the fact that the bourgeoisie, represented by Kornilov's "reaction" and his accomplices, was negotiating with the Germans for the surrender of Riga and even St. Petersburg.

So, Kornilov and Co. are trying to negotiate an agreement with the enemy in an imperialist war to surrender some territories to German control, and Lenin writes such epithets as "betray the MOTHERLAND."

But a modern leftist would say, what kind of Motherland are we talking about? After all, the proletariat has no homeland. Let whoever wants to come here with their imperialist army and rule us, they say, because for us, they say, it makes no difference which bourgeois rules here, etc.

How can you betray something that doesn't exist?

No, of course, one could say here that Lenin meant that the bourgeoisie will betray its bourgeois homeland, and that this doesn't concern us, it's none of our business. We are the proletariat, and it makes no difference to us whether NATO troops or the Russian Armed Forces are here. But this doesn't follow from the context at all. What follows is that Lenin is addressing a patriotic section of the public, proving to them that for the bourgeoisie, the concept of "homeland" is an empty phrase! And further on, in other points, you can see that Lenin, in essence, asserts that only the power of the workers and peasants can defend the country! Because the workers and peasants will be ready to fight for their power!

So, while some on the modern left, during Russia's battle with the global ultra-imperialist Western bloc, may think that defending the fatherland is an empty phrase, Lenin did understand the concept of "MOTHERLAND" in 1917, when the fate of the socialist revolution was still unclear, during the bourgeois government of Kerensky. In any case, For propaganda purposes, certainly. But in reality, it's about preserving and GROWING revolutionary forces! Just imagine how many patriots, recipients of the St. George Cross, and so on, joined the Bolsheviks when they saw this thesis: the bourgeoisie will betray the MOTHERLAND, but the Bolsheviks won't!

Our situation is certainly different, in many ways for the worse. The Russian bourgeoisie not only can sell out, but is selling out the MOTHERLAND wholesale and retail. Russia today, with 2% of GDP, is confronting a Western ultra-empire with at least 50% of GDP. Russia today has no de facto allies, as the Russian Empire had during the First World War. Therefore, the issue of defending the Fatherland will

become an increasingly pressing issue for us! Because from now on, we will increasingly see betrayal of the Motherland by the Kremlin bourgeoisie. We will see them betray soldiers on the front lines. We will see sanctions against oligarchs eased for every regiment or section of the front they expose to destruction. We will see Russian territories transferred to the control of "respected" Western and other partners. And Lenin's phrase that "...the bourgeoisie will betray the Motherland and resort to any crime, if only to defend its power over the people and its income" will take on a completely different meaning. It will sound so clear that the majority of Russian citizens will soon become patriots of our common MOTHERLAND and will march in columns of red avengers, marching to the palaces of those who betray our Motherland! (Addition made while compiling the brochure. I wrote this text during the most difficult period of the Central Military District, when the possibility of defeat on the battlefield, in my view, was real and tangible. As I saw it, this was happening, in part, due to sabotage and betrayal by a section of the bourgeoisie, which, of course, dreams of living as it did for the previous 30 years—continuing to plunder the people and the country as a whole, storing everything in the West.)

Following is the excerpt from Lenin's article itself.

9. The historical significance of the Kornilov rebellion lies precisely in the fact that it so forcefully opened the eyes of the masses to the truth that had been, and continues to be, concealed by the compromising phrases of the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks: namely, the landowners and the bourgeoisie, with the Constitutional Democratic Party. At their head, and the generals and officers who support them have organized themselves, they are ready to commit and are committing the most unheard-of crimes: surrendering Riga (and then Petrograd) to the Germans, opening the front to them, handing over Bolshevik regiments to be shot, starting a mutiny, leading troops with a "savage division" at the head of the capital, and so on—all for the sake of seizing complete power in the hands of the bourgeoisie, strengthening the hold of the landowners in the countryside, and drenching the country in the blood of workers and peasants.

The Kornilov Rebellion proved for Russia what history has proven for all countries: that the bourgeoisie will betray its homeland and resort to any crime to defend its power over the people and its income.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_152114](https://vk.com/wall7006326_152114)

This is probably my first article about the SVO! I believe it will be of interest to readers because it expresses largely my own thoughts. My approach to the SVO is largely intuitive and at the same time based on personal experience. Only after aggressive attacks from leftist non-warriors against me and other SVO supporters did my then-close comrades and I begin to more deeply study the views of classic Marxist scholars on issues related to various wars. Text from: February 25, 2022.

Regarding the position of some leftists who condemned the "war."

Condemning only the Russian government in this situation is a very dubious position. Supporting the LPR and DPR, Odessa, condemning the oppression of Russians, condemning the glorification of Nazism in Ukraine, the ban on communism. Opposing American imperialism... and at the same time condemning the deployment of troops, without reservations, etc. Are you serious?

Do you have any guarantee that in three or five years, Ukraine itself won't send troops as far as the Urals? Won't they be stuffed with weapons, won't they assemble a coalition? With the ideology currently being cultivated in Ukraine, why shouldn't this happen?

And the very fact that they've been killing our communist comrades all over Ukraine for at least eight years doesn't justify Putin's actions for us?

Okay, you don't like that Putin sent troops, so why aren't you on the front lines in the DPR and LPR, for example?

We don't want to fight ourselves, we can't, but Putin must be condemned when he even tries to do anything.... That's the position...

The DPR, LPR, Crimea are ours—and what's happening now is a natural continuation. Ukraine, in my opinion, never intended to live in peace and couldn't, because the Ukrainian government is run by absolute fascists under the auspices of the US!!!

And we must, of course, mourn the dead, including children. Who doesn't feel sorry for them?

But how can you wage wars without the dead? And if a civil war breaks out tomorrow, should we just go home and let the bourgeoisie win if a civilian accidentally dies?

Of course, I'm against any war. Of course, I believe the Russian authorities, who have committed mistakes and crimes since 1991, are also to blame for current events. But the US and the Nazis in Ukraine are ten times more to blame!

I understand the stones that will be thrown at me now. I hate the current Kremlin regime. And with this text, I'm essentially burning my bridges for a possible "retreat" to the West :-))) After all, those who don't condemn Russia's "aggression" now are not welcome there. Those who today make statements condemning only Russia will, of course, receive huge "perks" in any Western country.

But I prefer to speak the truth rather than think about a comfortable future in the West or after the dismantling of the Putin regime, for example, by liberal forces in Russia!

I'm a communist first and foremost, and if someone today is fighting against American imperialism, against Nazism, I cannot condemn such actions!!!

I'm for peace throughout the world, but not with the Nazis!

At the same time, even now, I believe that peace negotiations should be held at the first opportunity! But in this peaceful world, there should be no Nazis in Ukraine and no Western military interests!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_127144?w=wall7006326\\_127144](https://vk.com/wall7006326_127144?w=wall7006326_127144)

I am closing this chapter. I have decided to expand on some of the themes I outlined at the beginning in other chapters. This is because they go hand in hand with the themes I have distributed among other chapters.

2. Can communists support the bourgeoisie or bourgeois authorities waging a just war?

Can communists support the bourgeoisie or bourgeois authorities waging a just war?

We are not at all opposed to "defense of the fatherland" in general, nor to "defensive wars" in general. You will never find such nonsense in any resolution (or in any of my articles). We are opposed to the defense of the fatherland and to defense in the imperialist war of 1914-1916 and in other imperialist wars typical of the imperialist era. But in the imperialist era, there can also be "just," "defensive," revolutionary wars: 1) national; 2) civil; 3) socialist.

and so on.

Lenin's letter to Zinoviev, August 1916.

Another signal from Lenin to the Batov-Rudov anti-Marxist leftists, living, as I understand it, in 1914-1916.

So, gentlemen pink leftists, it's now 2021, and alas, there's only one imperialist on earth—a bloc of Western countries, gathered together according to the principle of an ultra-empire!!! True, only for Western countries and their loyal satellites. For all the other subhumans, Western imperialists act using the same old methods: fire and sword!!!

What should we Marxists understand from this letter?

1. The defense of the bourgeois fatherland in a just war is acceptable to a Marxist!
2. A war against imperialism, whether a war of national liberation or a war waged on the side of a national liberation uprising in defense of the oppressed, is a just war for Marxists!

Perhaps some don't know this, but in Ukraine, the Nazi regime oppresses tens of millions of Ukrainian citizens based on their nationality and language!

Furthermore, there are at least three other points in the conflict in Ukraine that make this war just for Marxists, on Russia's part!

I won't write about them now, but name them yourself! Who can?

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_158032](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_158032)

And below—another blow from Engels to those who believe that for communists, there are no just wars except class wars! My post, January 18, 2023.

The entire mass of the German people, of all classes, understood that the issue was primarily one of national existence, and therefore immediately showed a willingness to act.

Letter from Engels to Marx, August 15, 1870.

In this letter, Engels discusses how German progressive forces should approach the Franco-Prussian War.

So, a coincidence of class interests is possible :-))?

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_156062](https://vk.com/wall7006326_156062)

The article below gives my understanding of the nature of the war in Ukraine. But what's interesting about it is that I explicitly state that the Central Military District is a blow to Western imperialism, and that a Russian victory would give impetus to many nations subjugated by the West! However, I only began to encounter similar ideas from advanced Marxists, including those from Western countries, a couple of years later. In other words, I arrived at these conclusions entirely independently!

Article from September 10, 2022.

I'm a communist, so I don't accept your bourgeois morality, like, "Oh, they invaded an independent country because they crossed their border." I am guided by the interests of class struggle and the people's struggle. The United States is absolute evil, Ukrainian Nazism is a watchdog on a leash for the United States. And I couldn't care less who wants to break the teeth of this Nazi-Bandera monster! And thereby damage US imperialism.

Yes, Putin's regime is authoritarian, but it is fundamentally devoid of ideas. Its idea is to embezzle money. This means that if there is a social upheaval, progressive leftist forces could gain the upper hand. Because there is no rejection of them among the people.

So even in this sense, Putin's authoritarian regime is more advantageous to us! And his victory in this confrontation brings both physical, material and moral benefits to the people of Ukraine and even many people around the world.

Moreover, the leftist movement is strong in Russia, and in the event of a "commotion," we have a huge chance to seize the initiative.

Such is the dialectic of the moment! Such is the logic of Marxism-Leninism!

This is what Stalin did when he entered into a tactical alliance with the US and Britain. This is what Mao did when he formed an alliance with Chiang Kai-shek after years of bloody civil war!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_141376](https://vk.com/wall7006326_141376)

Below is a very short excerpt from Engels' letter to Marx. I will return to it later! But in fact, it gives a clear idea that Marxists should not take a stand because of dislike or disagreement with someone. Especially when it comes to large-scale events, when the fate of a positive undertaking depends on that person.

Read the text carefully and answer this question: can the name Bismarck be replaced with the name Putin?

The post below was written on January 14, 2023.

Now, please answer, how do you understand these words of Lenin?

"Engels wrote to Marx in 1870 that W. Liebknecht was mistaken in making anti-Bismarckism his sole guiding principle...

The unification of Germany was necessary, and Marx, both before and after 1848, always recognized this. As early as 1859, Engels openly called on the German people to go to war for the sake of unification. When revolutionary unification failed, Bismarck did it counterrevolutionarily, in a Junker-like manner. Anti-Bismarckism, as a sole principle, became absurd, for the completion of the necessary unification had become a fact."

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_155656](https://vk.com/wall7006326_155656)

A long article about whether a Marxist can support the bourgeoisie in special cases and how to do so.  
April 17, 2024.

Pedantic, illiterate leftists pester me with idiotic quibbles, claiming that communists shouldn't interact with the bourgeoisie, much less support it on any issues. In their minds, there are only two classes and nothing else...

But the world is more complex, and Marxism is a much deeper phenomenon than the phrase "there are only two classes"...

Yes, in general, in different countries today, there are two classes, although in some places there is also a class of nobility, that is, a monarchical relic. But in the most developed capitalist countries, and in Russia as well, due to its place in the global division of labor, social strata play a huge role—an intermediate or transitional social group that doesn't possess all the characteristics of a class, often called a "stratum"... Social strata can be intra-class or inter-class. You could call them social strata...

Roughly speaking, the precariat itself now plays a more significant role in Russian society than representatives of the working class—those officially employed in factories, those with stable salaries, benefits, pensions, and so on.

These strata are often more disadvantaged and possess real protest potential, even if they possess resources, such as freelancers, in-demand IT specialists, or even small business owners.

Oddly enough, many of them join left-wing organizations and not only spend their personal time promoting progressive ideas but also contribute resources. True, their motivation is often based on the idea that we need to fight not only for communist ideals but also for bourgeois freedoms in general, especially at this stage, but this is entirely understandable. After all, the Russian government's total lawlessness in matters of fair elections, judicial independence, corruption, and so on—this isn't some State Department ill-wishers' invention, but, alas, a reality we experience. And even if someone isn't ready to fight for communist ideals, but is willing to stand with us until the "February" changes, as they did in 1917, then such a person is our temporary, tactical ally, but still an ally!

Now let's move on to another dimension, namely, the question of attitudes toward the Soviet Military Revolution.

Why do communists support the Soviet Military Revolution? Because the Soviet Military Revolution is, by all accounts, a justified defensive war waged by Russia against the most powerful Western imperialism in human history. Meanwhile, the Ukrainian conflict is clearly a national liberation struggle waged by oppressed Russian and Russian-speaking citizens of Ukraine. Moreover, we mustn't forget that, say, since the death of Ilyich, there was a period of existence of the Soviet state, Soviet power, and a highly organized Soviet society. Essentially, the Soviet people existed, effectively as a community! And in Ukraine, the Nazi, comprador regime is striking its main blow precisely at this Soviet legacy. A huge number of repressive laws have been passed, enabling mass repression against supporters of the Soviet form of social existence. People are being prosecuted en masse for innocent acts, such as appearing in public with a USSR flag, wearing a T-shirt with a hammer and sickle, etc. Any attempt at an objective approach to the Soviet past is punished with the harshest possible penalties! Of course, I'm not idealizing the Russian bourgeois regime, but nothing similar has yet been done with regard to communist ideology in Russia. Although there are trials of communists, including for studying Marxism, these are disguised as other charges of violating other norms, not for the very fact of glorifying communism. And so far, this hasn't become widespread. So, we have more than enough complaints

about the Ukrainian Nazi regime, and we, communists, have been drawing the authorities' attention for decades to the sheer disgrace that is unfolding in Ukraine and that the Russian bourgeoisie, instead of responding to the actions of the Ukrainian Nazi regime, has been harshly trying to coax it, for example, by forcing Donbas back into Ukraine after the heroic struggle of the rebellious people in 2014.

And why on earth should we condemn the SVO, if this war is just by all accounts?

Especially since, I repeat, the Ukrainian Nazi regime is directly controlled by American and other Western imperialist bandits who are plundering most of the world!

Next, let's examine an excerpt from Lenin's work: THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL. 1915.

.....The national element in the current war is represented only by Serbia's war against Austria (which is noted, incidentally, in the resolution of our party's Berne Conference). Only in Serbia and among the Serbs do we have a long-standing national liberation movement, embracing millions of "masses," the "continuation" of which is Serbia's war against Austria. If this war were isolated, i.e., not connected with the pan-European war, with the selfish and predatory aims of England, Russia, and others, then all socialists would be obliged to desire the success of the Serbian bourgeoisie—this is the only correct and absolutely necessary conclusion from the national aspect of the current war.

Why is this comment by Lenin important to us? Correctly, because Lenin here directly allows, under certain conditions, support for the BOURGEOISIE... Because the bourgeoisie, too, can wage a just war, a defensive one! As I showed above, Russia is currently waging precisely such a war!

Continued.

And in such wars, both Marx and Engels, and, of course, even Ilyich, not only supported national liberation movements as such, but were also ready to join them and even support the bourgeoisie leading the struggle in such Wars.

This is what Engels proposes in a letter to Marx during Germany's war with France. As is well known, this war was at the forefront of a number of issues concerning the reunification of German lands.

ENGELS TO MARCX, AT RAMSGOTH, Manchester, August 15, 1870

I think our people could:

1) join the national movement—you can see how strong it is from Kugelmann's letter—insofar as and as long as it limits itself to defending Germany (which does not, under certain circumstances, exclude an offensive, even to the conclusion of peace);

2) emphasize the distinction between national German and dynastic Prussian interests.

....

So, Engels writes that the organized proletariat could join this national liberation movement. Not lead it, not lead it during the war with France against Bismarck, but join it! Simply become part of this movement! Of course, I won't publish the entire letter; there's no point in doing so now. I'm simply interested in documenting the fact that Engels and Marx allowed for some degree of collaboration with the bourgeoisie when power in Germany was held by a strict, iron-fisted Chancellor! Moreover, in point

2 of the passage I cited, Engels suggests constantly emphasizing the distinction between national and dynastic interests in this war. It's all logical; by positively assessing one aspect of the conflict, we are not obligated to fully support any bourgeois regime. This is precisely how true Marxists behave in Russia today! While supporting Russia's struggle against American imperialism and Ukrainian Nazism, we simultaneously mercilessly criticize the actions of certain representatives of the Russian government, who are clearly contributing to Russia's defeat, run counter to the interests of the common people, and, in fact, are perhaps nothing more than the frequent interests of the comprador oligarchy!

And look at the Report to the Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East. ....Thus, the socialist revolution will not be solely and primarily a struggle of revolutionary proletarians in each country against its own bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, all dependent countries, against international imperialism.

In our party program, adopted in March of this year, we, describing the approach of the world social revolution, said that the civil war of the working people against the imperialists and exploiters in all the advanced countries is beginning to merge with the national war against international imperialism. This is confirmed by the course of the revolution and will be increasingly confirmed. The same will happen in the East.

(What's so important about this paragraph? Doesn't it ring true today? Didn't Ilyich emphasize here that the fight against imperialism is extremely important, and that in this struggle, communists must unite with national liberation movements. After all, by waging such wars, we can strike at the core of imperialism! Weaken them from within and provoke social revolutions in Western countries—that's the ABC of Marxism. Why even this is so stubbornly ignored by the left-wing non-warriors, I can't fathom, but apparently, some left-wing preachers are getting paid handsomely for their slander against Russia and against Marxists who today support the SVO.)

.....You will have to rely on the bourgeois nationalism that is awakening among these peoples, and cannot help but awaken, and which has historical justification. At the same time, you must pave the way for the working and exploited masses of each country and tell them, in a language they understand, that the only hope for liberation lies in the victory of the international revolution and that the international proletariat is the sole ally of all the working and exploited hundreds of millions of peoples of the East.

(Well, this paragraph really hits the "smart" ones over the head, those who like to talk about two classes and, in general, there is no war other than a class war. No, friends, supporting even bourgeois nationalists in the fight against global imperialism has always been acceptable for communists! This is not Razvozhayev's invention! This action, as Lenin says, has historical justification! Do we need to remind them how cruel Western imperialism is? And it is precisely this imperialism that is the main culprit behind the world's major misfortunes! At the same time, we must tirelessly repeat in such situations that the only shortest path to victory in wars against imperialism is the transition to a socialist path of development for the country waging this struggle, in this case, Russia. That is, we do not cast aside the propaganda of socialist ideas in such a situation! It just should not be turned into a tool for supporting Western imperialism and Ukrainian Nazism, as the so-called left-wing non-warriors are using it!

I can cite hundreds more arguments for supporting the SVO. Based on the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. But the main thing is that everyone must understand. Too much time has passed since the beginning of the Second World War for even the most naive person to grasp the basis of this issue. And if someone calling themselves a Marxist suddenly says that Russia is waging an unjust war of conquest against Ukraine, know that this person is an enemy of Marxism and a direct accomplice of Western imperialism and the Ukrainian Bandera regime!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_182266](https://vk.com/wall7006326_182266)

The following text was written on January 18, 2023.

Returning to the topic of anti-Bismarckism and the discussion with some leftists who are very fond of telling me that victory cannot be handed over to Putin and Co.

From Engels' letter to Marx, August 15, 1870:

"The fact that this war is being waged under the leadership of Lehmann, Bismarck, and Co., if they end it successfully, will contribute to their We owe our temporary glory to the wretchedness of the German bourgeoisie. This is, of course, very vile, but nothing can be done about it.

However, it would be absurd for this reason to elevate anti-Bismarckism to the sole guiding principle."

That is, Engels is prepared to temporarily hand over victory and success to Bismarck in this just war, the goal of which, among other things, was the unification of the German lands, while understanding That revolutionary events will come later, and the triumph of the regime will only be temporary, but as soon as we, true communists, even hint that a victory for the Putin regime is permissible, we are immediately labeled as chauvinists and hangers-on.

I repeat, yet again:

1. The defeat of the Putin regime, with a change of power to a pro-Western one or a Ukrainian intervention, means the communist will be hanged.
2. The defeat of the Putin regime without a change of power means the regime's embitterment and a maximum tightening of the screws.
3. A revolution before the end of the war is impossible, because even if we assume it does happen (which is doubtful), it will be immediately crushed by Putin, Prigozhin, NATO, and the Ukrainian Armed Forces.
4. So, alas, a victory for the current regime is now our best option, just as Bismarck's victory was for Engels.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_156110](https://vk.com/wall7006326_156110)

The following is a text beginning with irony. April 18, 2023.

We must overthrow Putin right now. Anyone who disagrees is an opportunist and has submitted to the government.

(C) Average leftist.

The standard rhetoric of the pink-leftists is the need for revolution here and now. As if there is no external threat, as if there is a real chance to seize and HOLD power here and now.

Leftist gentlemen (for what kind of comrades are you?), at least read Lenin.

What did Vladimir Ilyich write about the reasons for the victory of the Great October Revolution?

Well, for example, including the fact that victory was possible because external forces were busy fighting each other in imperialist struggles and had no time to suppress the Russian Revolution.

Is there anything similar today? Of course not! There aren't currently several imperialist blocs fighting each other. There is one imperialist bloc, NATO, fighting against Russia. Of course, if the revolution in our country succeeds, all the forces of this bloc will be directed toward suppressing it. It was not for nothing that Marx wrote that an untimely revolution in France would be a tremendous tragedy, for Bismarck's smashing of the barricades on the streets of Paris would have set back the development of French society by decades. This is precisely what would happen if a revolution were to occur today: NATO and Ukrainian troops would crush the revolutionary government and install their puppets at the head of a country, or even several countries, on the territory of the former Russia! This, precisely this, would be the outcome of an untimely revolution.

But should we really agree with Putin and support the government? No, absolutely not. We must postpone attempts at revolution until later, but at the same time, never for a second relax our criticism of the government. Here's what Lenin wrote during the Kornilov rebellion:

"We will fight, we are fighting Kornilov, just like Kerensky's troops, but we do not support Kerensky; we expose his weakness. That is the difference. It is a rather subtle difference, but a crucial one, and we must not forget it.

What is the change in our tactics after Kornilov's rebellion?

It is that we are modifying the form of our struggle against Kerensky. Without weakening our hostility toward him one iota, without taking back a single word spoken against him, without abandoning the task of overthrowing Kerensky, we say: we must take the moment into account; we will not overthrow Kerensky now; we will now approach the task of fighting him differently, namely, by explaining to the people (fighting against Kornilov) Kerensky's weakness and wavering. This was done before. But now it has become the main thing: this is the change.

Furthermore, the change is that the main thing has now become: intensifying agitation for a kind of "partial demands" for Kerensky: Arrest Milyukov, arm the Petersburg workers, summon the Kronstadt, Vyborg, and Helsingfors troops to Petersburg, dissolve the State Duma, arrest Rodzianko, legalize the transfer of landowners' lands to the peasants, introduce workers' control over grain and factories, and so on and so forth. And we must make these demands not only to Kerensky, not so much to Kerensky, but to the workers, soldiers, and peasants who are swept up in the struggle against Kornilov. We must further engage them, encourage them to beat up the generals and officers who spoke out for Kornilov, insist that they demand the immediate transfer of land to the peasants, instill in them the need to arrest Rodzianko and Milyukov, dissolve the State Duma, close Rech and other bourgeois newspapers, and

subject them to investigation. The "left" Socialist Revolutionaries must be especially pushed in this direction.

It would be wrong to think that we will continue "We have abandoned the task of the proletariat's conquest of power. No. We have come extremely close to it, but not directly, but from the side. And we must agitate now not so much directly against Kerensky as indirectly, against him, but indirectly, namely: by demanding an active, truly revolutionary war against Kornilov. The development of this war alone can bring us to power, and we must speak as little about it in our agitation as possible (firmly remembering that tomorrow events could put us in power, and then we will not let go)."

Isn't it the same now? We criticize Putin, but trying to overthrow Putin now would be madness. Because of the presence of the most serious external threats, the likes of which Russia has never faced in its entire history! Criticism of the government from the left, demands for a leftward turn—that is our tactic. A tactic to show the people that the government is not listening to these demands, that the government is impotent. And at the same time, support for the fight against Ukrainian Nazism. This is in no way synonymous with support for the government's specific actions. In most cases, we should, on the contrary, criticize them for their sluggishness, indecisiveness, and collusion.

Are we abandoning the idea of "revolution" altogether? No, absolutely not. The situation can change at any moment. And our task is to think dialectically. It's perfectly normal to put forward certain slogans today and abandon them tomorrow due to a changed situation. Lenin did the same. The path to socialism is long and difficult. It requires no thinking in clichés or dogmas. When a revolutionary situation arises, we will be the first to take to the barricades. But it doesn't exist now, and even if it did, it's unlikely the revolution would be purely socialist in nature, again due to external threats and the strangulation of that very revolution, primarily by external forces.

Some will say that Lenin, in this work ("To the Central Committee of the RSDLP"), doesn't address the issue of agitation against the imperialist war. This is true, but nevertheless, during the Kornilov rebellion, Lenin clearly makes clear the main danger facing revolutionary forces. It lies in the very reaction that could have destroyed the seeds of revolution had the Bolsheviks not, in essence, joined forces even with their sworn enemies, the Provisional Government, albeit indirectly rather than directly.

Today, for Russia and for people with progressive views, the main danger emanates precisely from Western imperialism. This danger is mortal for all strata of our society. Therefore, modern Marxists are obliged to do everything possible to prevent the forces of global reaction from destroying Russia to satisfy their capitalist needs.

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_164768\\_r164864](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_164768_r164864)

I had to write a clarification to yesterday's text, as the pink religious pseudo-Marxists are asking me roughly the same questions about this post:

1. Why didn't I address the issue of "defensism" mentioned by Lenin in this article?
2. Why, in the event of the revolution that took place in Russia today, do progressive forces have no chance of retaining power?

### 3. What should be done today to ensure the victory of the world revolution?

Answer:

The article addressed the issue of how to treat the enemy during the emergence of a different, more dangerous enemy. We've discussed the question of defensism or not in dozens of other discussions and found that Lenin was perfectly capable of being a defensist in just wars! The war in Ukraine today, on Russia's part, is just in many ways!

Naturally, every Marxist today is obliged to be a defender and even an "offensive" person. They are obliged to push the authorities to take more decisive and effective action, but to do so, the authorities must arrest today's Milyukovs and all sorts of "generals" who are de facto engaged in sabotage and playing into the hands of the "counterrevolution," that is, into the hands of the Ukrainian Nazis and Western imperialists.

Demands for a leftist turn, nationalization of factories, the introduction of a progressive tax scale for the super-rich, the transfer of power to representatives of left-patriotic forces, and so on. These are the actions that today bring us closer to replacing the OEF.

Regarding the 1918 intervention. It happened. But Lenin writes that the imperialist countries' fatigue from years of war prevented these countries from engaging in a larger-scale intervention! Due to the hardships of World War I, these countries were on the brink of revolution at home; in some places, there were even attempts at it. Naturally, they didn't want to risk such a situation and left Russia alone. Soviet Russia, however, did have a year to breathe, from 1917 to 1918.

You write that I'm hinting that, in order for a reversal to occur in other developed countries, which are now indirectly drawn into the conflict in Ukraine, we need to do everything we can to prolong the conflict. I've written about this explicitly and repeatedly! If we really want peace, then...

Revolution, then, as Marxists, we must do everything possible to strengthen Russia and weaken the imperialist bloc and Ukraine. This includes through the global left movement, primarily in Europe and the United States.

Yes, the left there must begin a more widespread resistance to their imperialists, disabling military equipment, factories, and so on. Then we might actually have a chance for a "revolution" here and there.

Marxists are not students at an institute for noble maidens.

We are not afraid of war, and if it is already happening, we are obliged to do everything possible to obtain

maximum benefit for the revolutionary movement and

bring the revolution closer, and today you are doing everything possible for the triumph of the imperialist counterrevolution!!!

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_164853](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_164853)

Article from December 16, 2022.

Ilyich is once again trying to pull the non-war leftists out of the haze of sophistry and dogmatism.

So, national wars in the era of imperialism are not only possible, but they are also progressive! That's a "paragraph" from Lenin!

"...National wars against imperialist powers are not only possible and probable, they are inevitable and progressive, revolutionary..."

Lenin then proceeds to slap on the head all sorts of sophists who believe there is no difference between a national liberation war and an imperialist war! No, friends, for Marxists, there's literally a gulf between these two types of war!

Next, Lenin!

.....

"Only a sophist could erase the difference between an imperialist war and a national war on the grounds that one can transform into the other. Dialectics has often served—even in the history of Greek philosophy—as a bridge to sophistry. But we remain dialecticians, combating sophisms not by denying the possibility of any transformations in general, but through concrete analysis given its context and development."

Lenin, "On Junius's Pamphlet." Written in July 1916.

Incidentally, in my opinion, Lenin's work contains a very important sentence, a couple of words that explain the most important "detail" of why we should sympathize with Russia in this war. I repeat, not always support Russia, not in all wars, but specifically in this situation!

I have often mentioned this particular aspect of the conflict in my writings. And in some of Lenin's works, in one form or another, this detail also exists. But I would like to ask whether you saw this argument of Lenin's in this work? Actually, that's my question for you. What important detail from this text am I referring to? This detail, as you understand, is one of the most important arguments that confirms that my position on the SVO is fully justified, first and foremost, Lenin's position!

Here I've already forgotten what detail I was asking about, but most likely I meant that a national liberation war is often a tool in the struggle against imperialism, which is certainly an act of revolutionary action from a Marxist perspective, because it undermines the economic power of imperialist countries.)

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_153723](https://vk.com/wall7006326_153723)

March 20, 2023

On the interaction between Mao and Chiang Kai-shek.

For the leftists who think Razvozhayev is an original and that no one has ever acted as he suggests...

Here is Mao's opinion on the initial period of interaction with Chiang Kai-shek in the joint struggle against the Japanese interventionists.

Below is a clip from a Chinese series about Mao. This episode is generally about these events. But you only need to watch the first 10 minutes to understand that Mao is making significant concessions. For the sake of saving the common fatherland, led by the bourgeois nationalist Chiang Kai-shek!

The piquant part of the situation is that the communists miraculously managed to capture Chiang and could have executed him on the spot!!!

But Mao feared that this would lead to a larger civil war, which would play into the hands of the Japanese imperialists!

Now recall the texts of Lenin, Stalin, and others, when they warned leftist theorists that they shouldn't resort to revolutionary escalation when they're itching in their ass!

And even more so, they shouldn't weaken even a bourgeois fatherland in the face of imperialist invasion! When the forces of the warring parties are clearly unequal, and Russia today is dozens of times weaker than the Western imperialists!

Moreover, Mao had effectively integrated himself into the military structure of Chiang's bourgeois regime, after many years of bloody civil war in China. I propose strengthening Russia's leftist movement through humanitarian support for soldiers at the front and civilians in frontline zones. While we generally approve of the initially stated main objectives and tasks of the SVO, we must criticize the government's mistakes, express our lack of confidence in Putin's clearly incompetent leaders, and demand that they be replaced by representatives of left-patriotic forces!

Someone will say that we weren't attacked! Well, firstly, most of Ukraine is the same Russia that is currently under occupation by pro-Western, pro-imperialist, Western Ukrainian ultra-Nazi forces!

Secondly, I personally believe that we shouldn't wait until a Nanjing-like massacre occurs in our homeland to finally put aside theoretical debates and do something to defend the Fatherland!  
[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_163044\\_r163203](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_163044_r163203)

An attempt to explain, in simple terms, why critical support for the SVO is necessary.

January 5, 2023.

Why do most Marxists today sympathize with the SVO?

Let's look at this example.

There are two criminals: one steals eggs from your barn. The other is a serial killer who wants to kill your children, grandchildren, wife, and generally destroy your barn and house. Both are criminals, right? But there are still differences between them, aren't there?

So, which issue would you rather resolve? By the way, wouldn't you try to negotiate with the egg thief about a joint effort to neutralize the maniac?

How would you proceed?

So, Putin's organized crime group is made up of those same petty thieves stealing eggs, while American imperialism is that same maniac, eager to satisfy his inhuman desires completely and utterly.

Therefore, when a poorly prepared "Marxist" says there are no differences between the bourgeoisie, it only speaks to his poor ideological preparation!

The differences between the bourgeoisie can be enormous. In the spring of 1917, Lenin wrote in several works that Russia was now the freest of all developed countries. I repeat, the freest! So, were there any less free countries? While in Russia at that time, Soviet power was already being established and armed people's militias were in place, in European countries, calling for a socialist revolution could officially lead to a bullet in the forehead.

At the same time, Lenin never stopped fighting against the provisional government, even when he was essentially saving it from the Kornilov rebellion.

So, while hating the government, one can immediately consider this regime the freest in the world and, for that reason, one can rise to its defense.

Yes, today Russia is, to put it mildly, not the freest country in the world. But Western imperialism certainly won't add to our freedoms and progress. This is evident in the dozens of countries occupied by the West in recent years, including Ukraine itself, where all leftist organizations have been crushed and communist ideology is banned altogether. So, even though we don't like the petty "thief" in the Putin regime, we certainly shouldn't let a maniac who's already operating in our backyard (the outskirts of Ukraine) into our home. And if the "thief" is trying to do anything to prevent the maniac from sneaking through our doors, then we shouldn't interfere!

And what should communists do first? We need to prepare for a maniac in our home, alas, and perhaps this will happen without the "thief"'s participation.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_154981?w=wall7006326\\_154981](https://vk.com/wall7006326_154981?w=wall7006326_154981)

Article from December 24, 2022.

Inspired by Lenin's "Letters from Afar."

Pink leftists who consider themselves staunch Marxists often write that there are only two classes and their interests will never converge.

If you approach Marxism vulgarly, superficially, without a detailed understanding of the social structure of various bourgeois societies, then that's exactly what it is: two classes...

However, scientific Marxism, and therefore revolutionary Marxism, must take into account the mood, and today, perhaps most importantly, the size, of social strata (or strata). Furthermore, it's important to consider the balance of intra-class struggle. Yes, friends, such is the struggle of clans Corporations, etc. And it's ongoing, just like class struggle. And there are historical moments when the bourgeoisie's intra-class struggle contributes far more to progress and even to socialist revolution than inter-class struggle. And we, Marxists, are obligated to pay attention to these intra-class struggles of the bourgeoisie and even support one camp or another, including for our own benefit, to improve the situation of the working class and, above all, to strengthen its political position.

The conflict in Ukraine is, without a doubt, first and foremost a conflict between the bourgeoisie of different countries. Or rather, between the big bourgeoisie of the West and the big bourgeoisie of Russia. But it is also a conflict between the bourgeoisie within Russia, which, under certain conditions, could lead to a serious transformation of Russian society. Specifically, it could elevate Russia's left-wing patriotic forces, which today de facto guard the interests of the working class, the petty bourgeoisie, and, perhaps no less so, other poorer strata. And yes, no matter how much we try to deny it, it is

precisely the non-war in Ukraine that is leading the Russian regime to disaster, or at least to a serious transformation.

So, the conflict in Ukraine is a tangled web of contradictions between several important social forces engaged in a bloody dispute. The Western bourgeoisie is attempting to strangle the Russian bourgeoisie in its lair—I repeat, in its lair—by exploiting the native Ukrainians for its own interests, as has happened repeatedly in the history of colonial policy, especially in Western countries.

It would seem that we should rejoice at the prospect of destroying Putin's authoritarian regime. But judging by the history of recent Western invasions in many countries, and perhaps most importantly, judging by the West's encouragement of Nazi policies and the suppression of progressive movements in Ukraine, as well as the scale of its participation in the Western coalition waging an imperialist war against Russia, the total defeat of the Russian bourgeoisie in this conflict bodes ill for the majority of Russia's population, and above all, for the disadvantaged classes!

In other words, the complete destruction of free education, healthcare, kindergartens and recreational systems, pensions, various subsidies, sports and cultural institutions supported by budgets at various levels, the army, and the military-industrial complex—and that's an even better scenario. The worst-case scenario is the country's disintegration into dozens of states, fighting each other with primitive weapons for decades. And also with weapons produced in Western countries, which representatives of these quasi-states will purchase in exchange for raw materials. So, a Mad Max movie coming to life across most of Russia is what awaits us in the event of defeat. And, by the way, modern countries from the former Soviet republics will be drawn into this vortex to a greater extent as well!

Meanwhile, some of the Russian bourgeoisie are ready to make any deal with the West, just to be able to serve as servants at the table of their Western masters and receive at least scraps from their meals. Moreover, they are completely unconcerned about the fate of the majority of the population.

Another section of the bourgeoisie, in my opinion, is unwilling to serve under any conditions, especially without guarantees of their safety,

including because they have a well-founded fear of becoming defendants in criminal cases at The Hague Tribunal.

And perhaps this isn't the worst-case scenario for them. We Marxists, as representatives of the interests of the majority of the population, undoubtedly do not benefit from a scenario of Russia's bloody collapse or its complete occupation by Western imperialists, with the curtailment of any hints of social benefits, disarmament, etc.

So, the interests of Marxists in the current situation, at this historical stage, partially coincide with those of a section of the Russian bourgeoisie.

At the same time, we must take into account that the Nazi regime in Ukraine oppresses tens of millions of Russian-speakers, and we must also take into account that resistance to Western imperialism is a good thing in itself. All this, in any case, would provide moral leniency for the Russian government, even if its current situation were not so dire.

But the fact remains: Russia is on the brink of disaster. And there is no way to avoid this disaster except by reformatting the regime within the framework of bourgeois society!

However, I personally believe that the left should not stand on ceremony with the Kremlin's "geniuses."

Today, we must clearly understand that without the political support of the left, the Kremlin will no longer be able to escape the trap it has fallen into!

Now, only the formation of a government of popular trust, a broad bloc of political forces based on left-wing patriotic politicians—only such a political configuration, such a political course—will give Russia a chance of salvation. In the fight against enemies both external and internal!

Such is the bizarre confluence of interests among representatives of different classes in modern Russia.

P.S.

This post was inspired by a passage from Lenin's "Letters from Afar," in which he records the historical fact of how bizarrely the interests of different classes in Russia converged in a brief moment in history. Let me remind you that this work was written in March 1917. Here's the passage...

"If the revolution triumphed so quickly and so—at first glance, superficially—so radically, it was only because, due to an extremely unique historical situation, completely different streams, completely heterogeneous class interests, completely opposing political and social aspirations merged together, and merged remarkably 'amicably.'"

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_154232?w=wall7006326\\_154232](https://vk.com/wall7006326_154232?w=wall7006326_154232)

Below is an article that is, to a large extent, a voice cast into the void! At the same time, it largely reveals the fact that the Russian bourgeoisie needs constant "slaps" from the left in order to pursue a more effective policy on the issue of victory in the SVO.

July 4, 2022 ARTICLE FROM SP.

Ukraine: A Great Reflection.

One often hears communists say things like, "This isn't our war, we don't need to die for the interests of big capital." I, of course, largely agree with such arguments. At the same time, I also agree that the causes for the conflict have been building for many years, and the essence of the conflict, in my opinion, is that it affects the interests of the majority of Russian citizens, regardless of class affiliation. The preparation for the conflict essentially lasted for decades, and many parties are to blame for it. This includes Russia's capitalist system, which is under Controlled by at the very least mentally degenerates, and this isn't a metaphor, but, unfortunately, a fact proven by simple, clear evidence. Specifically, dozens of articles and interviews with patriots who, for decades, have been discussing how the situation in Ukraine will develop, what sanctions the West will impose, and how, for Russians, this entire free market is simply a trap set up by Western countries to destroy our scientific, technological, and industrial potential—or, in fact, all the foundations of a developed society. So that they can then take us with their bare hands.

Next in culpability is the United States, as an imperialist predator engaged in provocations in Ukraine of the lowest Nazi nature. Then comes the Ukrainian regime itself, within which 50% of the blame, of

course, lies with the Ukrainian Nazis, and European countries, such as the EU, bring up the rear. But in the short term, over the last eight years, the blame lies primarily with the United States and the Ukrainian Nazi regime, and I would assign only a few dozen percent to the Russian leadership.

But I'd still like to return to the topic of whether the left is right when they say, "We won't fight for Abramovich's yachts."

Isn't this a contradiction in communist morality itself? It seems that communists are willing to fight for certain material values, which, for example, Abramovich took from us. But we seem uninterested in other righteous principles, and we are unwilling to sacrifice our lives or call on others to sacrifice theirs. Is this really the case, and is that the only point?

I'd also like to point out that many citizens who consider themselves communists are already on the front lines, and most often they are there on their own initiative.

So, why do communists often ask the question of what to fight for? It seems to me that this isn't a question of material values per se. It seems to me that the primary question here is whether the current government has done everything possible to avoid war. And is the Kremlin doing everything correctly and effectively today? Despite my negative attitude toward the Ukrainian Nazi regime and US imperialism, I want to say frankly that if communists were in power in Russia, they would have done much more to avoid war, and there would have been dozens and hundreds of moves. And I'm sure there would have been no war.

But those who are in power are in power. So let's proceed from this. The war began, and in a sense, this can be forgiven the Kremlin, as its inhabitants are not entirely sane, and the provocations of the Ukrainian regime and the US were such that the Russian government found no other way out.

But what do we see next? The Russian regime's tactic of goodwill gestures toward the Nazi authorities of Ukraine increasingly confirms the incompetence of the country's leadership and literally hits Russian citizens over the head.

The entry into Kyiv, the withdrawal from several regions, and, as a result, four months of treading water. This raises enormous questions for the Ministry of Defense. At the same time, although I'm generally an anti-militarist, I'm compelled to speak about the heroism of ordinary soldiers, who, in my opinion, often win not because of, but in spite of.

And here we come back to money. Perhaps the authorities simply don't have the funds to equip an army 5-10 times larger than it currently has? Is that same Abramovich who isn't providing the money?

I think that if Putin were to approach Comrade Kim today, say, with \$50 billion, he'd send 100,000 North Korean volunteers who would take Kyiv and Lviv in a matter of weeks, perhaps even marching from Brest along the Polish border.

But the Kremlin is doing nothing of the sort. The operation is being carried out with catastrophically small forces, resulting in weeks of fighting for every "toilet." Because encircling large territories, especially those filled with a numerically superior enemy, is fundamentally impossible!

Okay, so there's no money for such operations with Kim and the others. And the enemy must be defeated. What should we do then? In my opinion, we need to clearly understand that arms deliveries and military training in Ukraine have only just begun! Moreover, the US Lend-Lease Act will only take

effect in October. That's when a real war will likely break out. I hope there's not a single sober person in Russia who would say we're not afraid of Western arms supplies, claiming our industry is more powerful. Of course, our industry is dozens of times weaker, and comparing our factories with the Western world is, to put it mildly, a futile exercise today, and a very dangerous one at that!

So, we probably need to somehow explain to people that grave mistakes were previously made in the country's governance. The regime bred oligarchs who robbed the people and the country as a whole, thereby weakening it against threats like the confrontation with Western imperialists. Now, they say, everything will be different: let's defend our independence together, etc. The Fatherland, they say, is in danger. And now, they say, the plan is this: gather up all the available equipment, including the old one, arm an army of 1.5 million men with Kalashnikovs, transform bourgeois jeeps into carts with heavy machine guns, purchase other weapons from China, etc., launch four-shift production at military factories, and set off together to liberate Ukraine in a couple of weeks. With far fewer losses than there are and will be in a situation where an operation is carried out with a small number of troops.

But most importantly, we introduce truly progressive leaders, theorists and practitioners, social activists and futurologists into power. There are thousands of their names: Pavel Grudinin, Maxim Kalashnikov, Sergei\*, the entire Communist Party faction in the State Duma, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Nikolai Platoshkin, television to Maxim Shevchenko, the post of Moscow mayor to Leonid Zyuganov, who knows the city's problems down to the last basement and garage! Prime Minister Vadim Kumin, and so on. In one fell swoop, pass hundreds of laws aimed at developing society and supporting every citizen. Ban all private banks, nationalize all oil and gas companies, the entire metallurgical industry, and other large factories. Make tuition free at all universities in the country, with admission without any exams for the children of citizens participating in the Second World War, etc. Replace the entire gubernatorial corps, except for the Red governors...

And the country will sparkle with new colors and begin to win quickly, effectively, and without huge losses.

Some will say, "Well, I'm focusing on material wealth again." But what about the ideas of defending the fatherland, fighting Nazism, American imperialism, and so on?

I think it's important to keep a cool head in this matter.

Yes, there are more than enough reasons for a special operation. But the authorities have been demonstrating for decades, and especially since February, have been repeatedly demonstrating, that such a special operation is, to put it mildly, ineffective and sometimes downright dangerous. Even the example of the volunteer movement shows that soldiers have to be staffed by civilians, and Russian customs services often engage in outright sabotage by denying bulletproof vests, drones purchased by volunteers, and the like into the SVO zone. And the beginning of the SVO, in my opinion, will now be studied by every military institute worldwide as a complete failure of strategic planning.

Meanwhile, neither the country as a whole nor the citizens of Ukraine who were not liberated were mentally prepared for its beginning, not at all!

Ultimately, all this unprofessionalism, the greed of oligarchs, and the nepotism in power are leading and could lead to tens of thousands or more casualties among Russian citizens alone, not to mention Ukrainian citizens—our fellow brothers, incidentally, who found themselves hostage to the Nazi junta.

So, in my opinion, most communists are realists. And so they don't say wars are impossible. Given the predatory capitalist world we live in, wars are, alas, inevitable. But communists, at their core, oppose the idiocy of Russia's ruling elite, the blatant betrayal of a section of it, and the shady dealings it

perpetrates behind the backs of soldiers fighting on the front lines or workers creating our daily bread in all spheres!

Communists don't for a second believe in the Nazi regime in Ukraine or American, or indeed Western, imperialism! At the same time, communists are not going to silently contemplate or criticize any nonsense emanating from the Kremlin, much less the blatant betrayal of a section of the elite, who are constantly testing society's tolerance threshold today, pulling various stunts like the unfounded extrajudicial transfer of Nazis to Ukraine! Therefore, when communists today ask questions like, "Is it worth fighting for Abramovich's yachts?" they are also asking whether we should fight for the unjust society that has brought the situation to this point, for the elite whose military operations are ineffective, and for a regime that has repeatedly proven that it can destroy, and I believe has destroyed, hundreds of times more Russian citizens than all foreign enemies combined.

And yes, I think the special operation as a whole shouldn't be condemned! Otherwise, we could end up playing into the hands of a rabid enemy in the form of Ukrainian Nazism and American imperialism! But criticizing the military operations in detail is not only permissible, but a communist is obligated to do so! Just as soldiers on the front lines do! And it's crucial that this soldier, who is being exposed today to unjustified attacks by would-be strategists, hear, see, and know that communists think as they do. That communists aren't fighting against this soldier? Communists are fighting against common enemies with this soldier, both foreign and domestic!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_135651](https://vk.com/wall7006326_135651)

<https://dzen.ru/a/YsL8R0fdXiFkjGLD>

3. What is Annexation!!! And what does the right of a nation to self-determination have to do with it!

December 1, 2022.

Ilyich is burning leftist social-chauvinists and social-pacifists with napalm.

So, I'll translate into Russian: borders for a revolutionary socialist are an empty bourgeois phrase. If you advocate for the territorial integrity of the country at any cost, then you're a social-chauvinist. Essentially, the pink leftists today advocate for Ukraine's territorial integrity because of some de jure borders drawn by someone some time ago that don't reflect the de facto reality today! Let me remind you that this isn't the Ukrainian SSR, and people living in Ukraine aren't obliged to tolerate the Nazi quirks of lunatics from the Lviv region!

So, from this point in Lenin's work, we see that everything must be determined by the will of the people, not by legal notions of borders!

Some, of course, will say that no one invited us to Ukraine, etc. But I have a question: can you honestly say that in southeastern Ukraine, and even in other regions, there has been democratic ground for holding referendums on self-determination since 2014? Have you not heard about the repressions against supporters of the separateness of the eastern regions of Ukraine, etc.? Are you unaware of the Kremlin's betrayal of this impulse of the ordinary people of southeastern Ukraine?

So, Lenin even justifies annexation during an imperialist war, if there is a proper historical basis and the will of the people! And what can we say about wars of national liberation and anti-colonialist struggles, which for Russia the conflict in Ukraine is!

Thus, once again, Lenin confirmed that today's social pacifists are, in essence, lackeys of social-chauvinist Nazis and accomplices of American imperialism!

Excerpt from the work "

PROPOSAL

OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RSDLP TO THE SECOND SOCIALIST CONFERENCE"

5. The most important "peace question" at the present time is that of annexations. And it is precisely on this issue that both the currently prevailing socialist hypocrisy and the tasks of genuine socialist propaganda and agitation are most clearly evident.

It is necessary to clarify what annexation is, why and how socialists should fight annexations. Not every incorporation of "foreign" territory can be considered an annexation, for socialists, generally speaking, favor the elimination of borders between nations and the formation of larger states; — not any violation of the status quo, for that would be the greatest reaction and a mockery of the fundamental concepts of historical science; — not any military annexation, for socialists cannot deny violence and war in the interests of the majority of the population. Annexation should only be considered the incorporation of territory against the will of its population; in other words, the concept of annexation is inextricably linked with the concept of national self-determination.

But on the basis of this war, precisely because it is imperialist on the part of both groups of warring powers, the phenomenon of the bourgeoisie and social chauvinists strenuously "fighting" against annexations was bound to grow, and did grow...

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_152310](https://vk.com/wall7006326_152310)

Written 01/16/2023

Opponents of the SVO often write that the Russian bourgeoisie started all this for some fabulous profits. I have already written several detailed articles refuting these fantasies.

But the key thing to understand here is that I'm writing specifically about the bourgeoisie as a whole, and particularly the ruling elite. Of course, it would be impossible to derive any significant profit from the conflict in Ukraine, even if Putin had resolved all the main issues there in a couple of months. Western sanctions, a densely populated country, the depletion of resources over hundreds of years of extraction, and so on—all of this contradicts the arguments about the war's aggressive nature. Moreover, the very fact that Ukraine, which has been under direct US control for nine years now (and even before that, it wasn't exactly independent after 1991), has a GDP ten times smaller than Russia's, suggests that Ukraine doesn't and can't possess any untold wealth! Otherwise, Western technology would already be extracting that wealth with tenfold energy! And Russia, with our technology, certainly won't be able to make any money there. :-))

(Please don't write about the 16 trillion in deposits allegedly seized by Russia; that article turned out to be a hoax to push military aid packages for Ukraine from the Western community.)

And yet, it's clear that certain individuals will profit from this war, and are already doing so, as they do from any war, especially under capitalism. There's no escaping this, because even in the war against Hitler, capitalists in the US, Britain, and elsewhere made huge profits. But surely no one would say that ordinary workers in America or England shouldn't have been sympathetic to the fight against Hitler!?

Almost everyone and always profits from and expropriates the property of the capitalists of a conquered country or political regime, even in the most just war.

Well, how do you imagine: there's a national liberation uprising, the oppressor is expelled from the territories of the rebellious people, and the property that brought profit to the exiled side continues to feed the enemy? Well, this is nonsense, forgive me for such tactlessness.

So what happens? Some leftist will say: since property went to certain bourgeois classes and didn't become public property, then it was all in vain? So, this is the wrong kind of uprising?

So, the Marxists of the last century were wrong to support hundreds of anti-colonialist wars of the past? After all, in a number of them, national bourgeoisies came to power in the newly independent countries.

Should we be so carried away by economism, completely forgetting dozens of other important things that are the foundation of communist ideals, just as important as the foundation. Moreover, often a number of these ideals are, in fact, steps on the path to achieving the main goal...

Here is how Lenin wrote on this matter in August 1916:

(Reply to P. Kievsky, Yu. Pyatakov)

"...Through the utilization of bourgeois democracy – toward a socialist and consistently democratic organization of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and against opportunism. There is no other path. Any other 'way out' is not a way out. Marxism knows no other way out, just as real life knows no other way out. We must include the free secession and free unification of nations in this same path, and not brush them aside, not fearing that this will 'contaminate' 'purely' economic tasks"...

The following is my text:

So, any other way out is not a way out. The other way out proposed by the young revolutionaries is nothing more than Blanquism. Incidentally, in this work (as well as in others dealing with the national question), Lenin emphasizes the great importance of the possibility of free national self-determination. Specifically, self-determination, and not the holding of nationwide referendums!

Lenin:

"A Swedish worker could, while remaining a member of the Social Democrats, advise Norwegians to vote against secession..."

...But a Swedish worker who, like the Swedish aristocracy and bourgeoisie, denied the Norwegians the right to decide this question themselves, without the Swedes, regardless of their will, would be a social chauvinist and an intolerant scoundrel within the Social Democratic Party."

So, we see Lenin's approach, but do modern leftists pose similar questions to the Ukrainian regime, to Western countries? Alas, they only have one mythical argument on their lips: "Russia is the aggressor," they insist. As if decades of creeping Western aggression, Nazi-style lawlessness in Ukraine, and so on hadn't happened. Incidentally, whatever one may say, it was Putin who, before February 24, tried to use rather Leninist arguments, including proposing that Western countries persuade Ukraine to create a confederation, hold referendums in individual regions, and so on.

A series of consultations were held with representatives of Western countries. And, in my opinion, it is the Western countries that are to blame for the situation escalating into a hot phase, as they clearly ignored Russia's proposals, as if there were no problem at all, likely because they benefited from a military conflict.

Returning to the economic implications of the Ukrainian conflict, I would like to remind you that for many years, Ukrainian oligarchs, integrated into the Ukrainian elite, remained the owners of large factories and other such things in the LPR and DPR. Moreover, there are serious grounds to believe that, prior to February 24, the Kremlin was attempting to buy off some of the Ukrainian oligarchs, essentially offering them the chance to take the helm of a liberated, independent Ukraine. And this isn't just about Medvedchuk, Yanukovich, and others... All of this, to put it mildly, refutes the thesis of Russian imperialism in this conflict. These actions are more akin to inoculating Ukrainian society, and especially the Ukrainian bourgeoisie, against rabies, giving them everything they can, if only they would cease their unnatural dealings with Western partners, as this poses a threat to Russia in general and to the Kremlin's businesses in particular. And the issue of Nazi terror against Russians and Ukrainians constructively inclined toward Russia, in my opinion, is also very important for the Kremlin, primarily for these reasons, which are primarily mercantile for them. But for us, this issue is of particular importance, pointed out by Lenin in hundreds of his works as one of the foundations of Marxism!

Lenin often noted that at times the interests of opposing classes can coincide in strange ways.

The conflict in Ukraine demonstrates precisely that it partially coincides with the interests of the Russian working class, part of the big bourgeoisie, and the majority of representatives of all other strata of society! And the task of the vanguard of Russian society is to do everything possible to maximize the benefits of this situation for progressive forces, for the working class, for the working intelligentsia, and for the petty bourgeoisie. We must do this in such a way that the Russian upper class is trapped in isolation and forced to focus on the development of the country, industry, science, education, social services, and so on.

At the same time, we must strive to achieve this goal without compromising our fundamental principles, without ceasing to criticize the Putin system for suppressing democratic rights and freedoms, for attacking citizens' social rights, and so on. But most importantly, we must not turn a blind eye to the fact that in our neighboring country, a Nazi regime remains in place, armed to the teeth by Western imperialism, trampling on all our fundamental principles, and, in fact, threatening the complete destruction of Russia's sovereignty!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_155840](https://vk.com/wall7006326_155840)

The following is a text taken from the internet, written by someone close to me at the time. A name that makes no sense to mention now.

The date of writing is approximately late 2022.

"If we are truly against annexations, then we must say: freedom of secession for Finland! Once we have said and implemented this, then—and only then!—will the 'agreement' with Finland be truly voluntary, free, a true agreement, and not a sham."

"Here is a clear, practical explanation of the question of annexations, which 'everyone' is now talking about, afraid to directly and precisely pose the question: whoever is against freedom of secession is for annexations."

From V.I. Lenin's work "Finland and Russia"

So what will be the response of those leftists who parrot bourgeois-liberal propaganda about Ukraine's territorial integrity and Russian annexation?

Aren't you in favor of annexations, but in favor of Ukraine?

Annexation is not the incorporation of territory. Annexation is the forcible incorporation or RETENTION. Here's confirmation from Lenin's work

"Defense of Imperialism, Disguised in Pleasant Phrases":

"Our Provisional Government 'diplomatically' declared its renunciation of annexations—just like the government of the German capitalists, the bandits Wilhelm and Bethmann-Hollweg. In words, both governments renounced annexations. In reality, both continue the policy of annexation, forcibly retaining: <then a list of territories>"

How do you like that?

-----

Further article on the same topic from December 26, 2022

Ilyich once again extends a helping hand to us Marxists who today stand on the correct, anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist positions. We advocate for the right of nations to self-determination, for the right of nations to liberation from oppression. Let me remind you that for decades, tens of millions of Russian-speaking citizens in Ukraine have been subjected to various kinds of oppression by the Nazi regime and Nazi organizations! Moreover, the Nazi regime in Ukraine has been effectively under the complete control of Western imperialists for the past nine years.

Thus, in this work, Lenin essentially reveals several possible developments in this kind of confrontation.

So, read Ilyich's article below, with my brief comments.

Complete Works. Volume 30. July 1916 – February 1917

Vladimir Lenin.

4. For or Against Annexations?

In §3 of the first section of their theses, the Polish comrades unequivocally declare that they are against all annexations. Unfortunately, in §4 of the same section, we encounter statements that must be considered annexationist. This section begins with the following... how can I put it mildly? strange phrase:

(So, here Lenin warns that if you shout about annexation against those who are aiding the national liberation struggle, you may well end up, in essence, aiding those who are annexing.)

"The starting point of the Social Democracy's struggle against annexations, against the forcible retention of oppressed nations within the borders of the annexing state, is the rejection of any defense of the fatherland (*italics added*), which in the era of imperialism is the defense of the rights of its own bourgeoisie to oppress and plunder other peoples..."

What is this? How is this possible?

"The starting point of the struggle against annexations is the rejection of any defense of the fatherland..." But after all, every national war and every national uprising can be called, and has been until now generally accepted, the "defense of the fatherland"! We are against annexations, but... we understand this to mean that we are against a war by the annexed for their liberation from the annexers, we are against an uprising by the annexed for the purpose of liberation from the annexers! Isn't this an annexationist assertion?

(Well, how about that, eh, pink leftists?)

The authors of the theses justify their... strange assertion by the fact that "in the era of imperialism," defending the fatherland means defending the rights of one's own bourgeoisie to oppress other peoples. But this is only true in relation to an imperialist war, i.e., a war between imperialist powers or groups of powers, when both warring parties not only oppress "other peoples," but also wage war over who gets to oppress other peoples more!

(Here Lenin strikes at perhaps the most fundamental thesis of the rose-colored pseudo-Marxists like Batov, Semin, Rudoy, and others. There are two crucial theses here. 1. So, Lenin is essentially saying that an alliance with the bourgeoisie cannot be rejected during a war of national liberation. The question of liberation from bourgeois exploitation of the working people is, in such cases, postponed. 2. Lenin considers a war of conquest, in other words, imperialist, only one in which the aggressor exploits or intends to exploit other peoples! Now, hand on heart, answer: do you consider the residents of Kharkov, Odessa, Donbass, and other parts of southeastern Ukraine to be foreign peoples?)

Apparently, the authors pose the question of "defense of the fatherland" quite differently from our Party. We reject "defense of the fatherland" in an imperialist war. This is stated most clearly in the manifesto of the Central Committee of our Party and in the Berne resolutions, reprinted in the pamphlet "Socialism and War," which was published in both German and French (20). We emphasized this twice in our theses (notes to §4 and §6). 10 Apparently, the authors of the Polish theses reject defense of the fatherland in general, i.e., even for a national war, perhaps considering national wars "in the era of imperialism" impossible. We say "perhaps" because the Polish comrades did not express such a view in their theses.

This view is clearly expressed in the theses of the German Internationale group and in Junius's pamphlet, to which we devote a special article.<sup>11</sup> We note, in addition to what is said there, that a national uprising of an annexed region or country against the annexing power can be called an uprising, not a war (we have heard this objection and therefore cite it, although we consider this terminological dispute frivolous). In any case, it is unlikely that anyone would dare deny that annexed Belgium, Serbia, Galicia, and Armenia would call their "uprising" against the annexing power "defense of the fatherland," and call it correctly. It follows that the Polish comrades are against such an uprising on the grounds that in these annexed countries there is also a bourgeoisie, which also oppresses foreign peoples, or, more accurately, can oppress them, since it is only a question of "its right to oppress." To evaluate a given war or uprising, therefore, we take not its actual social content (the struggle of an oppressed nation against an oppressor for its own liberation) but the possible exercise by the currently oppressed bourgeoisie of its "right to oppress." If Belgium, say, were annexed by Germany in 1917 and rose up for its own liberation in 1918, then the Polish comrades would oppose the uprising on the grounds that the Belgian bourgeoisie has the "right to oppress other peoples"!

(So, in the paragraph above, Lenin again highlights the idiots who even now often write to me that there are only two classes and that their interests never converge. No, Lenin directly asserts that such dogmas are inappropriate during a war of national liberation!)

There is not a shred of Marxism or revolutionary spirit in this reasoning. Without betraying socialism, we must support any uprising against our main enemy, the bourgeoisie of the major states, unless it is an uprising of a reactionary class. By refusing to support the uprising of the annexed regions, we objectively become annexationists.

(Here Lenin stole my thoughts (joke). The fact is, I often write that any struggle against Western imperialism is a good thing and, in fact, this struggle is a manifestation of de facto progress. Lenin also mentions here that we are not prepared to support the uprising of a reactionary class. Today, this could be, for example, ISIS's war against Western countries, etc. In such a situation, we would rather sympathize with the Western countries.)

It is precisely in the "era of imperialism," which is the era of the nascent social revolution, that the proletariat will support with particular energy the uprising of the annexed regions today, in order to attack the bourgeoisie of the "great" power weakened by such an uprising tomorrow, or at the same time.

(Well, this is simply a great hello to the dogmatists who believe that the world is still in the era of imperialism (personally, I believe that we are now in the era of ultra-imperialism, namely the union of universal Western imperialism, which, in essence, has brought most of the world under its control), but if you believe that now is the era of imperialism, just like 100 years ago, then your direct task, as Lenin recommended, is to support the national liberation struggle!)

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_154379](https://vk.com/wall7006326_154379)

March 26, 2023. I published this text in a private post.

This excerpt shows that Lenin had a dialectical approach to wars. Yes, war is bad, but Marxists must be realists and clearly understand that wars will not end on their own, and the job of communists is to contribute to the fall of the imperialist system. Only then can we put an end to both wars and annexations as such. Lenin here once again reminds us that annexation is not only a seizure, but also the forcible retention of a people within a state! This is precisely what we see in Ukraine, where residents of southeastern Ukraine were forcibly retained within a single state, despite active citizen protests in 2014!

Moreover, the text is important because Lenin demonstrates here that the struggle against such annexations can be a tool in the fight against imperialism in general!

We will examine this crucial aspect a little later!

## CONFUSION

### (MORE ABOUT ANNEXATIONS)

The editors of Izvestia, controlled by the Narodnik-Menshevik bloc, are breaking all records for confusion. In issue No. 67 of May 16, they attempt to polemicize with Pravda, without naming it, of course, in the bad "ministerial" manner. Pravda, you see, has a vague, misleading concept of annexations.

Excuse me, citizen ministers and ministerial editors, but the fact remains that only our Party has given a precise, official definition of annexation. Annexation (seizure) is the forcible retention of a foreign people within the borders of a given state. No one capable of reading and understanding Russian could fail to understand this after reading the supplement to issue No. 13 of Soldatskaya Pravda (resolutions of the All-Russian Conference of April 24-29, 1917).<sup>66</sup>

What is the objection of the Narodnik and Menshevik editors of Izvestia? The only problem is that, from our perspective, we are supposedly forced to "fight until Germany is transformed into the Duchy of Brandenburg... Russia into the Grand Duchy of Moscow"!! Annexation, the editors lecture their readers, "means the violent seizure of territory that was in the possession of another state on the day war was declared" (in short: without annexation = status quo, i.e., restoration of the pre-war situation).

It's reckless of the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders of the Executive Committee to hand over the editorial board to people with such confusion—reckless, indeed.

Let's apply their objection to ours to their definition: "fight until Russia regains Poland, Germany regains Togo, and the colonies in Africa"?? This is patent nonsense, and not only theoretical but also practical, for the soldiers of any country would drive away editors who reason in this way.

Their reasoning is mistaken in this regard:

1) The theoretical definition of annexation includes the concept of a "foreign" people, i.e., a people that has retained its uniqueness and will to a separate existence. Think about this, fellow citizens; if the matter is still unclear to you, read Engels' and Marx's discussions of Ireland, the Danish parts of Germany, and the colonies—and you will see how confused you are. Neither the Duchy of Brandenburg nor the Principality of Moscow have anything to do with it. 2) Confusing the concept of annexation with the question of "how long to fight" is absurd; this means failing to understand the connection between war and the interests and dominance of certain classes; it means adopting a philistine, "classless" viewpoint from the standpoint of class struggle. As long as the capitalist class is in power, peoples will inevitably fight "as long" as that class pleases. To escape this through wishes, demands, and conferences is a petty bourgeois illusion. 3) As long as the capitalist class is in power, their peace will inevitably be an "exchange of annexations": Armenia for Lorraine, colonies for colonies, Galicia for Courland, and so on.

It's forgivable for an ignorant person to turn a blind eye to this, but not for the editors of Izvestia. 4) When the proletariat is in power, which is what war is leading to everywhere, then a truly "peace without annexations" is possible; otherwise, it is impossible.

When our party proclaims "peace without annexations," it always explains—as a warning to those with confused minds—that this slogan must be inextricably linked with the proletarian revolution. Only in connection with it is it necessary and correct, only in its line does it outline, only in its development and growth does it facilitate. Those who waver helplessly between relying on the capitalists and relying on a workers' revolution condemn themselves to helplessness and confusion on the question of annexations in general.

P.S. "Delo Naroda" of May 17 agrees with Izvestia that "without annexations" is tantamount to the concept of "status quo." Just try, gentlemen Socialist-Revolutionaries or Mensheviks, to say this clearly, precisely, directly, in the name of your party, your Petrograd Committee, your Congress!

Pravda No. 60, published according to the text of

Pravda newspaper, May 31 (18), 1917

When you speak of peace, you haven't said what kind of peace. No one responded to us regarding a peace based on the status quo when we pointed out this glaring contradiction. You won't be able to say in your resolution, in which you speak of a peace without annexations, that this is not the status quo. You can't say this is the status quo, i.e., a restoration of the pre-war situation. So what then? Take away Germany's colonies from England? Try it with peace treaties! Everyone will laugh at you. Try taking away Japan's plundered Kiao-Chao and the Pacific islands without a revolution!

You're entangled in hopeless contradictions. And when we say "no annexations," we're saying that for us this slogan is only a subordinate part of the struggle against global imperialism.

ИБСЕПОС. CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES.

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_163569](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_163569)

#### 4. Who is an imperialist today!

Without a doubt, this section is perhaps the most important in justifying Marxist support for the SVO. Critical support! However, I'm not deeply versed in economics! However, in addition to my own thoughts, in this section I will post a link to Buzgalin and Kolganov's 2016 paper, in which they examined this topic in great detail and, of course, concluded that Russia cannot be considered an imperialist! I will also post a link to a conversation between Ekaterina Volkova and a leftist blogger named Stas—this conversation will feature simply stunning figures indicating Russia's catastrophic lag in all key areas of development and financial power compared to the world's leading capitalist countries. Under these circumstances, speaking of Russia's alleged imperialism from a Marxist perspective is, to put it mildly, strange.

At the end of this section, I have published the most relevant information on Russia's position in the world of financial investments!!! These figures, to put it mildly, completely refute the theory that Russia is an imperialist!

My text from January 30, 2023

We have some kind of unique "imperialism" :-))

Lukoil fuels Ukrainian tanks, etc., and the Russian stock exchange sells shares in Western factories that produce weapons that kill Russian citizens.

The bourgeoisie simply refuses to adhere to the fundamental tenets of imperialism as defined by Lenin.

Here, in particular, is point number 1: the concentration of production and capital, which has reached such a high level of development that it has created monopolies that play a decisive role in economic life.

And what do we actually see? Where is this monopoly, if our bourgeoisie does whatever they want. They arm whomever they want :-)))

Further:

3) the export of capital, as opposed to the export of goods, is acquiring particularly important significance;

4) International monopolistic capitalist alliances are formed, dividing up the world.

I won't mention point 3, to put it mildly, since, in essence, Russia is incapable of any capital export other than the export of raw materials. And this is a sign not of developed capitalism, not of its highest stage, but of a colonial, dependent state!

Of course, cash doesn't count here, since the export of capital and the export of money are, to put it mildly, different categories.

But point 4 is worth discussing in detail.

So, tell me, citizens who consider Russia an imperialist, with which international capitalists have Russians entered into an aggressive alliance and now want to divide up Ukraine, and perhaps the entire world :-))?)

Which of the global capitalist monopolies is helping Russia, disregarding the opinion of the global hegemon, the United States, and its allies?

So, please enlighten me: how can Russia be considered an imperialist if its position in the capitalist world doesn't meet the basic parameters Lenin set for recognizing a country as imperialist?

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_157209](https://vk.com/wall7006326_157209)

MY ARTICLE. 07/24/2023

Imperialist war is primarily a concept based on a specific stage of capitalist development, both globally and in the country waging such a war. But not every war is imperialist, even at the imperialist stage of capitalism's development! Especially in 2023, when Western ultra-imperialism has de facto emerged! It is so powerful, so mighty, that it can command most of the planet!

The practical existence of united Western imperialism in recent decades has shown that it brings no good to the enslaved countries!

Naive ordinary people in Third World countries, and even on the periphery, believe that if the West conquers us, our lives will immediately be like those in the West :-)))

No, no, and no again!

The West has destroyed a large number of relatively progressive countries and, instead of civilization, is sowing archaism there, pitting the peoples living in these countries against each other!

The West dictates technological standards even in countries on its immediate periphery, such as the EU countries of Eastern Europe, where all high-tech production has been destroyed, and residents are leaving to work as plumbers and servants in the richer core countries.

In the event of Russia's total defeat in this conflict, dozens of independent states will emerge on our territory, which will ultimately fight each other. Selling raw materials to the West in exchange for weapons, etc.

I believe the argument that the West doesn't need many countries with nuclear weapons on Russian territory doesn't work. The USSR also had 15 republics, and virtually all of them could have had nuclear weapons, but in the end, only Russia had them. So the technology for transferring nuclear potential to one or two countries is well-established. Moreover, it's possible that nuclear weapons won't work at all without the push of a button in the Kremlin. In short, there are many possible solutions to this problem.

Sorry for digressing, but what is imperialism? Ilyich's definition consists of five points, and Russia practically doesn't fit four of them. I discussed this issue in the link to my articles. Of course, imperialism has changed somewhat now. And it's essentially unique in the world; it's the ultra-imperialism of the West!!!

But what is modern anti-imperialism? That's perhaps a very important question. And I doubt anyone has ever seriously attempted to answer it!

So, go ahead and answer it. Maybe then you'll understand that Russia is currently forced to wage an anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist war. De facto. Although many representatives of the Russian comprador bourgeoisie dream of how to sell Russia's interests more effectively. More effectively, of course, for their own personal interests!

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_169323](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_169323)

This text appeared on May 6, 2023. It is the result of a discussion with an opponent of the SVO and addresses several topics, including the question: is Russia imperialist?

My discussion with one of the opponents of the SVO.

I had a discussion with a citizen who is close to the anti-war movement. Alas, I had to explain seemingly obvious things again.

I decided to publish part of our conversation.

So, HE: Who is facilitating the spread and facilitation of terrorist activity in Russia?

My answer.

Who is currently trying to write about the causes of the conflict in Ukraine as if Russia is participating there out of predatory, selfish interests?

I don't deny their existence altogether. But they are incidental; they are not and could not have been the initial determining factor in motivating the start of the war!

While economic interests may have been paramount, these are interests specifically aimed at protecting capital and businesses in Russia. And their protection was required precisely because of the long-term expansion of Western imperialism, primarily the United States!!! This expansion took various forms, both economic and military-political. I repeat, decades of it, from the West!

And the fact that Putin's inept response to this doesn't negate the fact that any government, even remotely independent of the West, would have had to respond to such expansion!

If the left were in power, we would have had to resist this in the same way. Of course, we would have done so dozens of times more effectively than Putin's rulers.

HE: I agree with that. Whether Russia is an imperialist or not doesn't even matter; that's secondary. The main point is that "while, of course, economic interests may have been paramount." On the other hand, our volunteers (not the bourgeoisie, not the capitalists, or the Presidential Administration) are fighting neo-fascism there, and the residents of eastern Ukraine are fighting for their right to self-determination. And that's the primary issue now. But! Be that as it may, calling for unification with "those very" capitalists and oligarchs, as well as calling for the class question to be pushed aside, is unacceptable.

My answer: The fight against Nazism in Ukraine, and accordingly the national liberation struggle of Russians and Russian-speaking residents of Ukraine, is taking place. It's foolish to deny it!

Regarding the call for unification with these very capitalists, as you put it, that's just your unfulfilled fantasy. It's unclear which capitalists in particular—all of them, or those who are prepared to fight against Banderites and imperialists within the framework of the proposals formulated by left-patriotic forces, for example?

Do you reject the bourgeois state altogether? Do you wear clothes made by hired workers robbed by capitalists? Do you ignore traffic lights and, in general, the traffic rules created by the bourgeois state? Do you drink urine instead of going to a bourgeois doctor working for a bourgeois state?

You should be more specific about the boundaries of your interaction with the bourgeois state...

Will the direct expansion of NATO troops invading Russian territory be a signal to you that it's possible to interact with the bourgeois Russian state?

HE: Of course, there are all the hallmarks of a national liberation war. No one denies that, except the Euro-leftists. Engaging with the bourgeoisie, particularly the petty, patriotic kind, is not the same as engaging with capitalists who seek to profit from the conflict and further enslave the proletariat. You're

lumping everything together again (just like you lumped together anti-vaxxers in general with people who simply didn't want to get vaccinated with Sputnik). Read your awards or the "committee" manifesto again carefully... Everything else is like asking, "You support the war, so why aren't you fighting yourself?"... And you personally called for unification with the class enemy Strelkov, who himself says he poses no threat to Putin...

My answer: The problem is that there is a segment of Russian society today who are ready and willing to defend Russia's independence and territorial integrity, while there are those for whom this is fundamentally unimportant. These people exist both in the very top business circles and among people of various political views. Therefore, I am a supporter of cooperation with those who want to make life difficult for the imperialist Western camp and, of course, who are willing to invest in the fight against Ukrainian Nazism, for example. The fault line in society now runs along these issues!

Of course, there are other issues that divide these two camps. And we are not resolving these issues in principle. Just as Lenin did not retract his concerns about Kerensky during the Kornilov rebellion. But he insisted that Kerensky should not be overthrown now. Because this could strengthen Kornilov, weaken the revolutionary forces, and so on.

Similarly, today, we must first resolve the most important task and then tackle others.

At the same time, I repeat for the hundredth time, while engaging with other political forces and representatives of other classes, the left must demand that our proposals for a "left turn" be implemented into the country's development agenda. Of course, without taking our wishes into account, no serious interaction with the bourgeoisie or other political forces is possible for now.

HIM: Of course, but we need to clearly understand and distinguish between who to ally with.

That's precisely the question. Because it's one thing to ally with a (petty/medium) bourgeois who earns his own living (clearly, through exploitation). It's quite another matter with large industrialists, capitalists, oligarchs, and banking magnates, who are firmly dependent on the budget and subsidies and see in the SVO only their own profits and an opportunity to expand the market.

The same goes for class enemies, with whom, in principle, an alliance is impossible.

MY answer:

No, that's not correct.

The current divide is over the question of whether we are for Russia's independence or its collapse!

And it doesn't matter whether he's a banker, a major industrialist, or a librarian. If he's willing to make an effort to save Russia, he can be our tactical ally!

Regarding who benefits from the war, it's all completely abstract. Our Alexander Andreev received a bonus in December while working at a defense plant. Should we now fire him from the LF?

All this capitalist profit-making during the war is practically unprovable!

Another issue is that we should demand the introduction of mechanisms so that all capital profits during the war are directed to the needs of the front, etc.

This is what we need to address, not the philosophical justification for what constitutes profit during the war.

HE: It doesn't matter to me who robs me. I'm a Bolshevik, and my primary goal is the victory over capitalism in general, not the pursuit of which capitalism is closest to my heart. The primary goal is the victory of communism, and if that requires sacrifice, so be it. I'm for Russia's victory, I'm for Russia's integrity, but if something else leads to the victory of communism, then so be it.

My answer: You won't be robbed. NATO soldiers will simply chop you up for your organs. That's the difference!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_165470](https://vk.com/wall7006326_165470)

Below is a post that caused a widespread online outcry; it was even reposted by Konstantin Semin, criticizing Buzgalin. I was in correspondence with Buzgalin, and he was about to respond to Semin, but then he gave up, citing his busy schedule. A couple of months later, he died.

June 14, 2023

MY POST ABOUT THE WORK OF BUZGALIN AND KOLGANOV!!!

Friends, comrades, and especially enemies. Especially those who got lost in the two left birch trees and suddenly, out of a hangover, declared Russia imperialist.

I completely by chance found a copy of the "Alternatives" magazine, issue 1, 2016, at home, and found an article by Buzgalin, Kolganov, and Barashkova. "21st Century Imperialism: Russia and the West."

And it's not an article, but a massive 50-page study, with a huge number of figures, statistics, and analyses of the Gorelevists' misconceptions, all with a clear conclusion. Russia is not imperialist! This doesn't mean that Russian capitalism is good, that it's supposedly progressive, etc. No, that's not what I'm talking about. The point is that Russia is essentially a semi-periphery, whose elites play by the rules established by global imperialism, and Russia's elites dream of living peacefully within this entire construct. At the same time, they are forced to respond to obvious oppression...

Let me remind you that Kolganov and Buzgalin are among the world's leading, universally recognized experts on Marxism! Doctors of Science, professors at Moscow State University, etc.

That is, these are not the empty-headed bloggers who have been blabbering to you for years, sometimes calling for you not to vote, sometimes for you not to engage in practical work, and only to read theory, etc.

No, these are experts of global significance and, incidentally, quite good practitioners of grassroots social institutions!

So, familiarize yourself with their work and finally draw the right conclusion. Incidentally, on the last page of their work, there's an interesting remark that goes something like this: "In 2014, the Russian state dared... to disregard the rules established by global players and do what only first-tier predators had previously allowed themselves to do... this is precisely what compelled the adherents of global capital's power to launch an active campaign denouncing the Russian Federation as an imperialist aggressor."

As dogmatists often like to say, there are only two classes in society: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat...

Paraphrasing their statement, I can say that today there are only two opposing forces in the world: Western imperialism and those who resist it. States are not imperialists at their core!

Below, I am publishing the work of these esteemed scholars in PDF format and a link to a website where it can be found online.

I also draw your attention to Matthias Fritz's article "Lenin's Theory of Imperialism and Russia's Role in the Global Capitalist System." To your surprise, you'll find some very interesting passages there...

Here are excerpts from this work that, in principle, provide a clear understanding that Russia is not, and cannot be in the future, an imperialist!

Further excerpts from the scholars' work!

Fourth, the "new imperialism" is more than just capital export. Global capital in the 21st century, in its expansion, not only exports assets but also subordinates the economies of third countries to its dominance, shaping and maintaining control over the technology, governance, and finances of these national systems.

(Does Russia have these very systems of control over the management and finances of other countries? Answer this question for yourself; it's very important. 100 years ago, such technologies didn't exist; now, these instruments, under the control of Western countries, can safely be considered the sixth characteristic of imperialism!)

Fifth, this capital, being one of the participants in the cooperative-competitive global financial capital, controls the global financial system. Specifically, this includes the issuance and control of freely convertible currency (global money, the "gold of the 21st century"), and the subordination of the international settlement system and institutions regulating global financial processes (the IMF, the World Bank, etc.).

Finally (and this is last but not least), by utilizing all the above-mentioned properties, such capital gains the ability to appropriate a special – "imperialist" – rent (Samir Amin<sup>27</sup>). Returning to the problems of external economic, political, ideological, and other expansion of various nation-states, we can conclude that, in the above-described contemporary conditions of the emergence of proto-empires, only those states that provide "their" global capital with the opportunity to realize at least the basic attributes of global hegemony listed above become subjects of imperialist policy.

Translating this into socio-philosophical language, a modern proto-empire

can be defined as an economic and political chronotope, the systemic quality of which is the presence of the basic attributes of global hegemony in the capitals that define it. Simplifying this socio-philosophical and, at the same time, political-economic definition, we can say that the subject of modern imperialism—the proto-empire—is a social space (a topos—a super-state, such as the United States; a group of countries, such as the core of the European Union; a global network of major financial capitals) that is currently (chronos) used by global players (TNCs, etc.) as an institutional framework (specifically, one possessing legal, political, ideological, and military instruments of influence) for manipulating and, ultimately, subjugating third parties.

Specifically, a proto-imperial state is one used by transnational corporations based within it as a mechanism for the political (or, in extreme cases, military) subjugation of external socio-economic

systems. The latter, in this case, act as the periphery of the global political-economic space, the "center" of which are the proto-empires.

In this case, the transnational corporations of the imperialist country gain not only political and military protection for their economic expansion, but also the ability to conduct this expansion according to rules that allow for the active manipulation of economic actors in the peripheral country.

These rules include both the economic institutions themselves (formal freedom of trade and investment, openness of any assets to privatization, the absence of serious social restrictions on capital), as well as their military (NATO), legal (the priority of international law developed by them and, ultimately, the international courts they themselves established), ideological (the priority of so-called "European" values, which are essentially bourgeois political and ideological institutions), cultural (the expansion of globalized mass culture and so-called "elite" culture), educational (the Bologna system), and other support. This forms the basis for the economic, political, ideological, and other subordination of the country to the periphery (its economy, political system, even the worldview of its citizens), and thus for the systematic extraction of imperialist rent.

.....The first argument aimed at proving that the Russian Federation is a subject of "new imperialism" is related to the fact that its economy is largely based on production concentrated in the hands of large corporations. This is indeed a fact, and in support of this feature of Russian capitalism, as we have already written about earlier, we can cite well-known data (see Table 2). Moreover, many of these structures have branches outside the Russian Federation and actively invest in foreign projects. All this, at first glance, confirms the presence of economic foundations for imperialist policy in Russia.

Below, we will attempt to demonstrate that this is, after all, only a semblance of the foundations of imperialism. But for now, we emphasize: this semblance is not accidental. Within the Russian economy, the level of production concentration is indeed sufficient to consider the largest corporations to be monopolies (in Lenin's definition), which undermine free competition and therefore act as bearers of a characteristic characteristic of imperialism. However, the economy of the 2010s, unlike that of the 1910s, is global, and in the vast majority of cases, Russian corporations cannot claim the role of global transnational corporations. However, there are exceptions, and therefore, there are certain preconditions for the emergence in our country of corporations capable of becoming actors in imperialist expansion, not as rare exceptions, but as a rule (remember these qualifications – "as a rule," "in most cases," etc. – we will return to them later, as they are not accidental and reflect the contradictory and transitional nature of Russia's geoeconomic position). Moreover, some behavioral traits even of today's Russian transnational corporations resemble those of imperialist aggression. But in the overwhelming majority of cases—and we will try to prove this below—we are talking almost exclusively about "ordinary" expansion, characteristic of any capital that has reached a sufficiently large size to enter global markets.

.... Imperialist aggression proper begins, as we have shown above, from the moment when ultra-large transnational capital (comparable in sales volume to the GNP of an average country), accumulated within the national economic system, enters the global market not as an equal, atomized, competing

producer, but as a means of manipulating certain segments of global economic processes. Russian corporate capital is not currently such a player, and there are a number of reasons for this...

.....To summarize: Russian capital is included par excellence in the typical capital flow pattern for peripheral countries subject to imperialist control: sale of raw materials (or, alternatively, the results of production based on cheap labor) – receipt of income in freely convertible currency – investment of these funds in reliable assets in the "core" countries or offshore zones. Thus, the portion of Russian capital actively oriented toward foreign economic operations is, in most cases, not just not imperialist, but simply comprador.

Secondly, Russian corporations can hardly be considered imperialist actors for the simple reason that they are primarily commodity-based. Moreover, unlike, say, Western oil TNCs, they export not capital from their own countries with the goal of exploiting the raw materials resources of peripheral countries, but raw materials with the goal of maximizing profits, which they invest in assets, securities, real estate, and so on, in "core" countries.<sup>44</sup> Only a few of these raw materials corporations have made very timid attempts to compete with the world's leading TNCs, but their results have been even worse than those of many semi-peripheral countries.

Returning to Russian capital, we emphasize that even the most powerful oil and other raw materials companies in our country, as a rule, "bend" under the influence of the capital and state machinery of the most developed imperialist countries. Thus, analysts note a declining presence of Russian fuel and energy companies in the global M&A market and the threat of previously agreed-upon deals being disrupted due to sanctions imposed on Russia by the EU and the US and the changing investment climate within the country. Therefore, the reality is not so much the growing expansion of Russian corporations into global markets as the reduction in their international activity, which was already focused on cooperation (not always mutually beneficial for Russia) with the largest Western multinational corporations.

Thirdly, a significant reason preventing Russian capital from being considered a full-fledged actor in the "new imperialism" is the weakness of Russian financial corporations. Russian banks are ten times smaller (!) than the world's largest financial multinational corporations (see Tables 6, 7, and 8). Thus, the assets of Russia's largest bank, Sberbank, amounted to only \$378 billion as of June 1, 2015, while the next largest bank, VTB, had assets of \$147 billion (see Table 6). This is an order of magnitude lower than the largest foreign banks: according to the Financial Times rating, the assets of the largest bank in 2015, Industrial & Commercial Bank of China, amounted to \$3,317 billion.

Thus, only a few state-owned or state-controlled banks (see Table 8) have a size (and, consequently, financial strength and "market power") comparable to foreign financial TNCs. However, in their goals and the nature of their operations, they bear little resemblance to aggressive imperialist capital. They are more like semi-bureaucratic national structures that cannot even provide financing for their own national production. The only area where they act as creditors is in relations with some of their CIS neighbors related to oil and gas sales. But we will, as already mentioned, specifically address this exception to the rule below.

.....As for the macro level, our country not only lacks any ability to control the functioning of the global financial system, but, on the contrary, is itself deeply and permanently dependent on global financial

and other markets (primarily oil and gas). Investments and the budget, citizens' incomes, and economic dynamics—all of this, to our great regret, in our country is almost decisively dependent on the aforementioned external parameters.

Even more importantly, the Russian authorities, while providing humanitarian and ideological support to the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics (DPR and LPR), in many cases pursue a policy of counteracting the positive, socially oriented aspirations initially initiated by the citizens of this region. But, again, despite all the negative aspects of Russian intervention in the affairs of the republics that emerged there (but not the war against Ukraine, which Russia is not waging), the participation of volunteers from our country in supporting the militia's struggle is a progressive phenomenon. And this contradiction is nothing entirely new: history knows many examples of progressive foreign policy actions carried out by states that were reactionary in their domestic policies (we will mention just one example – the transition to good-neighborly relations with the USSR by the semi-feudal rulers of several Asian countries in the 1920s and 1930s).

We thus argue that violating the "rules of the game" established by global capital can be both regressive and progressive – depending on who undertakes this action, for what purpose, and with what result. If the vector of the latter is at least a partial removal of the prevailing social alienation in the world, it deserves support.

Secondly, let us recall that, as a result of the above research, we have proven that the primary intention of Russian capital and the state is to enter the global space of goods and capital movements, corporate and geopolitical manipulation, and ideological and cultural pressure under conditions at least relatively close to those enjoyed by capital and countries of the "core." Russia, however, has been very weak in realizing this intention. Moreover, Russia is not a "core" capable of manipulating its partners, even within the Eurasian Economic Union (and its successor, the Eurasian Economic Union). In other words, Russian capital and the state are predators (like any capital and capitalist state), but they are "second-tier" predators—capable only of (1) occupying niches temporarily vacated by competition among the main global players, (2) dividing up the scraps of the global geoeconomic and geopolitical pie, competing with similar "second-tier" predators, and (3) occasionally resisting aggression and overly brazen manipulation by "first-tier" predators. Russian actors (the state, corporations, etc.) do not possess the specific characteristics of global capitalist players (the ability to manipulate other participants in global economic and political processes and set their own rules of the game for the rest of the world). The only thing that distinguishes the Russian Federation is that, relying on the legacy left by the USSR (the military-industrial complex, etc.), the Russian state in 2014 dared in one and a half cases (Crimea and, partly, Donbass) not to follow the rules established by global players, and to do what only "first-level" predators had previously allowed themselves to do (let us note in parentheses: it was precisely this – the third parameter in our list – that forced the adherents of the "center" power (or, more strictly speaking, the power of global corporate capital) to actively begin a campaign of denouncing the Russian Federation as an imperialist aggressor...70).

So, above are excerpts from an article by Buzgalin, Kolganov, and other prominent Russian scholars written in 2016. It essentially proves that, by all the key indicators, at the time the article was written, Russia was not an imperialist! And since 2016, the economic situation in Russia has only worsened!

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_167266](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_167266)

Ekaterina Volkova's interview with Stas Ay, How Simple. This interview contains a wealth of economic data that proves that Russia is not even close to being an imperialist!

[https://vkvideo.ru/video-50883936\\_456242406](https://vkvideo.ru/video-50883936_456242406)

As I promised at the beginning of this section, I'm publishing data on Russia's position in several economic sectors. So, here, in my opinion, is some of the most important data that sheds light on whether Russia is an imperialist.

After all, it's the country's economic situation that determines whether this is true or not. And the most important thing here is how much the country depends on external expansion and profits derived from the exploitation of other countries!

So: The Largest Investor Countries in the Global Economy (2023-2024)

Data based on statistics from UNCTAD (UN), the IMF, and the World Bank. The total volume of global foreign direct investment (FDI) is approximately \$45 trillion.

Top 15 countries by accumulated investment abroad:

Country Investment volume (\$) Share of global FDI Main destinations

1. USA ~\$8.5 trillion 24% EU, Asia, Latin America
2. China ~\$2.8 trillion 8.5% Asia, Africa, EU (until 2022)
3. Germany ~\$2.4 trillion 6.8% EU, USA
4. Japan ~\$2.1 trillion 5.9% Asia, USA
5. UK ~\$2.0 trillion 5.6% EU, USA, offshore
6. France ~\$1.8 trillion 5.0% Africa, EU
7. Netherlands ~\$1.7 trillion 4.8% Offshore schemes, EU
8. Canada ~\$1.6 trillion 4.5% USA, Latin America
9. Ireland ~\$1.4 trillion 3.9% Technology, fiscal systems
10. Switzerland ~\$1.3 trillion 3.7% Financial services, EU
11. Hong Kong\* ~\$1.1 trillion 3.1% Asia, China
12. Spain ~\$0.9 trillion 2.5% Latin America, EU
13. Italy ~\$0.8 trillion 2.2% EU, Mediterranean
14. South Korea ~\$0.7 trillion 2.0% Asia, US
15. Russia ~\$0.4 trillion 0.9% CIS, offshore (until 2022)

\*Hong Kong is considered a separate economic region in UNCTAD statistics.

So, Russia is in 15th place here, yet lags behind the leaders by dozens of times!

Developed economies dominate: The US, EU, and Japan account for 65% of global investment. China's influence: over 10 years, China's share has grown from 2% to 8.5% (projects in Africa and Asia as part of the Belt and Road Initiative).

Even before the sanctions, Russia's share was 1.8% (2019) and has fallen to 0.9% (2024).

But that's not all; in fact, these 0.9% can hardly be called investments in the normal sense of the word!

Although Russia's total investments abroad are estimated at ~\$380-420 billion, 65-75% of this amount, or \$250-300 billion, is held in offshore zones. This means that this money was simply stolen by oligarchs in Russia, and it was taken out of the country not for business activities, but to store the stolen goods abroad! Here are the main jurisdictions: Cyprus: 35-40% (\$130-160 billion) – historically the main offshore haven for Russian capital. The Netherlands: 15-20% (\$60-80 billion) – transfer pricing schemes. Switzerland: 5-8% (\$20-30 billion) – private assets and commodity trades. The British Virgin Islands (BVI): 5-7% (\$15-25 billion).

Moreover, now the bulk of this money is under arrest!

Changes after 2022 1. Capital repatriation: \$50-70 billion transferred from offshore zones to Russian jurisdiction. Asset freezing: up to \$100 billion blocked in the EU and US; according to some estimates, this amount exceeds \$300 billion. Then comes a change in schemes: Part of the capital was transferred to the UAE, Turkey, and Kazakhstan (up to 20% of offshore amounts).

The share of Russian investment in offshore zones decreased from 65-75% to 40-50% after 2022, but offshore zones remain a key tool for capital preservation. For accurate data, access to the confidential financial statements of the Central Bank of the Russian Federation and international banks is required. In general, real investment in economic projects is initially (30-40%). Volume: \$120-160 billion out of \$380-420 billion.

They go to the oil and gas sector. Here are some examples: Lukoil: gas station networks in Europe (until 2022), Novatek: LNG projects (e.g., Arctic LNG), Norilsk Nickel: plants in Finland, RUSAL: plants in Guinea and Jamaica, Chemical industry: Eurochem, Acron. In other words, this includes most of the countries of the imperialist core, which Russia cannot seize by definition! Capital with signs of "stolen funds" (25-35%). Volume: \$100-150 billion. Criteria for inclusion in this category: Investments in unproductive assets (real estate, yachts, luxury goods), Offshore accounts without a clear commercial purpose, Capital outflow schemes through inflated contract prices.

Further, capital is in the "Gray Zone" (30-40%). This capital, while formally considered investment, is actually used for: Tax optimization, concealing beneficiaries, and circumventing regulatory restrictions.

Specific examples of the export of funds for preservation or concealment! Yachts and real estate: \$25-35 billion (according to OCCRP), Swiss bank accounts: \$50-80 billion (BIS), Investments in the real sector: \$120-160 billion (UNCTAD).

Regional distribution of "questionable" assets: London: \$30-40 billion (real estate), Switzerland: \$20-30 billion (bank accounts), UAE: \$15-25 billion (various assets), Cyprus: \$40-60 billion (various schemes)

Conclusion: Real investments: 30-40% (\$120-160 billion), Capital with signs of illicit origin: 25-35% (\$100-150 billion), Gray zone: 30-40% (\$120-160 billion).

A precise breakdown is impossible without access to investigative data, but even conservative estimates indicate a significant amount of capital transferred from Russia into unproductive assets. This

demonstrates, firstly, Russia's extremely minimal presence in the international investment market, which means imperialist exploitation, and, more importantly, proves that the majority of the Russian bourgeoisie, essentially comprador, exports money to countries of the imperialist core, thereby helping to maintain stability in those countries!

Data sources: Orbital Insight, OECD, corporate reporting, Global Financial Integrity, Transparency International, Central Bank of the Russian Federation data, media investigations.

Next, I publish the top ten largest investment funds in the world!

As of August 2025, the top ten investment companies in the world by assets under management (AUM) are:

1. BlackRock Investment Management – approximately \$12.5 trillion.
2. Vanguard Investment Management – approximately \$10.4 trillion.
3. UBS Investment Bank – approximately \$6.6 trillion.
4. State Street Investment Management – approximately \$4.7 trillion.
5. Fidelity Investments Investment Management – approximately \$4.6 trillion.
6. JPMorgan Chase Commercial Bank – approximately \$4.3 trillion.
7. Goldman Sachs Investment Bank – approximately \$3.1 trillion.
8. Capital Group Investment Management – approximately \$3 trillion.
9. Credit Agricole Commercial Bank – approximately \$2.3 trillion.
10. Allianz Insurance – approximately \$2.2 trillion.

Of this list, the US: 7 companies (BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street, Fidelity, JPMorgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, Capital Group). Switzerland: 1 company (UBS). France: 1 company (Credit Agricole). Germany: 1 company (Allianz).

So, just seven American investment funds have approximately \$43 trillion! And that's not even counting all the funds!

Let me remind you that such financial indicators are a key criterion in Marxist theory for assessing whether a country is imperialist.

For comparison, Russia's entire budget for 2025 is approximately \$430 billion.

Therefore, an impoverished country, plundered by oligarchs (including foreign ones) over decades of comprador policies, cannot, by definition, be considered imperialist. This assertion contradicts all the laws of Marxist theory, logic, and simply common sense! There's also a wealth of data, both official and otherwise, showing that Russia continues to invest significant funds in American securities and government bonds! This can be called anything you like—vassalage or national betrayal—but imperialists certainly don't behave that way!

Furthermore, it's interesting that US imperialists don't just make money from direct investments abroad. Americans make enormous amounts of money practically out of thin air!

Here's one of the letters sent to me by Marxist researchers who asked to remain anonymous!

According to available data, US income from the sale of "intellectual property" (patents, copyright) abroad amounts to \$130-300 billion, according to various estimates, and from direct investment abroad, around \$600 billion.

The contribution of dollar emission to the US economy is significantly greater than that from "capital export" and "technology export." We had considered covering this topic (the contribution of monetary emission to the economy), as suggested by our methodology, but a recent paper reached similar conclusions based on well-processed empirical data. So to speak, we were relieved of the burden of a colossal amount of work. Let's briefly summarize the article's main result. The paper explains the benefits of monetary emission for the US economy, as an argument against monetary emission-based economic policy. The following general example is given:

An American company develops a product retailing for \$1,000. The company orders the device to be manufactured in China and pays \$100 for it (of which \$80 represents the cost of Chinese production, and \$20 represents the profit of the Chinese business). Since the company doesn't produce anything for export, these \$100 will represent net dollar emission transferred abroad through the chain of domestic economic relationships. A small amount will be spent on shipping the device to the US, followed by expenses related to "productization" (including advertising, insurance, licensing, etc.). As a result, the American company's total expenses total \$600, resulting in a profit of \$400 after the sale. Thus, for every \$100 issued, the contribution to the American GNP is \$900, of which \$400 is profit (i.e., the issue generates profit with a multiplier of 4). (Note in parentheses that the Chinese GNP increased by \$100 as a result of this transaction, of which \$20 is profit.) The article notes that in some industries, the multiplier reaches 8, and the average is estimated at 6. The latest data on annual issuance is \$2.41 trillion. Not all of it follows the pattern described above, but a significant portion goes abroad (which prevents the inflation acceleration that would correspond to such issuance without the emitted mass being dumped abroad).

It turns out that issuance is the foundation of the economy.

My comment: In general, the notorious expression that the US dollar is just a piece of paper has a very tangible basis. But behind this piece of paper are more than 800 military bases around the world, armed conflicts unleashed by the Americans in various parts of the world, the overthrow of governments, and the control of their protégés, who are forced to comply with all the demands of the hegemon! Institutions of international oversight organizations, from the IMF to various courts, and now the UN!

And we must understand that the power of the US and its allies is so powerful that Russia can only stand against them by uniting, and preferably by following a socialist path of development!

Yet, we have not yet seen any real steps from the Russian government toward changing the country's course. Moreover, attacks on left-wing forces and even the parliamentary Communist Party of the Russian Federation often take a completely vicious and vile character.

But is this really a reason to fight for the country to remain completely defenseless and fall under the steamroller of Western capitalist cannibals?

Research source at the link: <https://www.wipo.int/en/web/global-innovation-index/w/blogs/2024/cross-border-payments-ip>

## 5. WAR AS A PHENOMENON!

These bastards will gather and say they are "against the policy of August 4th," that they are "for peace," "against annexations," and... and... they will thereby help the bourgeoisie extinguish the budding revolutionary mood.

Lenin in a letter to Radek. 1915.

Published by me on July 30, 2022.

This text is intended to demonstrate that the Marxist attitude toward war cannot be based solely on pacifism and abstract humanism. Marxists understand that until the system of capitalist exploitation and oppression is destroyed, wars will be inevitable.

Therefore, communists first and foremost think about how to exploit the current military situation to advance or achieve their primary goal—a change in the socio-economic formation (SEF).

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_137461](https://vk.com/wall7006326_137461)

The next post continues the discussion of Marxists' attitudes toward war as a phenomenon! Written on November 20, 2024.

An interesting excerpt from a letter from Lenin to M. Gorky. Written later, January 25, 1913.

R.R.S.\* are undoubtedly for Austria and will fight for her. A war between Austria and Russia would be very beneficial for the revolution (throughout Eastern Europe), but it's unlikely that Franz Joseph and Nikolasha will give us this satisfaction.

And Ilyich writes this after the Basel Manifesto of 1912, where, as is well known, the Socialist Congress proclaimed a sharp rejection of war, and all participants unanimously promised to oppose it in every possible way if it were to break out. As is well known, the World War had begun, and, alas, most of the participants at that conference betrayed that very manifesto, thereby burying the Second International. Of the many who remained steadfast in their fight for the manifesto adopted in Basel, only the Bolshevik Party and a small group of socialists in European countries remained.

However, below are excerpts from the 1912 manifesto.

"Overcoming the contradiction between Germany on one side and England and France on the other would eliminate the greatest danger threatening to disrupt the peace, shake the power of Tsarism, which exploits this contradiction, make an attack by Austria-Hungary on Serbia impossible, and ensure world peace. All the efforts of the International must therefore be directed toward this goal.

The Congress states that the entire Socialist International is unanimous in these fundamental principles of foreign policy. He calls upon the workers of all countries to counter capitalist imperialism with the

might of international proletarian solidarity. He warns the ruling classes of all countries of the consequences of further worsening the misery of the masses, caused by the capitalist mode of production, through military action. He most emphatically demands peace. Let governments not forget that, given the current state of Europe and the mood of the working class, they cannot unleash the fury of war without creating danger for themselves. Let them remember that the French-German War was followed by the Commune, that the Russo-Japanese War set in motion the revolutionary forces of the peoples of the Russian Empire, that the growth of military and naval armaments gave class conflicts in England and on the Continent unprecedented intensity and led to massive strikes.

"Try to ensure that governments constantly have before their eyes the vigilant and passionate will for peace of the entire proletariat! Thus, counterpose to the capitalist world of exploitation and mass murder a proletarian world of peace and brotherhood of nations!"

That is, it clearly contains a call for peace, a call to prevent war.

True, the socialists also had a plan of action in case war did break out. It roughly reflected Lenin's famous slogan about transforming an imperialist war into a civil war, against one's own government, etc. Incidentally, I recall that already in Zimmerwald in 1915, Lenin was unable to persuade the socialists at the next conference to adopt this as their main slogan. Then, the pacifist slogan of "peace without annexations and indemnities" was adopted. Incidentally, Lenin never fully accepted it, which is precisely why the Zimmerwald Left Group, led by Lenin, was formed. So, let's return to Basel 1912. Here's another excerpt from the manifesto.

.... If war threatens to break out, then in the countries concerned, the working class and its parliamentary representatives are obliged to do everything in their power, with the support of the unifying activity of the International Socialist Bureau, to prevent the outbreak of war by employing the means they deem most effective, although these means, of course, vary depending on the degree of intensification of the class struggle and the general political situation."

"Should war nevertheless break out, socialists are obliged to intervene to bring it to an end as quickly as possible and to make every possible use of the economic and political crisis caused by the war to arouse the people and thereby hasten the fall of capitalist rule."

The first paragraph states that socialists must do everything possible to prevent war from breaking out! And the second declares a plan of action to destroy capitalism as such, taking advantage of the war. However, in his letter to Gorky, perhaps more personal than his message, Ilyich sees war as something beneficial for the revolution, and, alas, he says, Nicholas II is unlikely to provide the revolutionaries with such satisfaction.

In general, in his personal correspondence, I believe Lenin is less constrained and often reveals his true approach. False, bourgeois pacifism is alien to him. After all, this pacifism kills far more people than all wars combined.

And a communist must be able to extract benefit for the revolutionary cause from even the most vile social phenomena, such as war! At the same time, of course, a communist must offer both pacifist and reformist ideas to the masses. At the same time, we must understand that the bourgeoisie, by its very nature and greedy competition, will drive itself into various wars and disasters. And here we must not longer spare the bourgeoisie, or, so to speak, save the criminals, preaching peace at any cost. Incidentally, Lenin wrote extensively about this in his correspondence before Zimmerwald.

I would like to emphasize that Russia's current war in Ukraine is absolutely justified. This war is essentially an anti-colonialist uprising of the Russian bourgeoisie against Western imperialism! Yet, there is no imperialism in the world other than a united Western one! Furthermore, Ukraine is clearly a national liberation war waged by a section of the Ukrainian people against the oppression of Russians, Russian-speaking people, Russian-cultural people, Soviet-cultural people, and even Ukrainian communists and, oddly enough, Orthodox citizens.

What does this war give the progressive world? It's a true revolutionary gift. Because it opens up prospects for the collapse of the Western imperialist system and could trigger centrifugal processes both in the West and around the world!

Therefore, we must not preach peace at any cost. Here's what Lenin wrote on this matter, again in a letter to Radek in 1915: The bastards will gather, say they are "against the policy of August 4th," that they are "for peace," "against annexations," and... and... thus will help the bourgeoisie extinguish the seeds of revolutionary sentiment.

Here we are talking specifically about the preparations for Zimmerwald.

So, communism is not pacifism! Revolutionary struggle is not a stroll down the wide and straight Nevsky Prospect!

Class struggle will not intensify on its own if communists flirt with pacifism, whether appropriately or not!

A revolutionary is not obligated to help bourgeois criminals escape inevitable catastrophes! And even more so, a revolutionary cannot oppose just and revolutionary wars!

By the way, if Putin doesn't agree to a deal, he could set off revolutionary processes throughout the world! Thereby unknowingly becoming a great revolutionary of our time.

Whereas a leftist non-warrior is today essentially a counterrevolutionary and reactionary, working for the victory of Western imperialism and the Ukrainian Nazi regime! Such is the dialectic of the moment!

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_190358](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_190358)

STALIN'S DISCUSSION ON IMPERIALISM! 10/3/2024

The important thing in these passages is that Stalin believes that the national liberation struggle in the colonies undermines the rear of capitalism. Thus, in my opinion, imperialist countries are receiving less profit, and social tension is already building within them, which could ultimately lead to revolution in Western countries!

The growth and strengthening of the national liberation movements in India, China, Egypt, Indonesia, North Africa, and elsewhere is undermining capitalism's rear. If the "recovery" of imperialism requires expanding its sphere of influence in colonies and dependent countries, and these countries' struggle against imperialism is undoubtedly intensifying, then it is clear that imperialism's successes in this area cannot be sustainable.

Furthermore: Stalin, citing Lenin, confirms my post yesterday. The point here is that communists must see in imperialist wars, and wars in general, not only the fact that they bring disaster primarily to the common people, but also the opportunity to fight for change that opens up for communists during this period...

Stalin. Lenin proceeded from the fact that the old, pre-monopoly capitalism had already developed into imperialism; that the world economy was developing under conditions of a frantic struggle between the major imperialist groups for territory, markets, raw materials, etc.; that the division of the world into spheres of influence of imperialist groups had already been completed; that the development of capitalist countries was not uniform, not one following another or parallel to another, but spasmodically, with some countries that had previously advanced being pushed aside and new countries coming to the fore;

that such an order of development among capitalist countries inevitably gave rise to conflicts and wars between capitalist powers for a new redivision of the already divided world; that these conflicts and wars led to the weakening of imperialism; that the world front of imperialism therefore became easily vulnerable to a breakthrough in one country or another; that, in view of this, the victory of socialism in individual countries became possible. [https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_188885](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_188885)

"The Story of a Scandal" Over the Ukrainian Question.

And that's how it is with these semi-Marxist leftists! Absolute ignorance and, as a consequence, a lack of understanding of Marxism...

Here's my reaction!...

...

Friends, you all saw today that some kind of vile aggression was committed against me. This morning, someone accused me of all the deadly sins, including opportunism. And the icing on the cake was his assertion that the classics never sided with any particular bourgeois regime or movement.

Of course, this is a complete lie, since communists, including Marx, Engels, and Lenin, among others, often not only supported certain bourgeois regimes but even formed alliances with them or bourgeois movements to achieve certain goals. Moreover, the first person I removed cited Lenin's work, "Under a False Flag," as an example, claiming to prove me wrong. The work is generally devoted to opportunism during the First World War. Moreover, Lenin emphasizes this fact: strictly speaking, this work concerns that period of imperialist war!

As you know, I believe that Russia is currently being subjected to aggression from Western, practically global, imperialism! Therefore, applying Lenin's arguments in this work to our situation, in relation to those who do not condemn the Central Military District, is, to put it mildly, incorrect.

But I don't want to expand on this topic now. I'll try to do so later!!! (Note: the work with evidence from my texts that the war in Ukraine on Russia's part is not imperialist will be published later. However, I have already written a number of theses on this topic several times.) However, you'll truly laugh hysterically when you read this text, where Lenin repeatedly cites detailed facts about how and why Marx and Engels supported various bourgeois regimes and movements, including in various wars.

That is, the citizen who decided to "poke" me with Marxist truth apparently hasn't even read this work. Which completely proves my point!

Below are a few theses from this work!

"Under a False Flag."

...

"Which side's success is more desirable," Marx determined, for example, in the Italian War of 1859.

.....

"Behind Napoleon III," writes A. Potresov, "the figure of Gorchakov loomed, having just concluded a secret agreement with the Emperor of the French." The result is a tangled web of contradictions: on one side, the most reactionary European monarchy that oppressed Italy; on the other, representatives of a liberating and revolutionary Italy, right up to Garibaldi, hand in hand with the arch-reactionary Napoleon III, etc. "Wouldn't it have been simpler," writes L. Potresov, "to avoid sin by saying: 'both are worse'?" However, neither Engels, nor Marx, nor Lassalle were tempted by the 'simplicity' of such a solution, but set about exploring the question."

(Modern leftist non-warriors took the simple route, saying both are worse, thereby thinking the question was resolved. We're talking about those who make mistakes for free.)

.....

This conclusion is naive and childish or crudely sophistical, for it boils down to the following: since Marx in 1859 was deciding the question of which bourgeoisie's success was more desirable, therefore we, more Half a century later, we must resolve precisely this same question.....

More...

A. Potresov failed to notice that for Marx in 1859 (and in a number of later cases), the question of "which side's success is more desirable" was equivalent to the question of "which bourgeoisie's success is more desirable." A. Potresov failed to notice that Marx was resolving this familiar question at a time when undeniably progressive bourgeois movements were present—and not only present, but at the forefront of the historical process in the most important European states.

.....

More...

In the era of the old (bourgeois) democracy, Marx and Engels were deciding which bourgeoisie's success was more desirable, focusing on developing a modest liberal movement into a turbulent democratic one. A. Potresov, in the era of modern (non-bourgeois) democracy, preaches bourgeois national liberalism, when bourgeois progressive movements, whether modest liberal or turbulent democratic, are out of the question in England, Germany, or France. Marx and Engels, from their era, the era of bourgeois national progressive movements, moved forward, pushing these movements forward, ensuring that they developed "over the heads" of the medievalists.

In short, there's no point in publishing further. In my opinion, the level of development of my critics is clearly visible to everyone. It would be fine if they had conducted the discussion in some academic vein. But they're the ones who start the dialogue: you're an opportunist, a Putinist, an anti-Marxist, a dullard, you've created your own little world, etc.

People who understand nothing at all about Marxist-Leninist philosophy immediately begin accusing someone who clearly follows the Marxist path of opportunism, etc.

Regarding the main idea of this work, I'll say only one thing. Without a doubt, it completely confirms my correctness. Despite the fact that Lenin categorically opposes supporting his fatherland in the First World War! But if you carefully read this article, as well as Lenin's other works, then even from this work it will become perfectly clear to you that Russia today is not waging an imperialist war. Russia today is

itself a victim. Because the most powerful imperialism that has ever existed in human history, the imperialism of the Western coalition, is the real culprit and the sole source of aggression!

So I can only repeat once again: Don't listen to all sorts of leftist idiots. It's better to read Lenin, Marx, and others yourself, and no one will manipulate you. And you'll understand the essence of things yourself!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_147915](https://vk.com/wall7006326_147915)

Next is an article by a good friend who has a good understanding of the topic! Published January 6, 2023.

A Marxist and SVO supporter named Alexander sent me an interesting study based on several works by Lenin and Marx.

Frankly, I believe it contains some minor inaccuracies. But overall, based on this study, every communist can draw the right conclusion about how to approach the conflict in Ukraine.

So, get acquainted :-))))

In connection with a new reading from Lenin's PSS, this morning a certain train of thought about the pink leftist non-warriors formed in my head. From quotes by Vladimir Ilyich, of course. I'd like to share:

"The concept of annexation usually includes 1) the concept of violence (forcible incorporation); 2) the concept of foreign oppression (annexation of a 'foreign' region, etc.); and – sometimes – 3) the concept of violating the status quo. And we indicated this in our theses, and this instruction of ours was not criticized.

The question arises: can social democrats be against violence at all? Clearly not. This means we are not against annexations because they constitute violence, but for some other reason. Similarly, social democrats cannot be for the status quo. No matter how you twist and turn, you cannot escape the conclusion: annexation is a violation of a nation's self-determination; it is the establishment of state borders contrary to the will of the population.

To be against annexations means to be for the right of self-determination. To be "against the forcible retention of any nation within the borders of a given state" is the same as to be for the self-determination of nations.

(Results of the Discussion on Self-Determination. What is Annexation? from pp. 25-26 of Lenin's PSS, v. 30)

In connection with the above:

- 1) a social democrat/communist cannot criticize the SVO for its violence.
- 2) a social democrat/communist cannot firmly support the status quo, i.e. Beyond the state borders established following the 1991 coup d'état and those currently in place.
- 3) Annexation is the establishment of state borders against the will of the population. This is what Ukraine is doing, as the people of Crimea, the LPR, and the DPR have quite officially expressed their will to join Russia.

Regarding the imperialism of the SVO:

Imperialism includes "five main characteristics: 1) the concentration of production and capital, which has reached such a high level of development that it has created monopolies that play a decisive role in economic life; 2) the merger of banking capital with industrial capital and the creation, on the basis of this "financial capital," of a financial oligarchy; 3) the export of capital, as opposed to the export of goods, acquires particular significance; 4) international monopolistic capitalist alliances are formed, dividing up the world; and 5) the territorial division of the earth by the largest capitalist powers is completed. Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development when the dominance of monopolies and finance capital has taken hold, the export of capital has acquired preeminent significance, the division of the world by international trusts has begun, and the division of the entire earth's territory by the largest capitalist countries has ended.

Imperialism is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat. This has been confirmed on a global scale since 1917."

(Imperialism, as the Highest Stage of Capitalism, from pp. 308-387 of Lenin's Collected Works, Vol. 27)

In connection with the above:

1) Which international monopoly alliance of capitalists dividing up the world does Russia belong to? Belarus, of course, is not included.

2) Which country is currently on the eve of proletarian revolution?

The point is that Russia, of course, is an imperialist to a certain extent. (I disagree with the idea that Russia is an imperialist; in my view, the proponents of this thesis, among the proponents of the Central Military District, are more philosophical than realistic.)

But who said that any war fought by an imperialist is imperialist? For example, France's imperial status in the 19th century did not prevent it from waging "truly national" wars:

"In the present imperialist war [1914-1918], which was born of all the conditions of the imperialist era, i.e., was not an accident, not an exception, not a deviation from the general and typical, phrases about defending the fatherland are a deception of the people, for this is not a national war. In a truly national war, the words 'defending the fatherland' are not a deception at all, and we are not at all against it." Such (truly national) wars occurred "especially" in the years 1789-1871, and the resolution, without denying their possibility even now, explains how to distinguish a truly national war from an imperialist one, disguised behind deceptively national slogans. Specifically, to make this distinction, one must consider whether the "basis" lies in a "protracted process of mass national movements," the "overthrow of national oppression." The resolution on "pacifism" states bluntly: "Social Democrats cannot deny the positive significance of revolutionary wars, that is, not imperialist wars, but those waged, for example" (note this: "for example"), "from 1789 to 1871 for the overthrow of national oppression..." Could our party's resolution in 1915 have spoken of national wars, examples of which occurred between 1789 and 1871, and indicated that we do not deny the positive significance of such wars, if such wars were not recognized as possible even today? Clearly, it could not...

...What is "defense of the fatherland," generally speaking? Is it some kind of scientific concept from the realm of economics or politics, etc.? No. It is simply the most current, commonly used, sometimes simply philistine expression, denoting the justification of war. Nothing more, absolutely nothing! The only "treacherous" thing here is that philistines are capable of justifying any war by saying, "We are defending the fatherland," whereas Marxism, which does not debase itself to the level of philistinism,

demands a historical analysis of each individual war to determine whether it can be considered progressive, serving the interests of democracy or the proletariat, and in this sense, legitimate, just, etc.

The slogan of defending the fatherland is often a philistine, unconscious justification of war, due to an inability to historically analyze the meaning and significance of each individual war.

Marxism provides such an analysis and says: if the "real essence" of war consists, for example, in the overthrow of foreign oppression (which was especially typical in Europe from 1789 to 1871), then war is progressive from the side of the oppressed state or nation. If the "true essence" of war is the redistribution of colonies, the division of spoils, and the plunder of foreign lands (such as the war of 1914-1916), then the phrase about defending the fatherland is "a complete deception of the people."

How then can we find the "true essence" of war, how can we define it? War is a continuation of politics. We must examine the politics that preceded the war, the politics that led to it and that led to it. If the politics was imperialist—that is, protecting the interests of finance capital, plundering and oppressing colonies and foreign countries—then the war that resulted from this politics is an imperialist war. If the politics was national liberation—that is, expressing a mass movement against national oppression—then the war that resulted from such politics is a war of national liberation.

The average person doesn't understand that war is a "continuation of politics," and therefore limits themselves to saying, "the enemy is attacking," "the enemy has invaded my country," without examining why the war is being waged, which classes are involved, or for what political goal. P. Kyiv descends completely to the level of such an average person when he says, for example, that the Germans occupied Belgium, which means, from the standpoint of self-determination, "the Belgian social patriots are right," or that the Germans occupied part of France, which means "Guess can be satisfied," since "it's a matter of territory inhabited by this nation" (and not by a foreign nation).

For the average person, what matters is where the troops are stationed and who is currently winning. For a Marxist, what matters is why

a given war is being waged, during which one or another army may emerge victorious. (On the caricature of Marxism from 1980-83 of Lenin's Collected Works, Vol. 30)

In connection with the above:

- 1) A social democrat/communist cannot criticize the SVO for being an "attack on independent Ukraine" or an "invasion of Ukraine."
- 2) A social democrat/communist must clearly define the "true essence" of the war and "study the policy before the war, the policy leading to and leading to the war." In other words, ignoring NATO expansion, bribery, and the drawing of Ukraine into the European-American sphere of influence, and the events since 2014, is un-Marxist.

Repeating that Russia is imperialist and the SVO is an imperialist war is simply mindless repetition of dogma. Regarding this, Lenin wrote:

"The doctrine of Marx and Engels, as they always explained, consists in this: 'our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action.'"

(First All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, June 3-24 (June 16-July 7), 1917, with 266 PSS of Lenin, vol. 32)

"It would be a grave mistake if we were to force the complex, urgent, rapidly developing practical tasks of the revolution into the Procrustean bed of a narrowly defined 'theory,' instead of seeing in theory, first and foremost, a guide to action."

(Letters from Afar, letter "On the Proletarian Militia," with 44 PSS of Lenin, vol. 31)

In light of the above, a Marxist cannot endlessly repeat the truisms of Marxism, relevant at the time of the First World War, and ignore the specifics of the situation. Specifically, addressing those who suddenly decided in February that Russia had attacked Ukraine, Lenin wrote:

"We are familiar with the saying of one of the most famous writers on the philosophy of war and the history of war—Clausewitz—which reads: 'War is the continuation of politics by other means.' This saying belongs to a writer who surveyed the history of war and drew philosophical lessons from it—shortly after the Napoleonic Wars. This writer, whose fundamental ideas have now become an indispensable asset to every thinking person, already fought some 80 years ago against the philistine and ignorant prejudice that war can be isolated from the policies of the respective governments, the respective classes, that war can ever be regarded as a simple attack that violates the peace, and then the restoration of that broken peace. They fought and made peace! This is a crude and ignorant view, refuted decades ago and refuted by any, even the most attentive, analysis of any historical era of wars...

The actual policies of both groups of the greatest capitalist giants—England and Germany, who, along with their allies, moved against each other—this policy, spanning decades before the war, must be studied and understood in its entirety. If we failed to do so, we would not only have forgotten the fundamental demand of scientific socialism and all social science in general, but we would have deprived ourselves of the opportunity to understand anything about modern warfare. We would have surrendered ourselves to the power of Miliukov, a deceiver who fanned chauvinism and hatred of one people for another with methods that are used without exception everywhere, methods about which Clausewitz, whom I mentioned at the beginning, wrote eighty years ago, even then ridiculing the notion that, look, peoples lived peacefully and then came to blows! As if that were true! Can war be explained without linking it to the preceding policies of a given state, a given system of states, and given classes? I repeat once again: this is the fundamental question, constantly forgotten, and due to its misunderstanding, nine-tenths of conversations about the war degenerate into empty squabbles and empty rhetoric. We say: if you have not studied the policies of both groups of belligerent powers over decades—to avoid accidents, to avoid singling out isolated examples—if you have not shown the connection between this war and its preceding policies, you have understood nothing about this war!

(War and Revolution, lecture, May 14 (27), 1917, pp. 78-82, Lenin's Collected Works, Vol. 32)

In conclusion, a little about Lenin's position at the end of World War I in June 1917:

"Such a solution—we must tell the truth—is a solution to the problem through a deal with the capitalists and between capitalists. It means: let us abandon the old seizures (made before the war), and let there be no new ones." Firstly, such a decision cannot be justified by a socialist without betraying socialism. It is not the job of a socialist to reconcile capitalists to the old division of the spoils, i.e., conquests. This is clear. Secondly, such a decision is impossible to implement without a revolution against capital, at least Anglo-Japanese capital, for anyone sane can see that Japan will not give up Kiao-Chao, nor England Baghdad or the African colonies without a revolution.

The peasant decision defined conquests (annexations) differently, proclaiming the right of "every" people (including those annexed, i.e., forcibly annexed before the war) to freedom, to "independently determine their own destiny."

This is the only correct decision from the standpoint of a truly consistent democrat, especially a socialist. No socialist, while remaining a socialist, can pose the question of annexations (seizures) any other way; they cannot deny every people the right to self-determination, the freedom to secede.

But let's not deceive ourselves: such a demand means a revolution against the capitalists. And above all, the British capitalists, who have more annexations (seizures) than any nation in the world, would most certainly not accept such a demand (without a revolution).

Both demands, both desires—the desire to renounce annexations in the sense of restoring the old ("status quo"), and the desire to renounce both new and old annexations, all annexations—both desires are unrealizable without a revolution against capital, without the overthrow of the capitalists. We must not deceive ourselves or the people about this!

Either preach and wait for a deal with the capitalists, which is tantamount to instilling in the people a trust in their worst enemies, or trust in the workers' revolution, and only in it, concentrating all efforts on the overthrow of the capitalists. A choice must be made between these two paths to ending the war."

(A deal with the capitalists or the overthrow of the capitalists? (How to end the war) from 199-200 of Lenin's PSS, Vol. 32)

That is, in the summer of 1917, Lenin, of course, wasn't "deceived" and was counting on a revolution, "above all" and "primarily" against the British capitalists, "who have more annexations than any nation in the world." It's hard to say now who has more annexations – Britain or the United States.

In short, while Lenin did count on a revolution in England, and at the beginning of the 20th century this was a perfectly realistic scenario, today only a naive fantasist could expect something similar in England or the United States. And the one-sided call for Russia to lay down its arms, the one-sided desire for "defeat to its government" and surrender to "annexation" by a "free Ukraine" (allegedly in Lenin's style) and the imperialist United States, somehow ignores the historical context (the absence of a world war, an international revolutionary situation, etc.), the economic power of states, the balance of political forces, Lenin's own definitions of annexations, imperialist and national wars, and Lenin's analysis of specific wars and events. Not to mention the appropriation of Lenin's positions on specific issues at specific periods of time (for example, in the Resolution of the Central Committee of the RSDLP(b), adopted on April 21 (May 4), 1917 (volume 31, p. 309), Lenin rejects the slogan "from the imperialist war to the civil war," which many dogmatic leftists like to mindlessly chant today) and the thoughtless application of parallels to completely different phenomena. In conclusion, once again: "our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action."

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_155094](https://vk.com/wall7006326_155094)

My post October 30, 2022

In the imperialist war of 1914-1917, between two imperialist coalitions, we must be against the "defense of the fatherland," for (1) imperialism is the eve of socialism; (2) An imperialist war is a war of thieves for booty; (3) Both coalitions have an advanced proletariat; (4) In both, the socialist revolution is ripe. That's the only reason we're against "defense of the fatherland," that's the only reason!

January 19, 1917.

Citizens with their pedantic scholasticism, what is Ilyich writing here? Is he really saying that Communists should never rise up in defense of the bourgeois fatherland?

Or that every war is imperialism?

Or perhaps that we shouldn't pay attention to whether a revolutionary situation has matured in the warring countries?

Ah, perhaps Lenin is writing here that Communists should wrap themselves in the flags of the powers at war with your country and demand its defeat? [https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_148950](https://vk.com/wall7006326_148950)

November 21, 2022

So, it turns out it's not necessary to use the classics to prove that the conflict in Ukraine isn't imperialistic on Russia's part. For Russia, the conflict in Ukraine is essentially anti-colonialist, liberating, unifying in the sense of gathering lands, and deeply anti-imperialist. And in this sense, Russia's actions are absolutely progressive from a Marxist perspective.

But some leftists still try to draw an analogy between this conflict and World War I. However, let us, in the end, turn to Lenin for help.

Excerpt from Lenin's work "Russian Südekums."

"Engels wrote to Marx in 1870 that W. Liebknecht was mistaken in making anti-Bismarckism his sole guiding principle...

The unification of Germany was necessary, and Marx, both before and after 1848, always recognized this. As early as 1859, Engels directly called on the German people to go to war for the sake of unification. When revolutionary unification failed, Bismarck did it counterrevolutionarily, in the Junker style. Anti-Bismarckism, as a sole principle, became absurd, for the completion of the necessary unification had become a fact. And in Russia?" Read also

(There is a direct analogy here with the current situation related to the conflict in Ukraine. The protection of the Russian and Russian-speaking population living in Russia's ancestral territories, which comprise most of Ukraine, is a pressing issue for all of Russian society. And this is not a shameful phenomenon, as some leftists characterize it as social chauvinism. It is a progressive, Marxist phenomenon. Especially given the absence of a revolutionary situation in the countries of Western imperialism and in Ukraine.)

After all, in essence, Lenin, in a letter to Armand on January 19, 1917, explicitly wrote that we refuse to defend the Fatherland only for several reasons that arose in 1914-1917. "In the imperialist war of 1914-1917, between two imperialist coalitions, we must be against 'defense of the fatherland,' for (1) imperialism is the eve of socialism; (2) imperialist war is a thieves' war for booty; (3) both coalitions have an advanced proletariat; (4) in both, the socialist revolution is ripe. Only for this reason are we against 'defense of the fatherland,' only for this reason!"

Here is another quote from Lenin from "The Russian Südekums"

On the Western countries' silence about preparations for war!

"The German bourgeoisie is sophistically accused of violating the peace, while the bourgeoisie of the 'Triple Entente's long and persistent preparations for war against it are hushed up." Here's a more detailed look at Ilyich's view on the pressing question of whether it matters who attacked first, a question that's relevant today: "Essay on 'The Proletariat and War,' October 1 (14), 1914":

"We all expected this imperialist war; we prepared for it. And if that's the case, then it doesn't matter at all who attacked; everyone prepared for war, and whoever attacked at the given moment considered it more advantageous."

So, in these two examples, I've shown that even in imperialist wars, for a Marxist, it makes no difference at all who made the first move. Because one must look at the situation holistically.

Furthermore, in the case of national liberation wars, Lenin fully justifies even the offensive nature of such wars. A quote from the same essay:

"Of course, even now there are still stains of the old paint in the living picture of reality." Thus, of all the warring countries, only the Serbs are still fighting for national existence. In India and China, class-conscious proletarians could also not choose any other path than the national one, since their countries had not yet formed into nation-states. If China were forced to wage an offensive war to achieve this, we could only sympathize with it, because objectively, it would be a progressive war. Similarly, in 1848, Marx could preach an offensive war against Russia.

Let me remind you that Ukraine is, to a large extent, a historical part of the pan-Russian space. And the fact that territories with Russian and Russian-speaking populations living there were once torn away from us, not even by military means but by deception, does not prove that our people have no right to reunification. For Marxists, any path to reunification can be understandable and morally acceptable, even a military one, if circumstances dictate so."

So, in my article, I've clearly demonstrated that the conflict in Ukraine is not imperialist or predatory for Russia from the perspective of scientific Marxism. Moreover, it has a clearly liberating character, regardless of the attitude toward this conflict on the part of Russia's ruling bourgeois class. Moreover, it is precisely the ruling bourgeoisie, or rather, the majority of it, that is apparently interested in Russia's defeat and, probably, as it believes, in continuing to exist in a vassal state to Western imperialism.

That is, in essence, within this global conflict there are several conflicts: the confrontation between the semi-colony that is Russia itself in its relations with Western imperialism; the confrontation between our semi-colony and the Ukrainian colony of the West; the confrontation between citizens within Ukraine and the comprador, Nazi regime; and the confrontation between Russian Patriots, including communists, against Russian comprador bourgeois pro-Western forces.

Read also

And, while waging an information war against Ukrainian Nazism and Western imperialism, we must, of course, not forget the confrontation between Russian left-patriotic society and the Russian reactionary pro-Western bourgeoisie.

Moreover, in a letter to Armand dated January 19, 1917, Lenin outlines a number of conditions under which we can oppose the defense of our fatherland. One of the most important points there is that the warring countries must be in a revolutionary situation and have a powerful movement of the revolutionary proletariat capable of initiating revolutionary action in all warring countries, not just in one. Otherwise, we are effectively siding with the enemy, in this case, the imperialist predators of the West.

Does this mean that we are only playing for the defense of the Kremlin's current course? Of course not: we stand for the bright ideals of justice, In defense of the oppressed and dispossessed strata of Ukrainian society, against the bandit imperialism of the United States and the West in general, the defense of the Fatherland in this case is not alien to Marxism.

At the same time, we must not forget that Russia will soon have millions of young veterans who will join the political struggle in any case. And they can become the force that can help significantly reform Russian capitalism. And our task is to do everything possible to ensure this is accomplished under the leadership of left-wing forces.

This text is an excerpt from an article from SP

<https://svpressa.ru/blogs/article/352488/>

Post from October 30, 2022

Here is Lenin's brief response to the verbal diarrhea of those who believe the West isn't fighting in Ukraine because there are supposedly no Western soldiers there. Firstly, they have been there from the very beginning, and secondly, Lenin's text is below...

... There's no need to write anything more... Well, this is for the intelligent, for I need to cite another 1000 quotes from Ilyich, but that still won't be enough for him :-))

So, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" VIII. Parasitism and the Decay of Capitalism...

2) Recruiting an army from dependent peoples. "The first is the custom of economic parasitism, by virtue of which the dominant state uses its provinces, colonies, and dependent countries to enrich its ruling class and to bribe its lower classes to keep them quiet." For such bribery, in whatever form it takes, to be economically feasible, requires—we might add—a monopolistically high profit.

Regarding the second circumstance, Hobson writes: "One of the strangest symptoms of the blindness of imperialism is the carelessness with which Great Britain, France, and other imperialist nations take this path. Great Britain has gone further than anyone else. Most of the battles by which we conquered our Indian Empire were fought by our troops, composed of natives; in India, as recently in Egypt, large standing armies are under British command; almost all the wars connected with our conquest of Africa, with the exception of its southern part, were waged for us by natives."

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_149127?w=wall7006326\\_149127](https://vk.com/wall7006326_149127?w=wall7006326_149127)

There's one comment below, written against my position, but it contains a lot of valuable support!!! The tenets of Marxism are important here: so, in assessing war, it doesn't matter to us who attacked, and we can only oppose unjust, predatory wars, not all wars. And most importantly, we should consider the benefit each position brings to revolutionary processes!

Next comment!

"...A socialist, a revolutionary proletarian, an internationalist, reasons differently: the nature of a war (whether it's reactionary or revolutionary) depends not on who attacked and in whose country the "enemy" is, but on which class is waging the war and what policies are being pursued by the war. If a given war is a reactionary, imperialist war, i.e. "Led by two global groups of the imperialist, violent, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, every bourgeoisie (even that of a small country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my task, the task of the representative of the revolutionary proletariat, is to prepare for the world proletarian revolution as the only salvation from the horrors of global carnage. I must argue not from the perspective of "my" country (for that would be the argument of a wretched

blockhead, a nationalist philistine who doesn't understand that he is a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the perspective of my participation in the preparation, in the propaganda, in bringing about the world proletarian revolution."

---

V.I. Lenin / THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE RENEGADE KAUTSKY.

The following is a very interesting excerpt from a speech by V.I. Lenin. Seventh (April) All-Russian Conference of the RSDLP(b). April 24–29 (May 7–12), 1917. Opening Speech at the Conference. April 24 (May 7).

Posted February 13, 2023.

"Especially in the 20th century, capitalism developed by leaps and bounds, and the war accomplished what hadn't been accomplished in 25 years. Nationalization of industry advanced not only in Germany but also in England. Monopoly in general was transformed into state monopoly. The objective state of affairs showed that the war accelerated the development of capitalism, and it moved from capitalism to imperialism, from monopoly to nationalization. All this advanced the socialist revolution and created the objective conditions for it. Thus, the socialist revolution was advanced by the course of the war."

What does this excerpt from Lenin's speech tell us?

I think, first of all, that wars cannot be seen as solely negative phenomena. Marxists are humanists, it's true, but Marxists understand perfectly well that the road to hell is paved with good intentions! And since historical development has led Russian society to war, we Marxists must strive to make the most of this situation, especially since the very logic of further development is driving the ruling Russian oligarchic regime into the trap of a sharp left turn! Because Russia, as a state, can only survive by using, essentially, socialist mechanisms! Including the nationalization of several sectors of the economy.

But today, a leftist non-warrior, and therefore anti-Marxist, will say that no change can occur within the framework of the bourgeois system. And in doing so, he will go against scientific communism, against the dialectical understanding of social development!

At the same time, I would also warn people against the other extreme, the extreme of hoping that everything will sort itself out. No, the idea of a left turn must be made popular in society. A left turn must become the national idea of the majority of society; a left turn must become a conscious necessity. Only then can a true left turn occur, leading to a socialist transformation of society as it did in 1917.

For those who don't understand why it's important for revolutionary forces to demand a leftward turn from the existing government, I'll highlight an important aspect. Besides greatly increasing Russia's chances of victory in the conflict with Western imperialism, it also facilitates our transition to a socialist path of development. The fact is that without private ownership of a large enterprise, the bourgeoisie's resistance to our progressive steps is significantly weakened. Let's say a classic revolution is taking place somewhere, and the revolutionary people demand the bourgeoisie hand over its assets. In such a case, the private sector will hire huge armies and defend "their" factories with weapons in hand. This will ultimately lead to civil war and enormous casualties. During war, the state apparatus, under the control of a section of the bourgeoisie, gains broad powers, which are supported by the majority of citizens of the warring country. This is especially true in our case, where the majority of the people understand that in the current conflict, Russia is the primary victim. Thus, with the presence of state monopolies, the

chances for progressive change increase many times over. "What if we don't win?" a skeptic on the left asks. But Lenin answered his doubts here, too.

Also from the same speech.

We are fighting not to be defeated, but to emerge victorious. At the very least, we are counting on partial success. If we suffer defeat, we will achieve partial success. This will be reforms. Reforms are an auxiliary means of class struggle.

Let me remind you that these words were spoken by Lenin on April 24, 1917, Old Style!

Thus, the slogans and demands for a left turn are crucial today and, without exaggeration, revolutionary!

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_158680\\_r158893](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_158680_r158893)

ARTICLE FROM SP, August 28, 2022.

Do you condemn Nazism in Ukraine—does that mean you're a chauvinist?

Support for the SVO is based on the understanding that Ukraine has been taken over by far-right elements.

They probably think chauvinism is such a bad word that it can be applied indiscriminately to any situation, thereby putting your opponent on their backs.

These are gentlemen who haven't studied Marxism, formally affiliated with left-wing movements and even various communist parties.

However, chauvinism and all its variations and phrases have specific designations for certain phenomena.

It's become fashionable now to write to those who didn't condemn the special operation or even supported it, saying that you're a national chauvinist, etc. Let's figure out if these chauvinists even exist.

I'm sure they do, they exist in all strata of society, even among representatives of different nationalities.

But let's say I've seen thousands of times that when someone calls for "punching the hohols in the face for Great Rus'," they immediately receive public condemnation in the form of numerous comments, the gist of which boils down to the idea that you yourself are just as much a Nazi as those targeted by the special operation.

That is, there's a strong understanding in society that the SVO is primarily directed against the political regime in Ukraine, which holds extremely nationalist positions and pursues Nazi policies toward a number of national minorities and other segments of Ukrainian citizens.

Incidentally, this aspect isn't even particularly contested by adherents of what is essentially a religious sect of the left, proponents of the theory of a "flat" "imperialist war" against Ukraine.

At the same time, true Marxists have already refuted these fallacies of leftist dogmatists a thousand times over with their arguments, and it is probably for this reason that they began to accuse Marxists of chauvinism.

So, what exactly is chauvinism? Let's look at what various sources provide when defining this fashionable word in sectarian-leftist circles:

Wikipedia: Chauvinism (French: chauvinisme) is an ideology of national superiority that aims to justify the right to discriminate, exploit, and oppress other peoples. Chauvinism fosters the emergence and spread of hostility and even hatred toward outsiders, foreigners, and people of other faiths, based on the principle "different—alien—alien—enemy." One of the forms of heteronomy and xenophobia.

Great Russian Encyclopedia:

CHAUVINISM, an extreme form of nationalism; preaching of nat. exclusivity and superiority. According to Hannah Arendt, chauvinism is a natural product of the national concept, growing directly from the old idea of the "national mission."

Chauvinism Chauvinism (French: chauvinisme) is an extreme form of nationalism, preaching national exclusivity; opposing the interests of one nation to the interests of all other nations, spreading national arrogance, and inciting national enmity and hatred. The term "ch." appeared in France [in 1831 in the comedy "The Tricolor Cockade" by the brothers I. and T. Cognard; one of the characters was the aggressively warlike recruit Nicolas Chauvin; it is believed that the prototype for this character was a real person – Napoleonic war veteran N. Chauvin, raised in the spirit of admiration for the emperor – the creator of France's "greatness"). The word "ch." came to denote various manifestations of nationalist extremism. In Great Britain, chauvinism received a special name—jingoism—since the late 1870s. Other manifestations of chauvinism include social chauvinism and Great Power chauvinism. It became widespread in imperialist countries. Its most extreme manifestation is the misanthropic ideology and policies of fascist states. Marxist-Leninist parties have always considered the fight against all forms of chauvinism and its proponents one of the most important tasks.

There is, however, also Great Power chauvinism, a form of chauvinism, nationalism, the ideology and policies of the ruling exploiting classes of a nation occupying a dominant (power) position in the state, who declare their nation to be the "superior" nation. Great Power chauvinism arose during the era of the formation of bourgeois nations, nationalities, multinational states, and colonial empires. The bourgeoisie's policies in the dominant "great" nations are aimed at enslaving other nations, discriminating against them in economic, political, and cultural spheres, and depriving them of their independence. V.Sh., like chauvinism in general, is characterized by the incitement of enmity and hatred between peoples, the persecution and harassment of individuals of other nationalities...

(Source: Soviet Encyclopedia).

So, what we see is that chauvinism is essentially the same Nazism, albeit in more diffuse forms.

However, supporters of the left-wing special operation always consistently oppose all forms of Nazism, authoritarianism, and the infringement of rights based on nationality. Moreover, their support for the SVO is based precisely on the understanding that Ukraine has been captured by outright far-right elements, in the employ of Western imperialists. The evidence for this fact, unfortunately, is so overwhelming that some leftist dogmatists seem to have already accepted all these instances of far-right Nazism by the Kyiv regime as the norm.

For decades, the Russian-speaking population in Ukraine has been persecuted because of their language affiliation. Left-wingers have been persecuted for decades, and for the past eight years, a veritable reign of terror has been unleashed against communists throughout Ukraine. Thousands of communist supporters have been killed, imprisoned, or otherwise persecuted.

For decades, Nazi views have been cultivated and popularized there, along with far-right terrorist organizations and pressure on representatives of various ethnic groups, including Jews, Roma, and others, not just Russians. There are thousands upon thousands of such cases.

But some leftist dogmatists, for some reason, have seen a manifestation of chauvinism on the part of Marxists precisely in the demand to end this Nazi lawlessness in Ukraine.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin often taught us to pay attention to the differences between bourgeois regimes, without adopting a formulaic approach to developing tactics to combat them. The world after Lenin faced the most aggressive chauvinism in human history; European fascism of the 1930s led to the clash of virtually all of humanity in the 1940s.

At the same time, we shouldn't close our eyes and say that on one side there were the forces of evil, while on the other, everyone was soft and tame. Of course, we understand that Britain, and indeed the United States, waged a war against Nazi Germany and its allies that was entirely imperialistic, seeking to redistribute spheres of influence across virtually the entire globe. I'm sure that the capitalist countries even employed chauvinistic tactics against the German people and their allies, inciting hatred of all things German by the British, US citizens, and their allies in the capitalist countries.

And even in this situation, the USSR, and even communists in a number of these capitalist countries, were forced to choose between the lesser evil. For example, Mao Zedong insisted on launching joint military operations with Chiang Kai-shek against the Japanese imperialists. Of course, Mao did this with Stalin's approval. Naturally, communists from the United States, Britain, Australia, and Canada also volunteered for the front to fight against humanity's main enemy, Nazism-fascism. Let me repeat, this occurred despite the fact that both Britain and the United States were essentially chauvinistic countries; one only needs to recall the laws infringing on the rights of Black citizens in the United States.

Would it have occurred to any communist of that time to call the USSR a chauvinistic country, or to call those American communists who shared the same trenches with soldiers of other political views, perhaps even segregationists, chauvinists?

We, modern Marxists, today see the full complexity of the historical moment as clearly as ever. The military-political bloc of Western imperialist countries had been preparing for this battle for years, even decades. And, alas, it was Russia's leadership that was essentially the main instigator of these events, presenting itself as a defenseless victim, destroying science, industry, and the army, corrupting society, and creating a gigantic bourgeois class that functions as a comprador servant of Western countries. All these years, decades, we've been warning how all this activity of destroying common sense will end. For decades, we've been calling for the salvation of the fraternal Ukrainian people from the Nazi elite that has seized power there. We say that Ukrainians are our brothers, and we must not abandon them in their time of need.

And yet, leftist dogmatists tell us that the fight against American imperialism is chauvinism, the fight against Ukrainian and other Nazism is chauvinism, and the fight to defend communist ideals is, in their opinion, also chauvinism. Soon, they'll probably tell us that any political struggle is chauvinism. A kind of Tolstoyanism. No, if you like to call us chauvinists, that's your right! But we remain Marxists, which means we won't abandon the struggle at all, not even where you're ready to betray all the bright communist ideals! <https://svpressa.ru/blogs/article/344357/>

Article in the SP 5.09.2022

For decades, virtually all leftists in Russia have claimed that Russia is a Western raw materials colony.

And in fact, this isn't an unfounded assertion, but rather the actual state of affairs in the Russian economy.

Despite all the Kremlin gang's claims about some kind of rise from its knees, and then about import substitution, it turns out that even our Kamaz truck isn't ours in terms of its internal components.

What can I say? We can't even produce high-octane gasoline in the required quantity and quality to fuel the foreign cars of oligarchs, their servants, and other top security officials who drive the hated Western Mercedes and Bentleys.

To be an advanced superpower in the capitalist sense, in my opinion, you need to have an advanced industry with advanced technology, and therefore advanced education and science.

It's also important for a country to have enormous investment opportunities, primarily for capital export, particularly because there's little room for such capital in your country, as you have a developed industry and your population is already effectively employed in other important sectors.

There are such countries in the world, and quite a few of them. There are, incidentally, countries that possess virtually nothing but gigantic investment opportunities without much indigenous technology; here, we're talking primarily about countries like the United Arab Emirates. But powerful capitalist countries generally possess both technology and enormous investment potential. This is primarily the United States, of course, but countries with smaller investment potential, such as Germany, Japan, Britain, France, Italy, and others, are still orders of magnitude greater than modern Russia's. This is especially true when considering technology and investment combined.

Added to this situation is the fact that the world, technologically speaking, is divided among corporations, which are often owned by the same investors, essentially monopolists in many sectors of the economy.

In his work "Imperialism and the Split of Socialism," Lenin explains the distinctive features of imperialist war. First, he points out that the era of imperialist wars began literally in the late 1890s. This is due to the special conditions of capitalist development. This special era, which Lenin considers the final stage on the eve of socialist revolutions. Moreover, Lenin saw the hot phase of this imperialism, in the form of imperialist wars, as a manifestation of the confrontation between international monopolies.

Here are some of his conclusions: "The export of capital, as a particularly characteristic phenomenon in contrast to the export of goods under non-monopoly capitalism, is closely linked to the economic and political-territorial division of the world."

And here's something even more interesting: "The distinctive feature of imperialism is the dominance not of industrial but of financial capital, the desire to annex not only agrarian countries, but all countries."

I would especially like to note that the current Russian-Ukrainian conflict has nothing in common with these definitions! I repeat, Lenin considered these definitions the "crux," that is, the foundation, in defining imperialist war.

During the war, namely in 1916, Lenin very often condemned those leftists who called for peace in a bourgeois pacifist manner. He proposed transforming the wars of empires into civil wars, essentially socialist revolutions. And simple demands for peace, in his view, could help the bourgeoisie avoid revolutions, thereby saving the capitalists.

Moreover, Lenin often mentions the uniqueness of the moment, claiming that it is precisely an imperialist war that offers the chance for a socialist revolution. Not just any war!

During this same period, Lenin repeatedly denied that he opposed any wars whatsoever. He was undoubtedly an ardent supporter of civil wars between the proletariat and its oppressors, but he also openly ridiculed those leftists who propagated the idea that the proletariat had no Fatherland.

Citing the views of Marx and Engels when they literally fanned German patriotism in the wars for German unification, all these discussions can be explored in depth in letters to Radek, Armand, and others.

Thus, Lenin did not reject the possibility of supporting national wars for the unification of lands fragmented as a result of historical injustice, and especially anti-colonial wars.

Now let's return to our mortal world. What do we see today? Russia is a backward, raw-materials-based economy with backward financial and industrial capital, exploited for decades by advanced Western countries, using various schemes to completely drain the country of finances, raw materials, the best labor resources, etc. It has accepted onerous conditions for joining the WTO and other organizations. Russia's elite is largely composed of citizens of Western and other countries, whose children, and especially grandchildren, hardly speak Russian anymore, much less think.

In short, a typical colonial policy. It's important to understand that Lenin also points out that Western countries had already conquered many new colonies, primarily using soldiers from old colonies. This means we shouldn't delude ourselves into thinking that a country has its own army. It's quite possible that it might not be guarding the interests of the people living in that country.

And so, on February 24th, Russia crossed the Rubicon. Whether the elites realized it or not, the fact remains.

Russia is challenging virtually the entire Western world. All empires at once. United now, more than ever.

Essentially, whether the Russian elites intended it or not, they have unleashed both an anti-colonialist and a national unification war.

But in many ways, this war is a war waged by the elites, led by the so-called elites, who probably dream of remaining a colony. Or rather, they dreamed of it before February 24th. But then something went wrong. And now they understand that they cannot lose. But they cannot win without the people's participation, and their victory would also mean the partial liberation of the common people.

So there's every reason to believe they will have to make changes, including ending colonial dependence.

If they win, of course.

I don't even want to imagine what will happen if Russia loses this confrontation.

But of course, there will definitely be no socialist revolution!

Lenin made this clear in "Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder," writing that the Bolsheviks won the civil war and held on to power largely only because the imperialist countries were busy fighting among themselves and simply lacked the strength to launch a powerful, combined attack!

Today, Russia, having entered certain regions of Ukraine, immediately begins distributing passports to those wishing to become Russian citizens. Moreover, laws have been passed simplifying the process of obtaining citizenship for all Ukrainian citizens. Thus, all of Russia recognizes Ukrainians as equals. Of course, this attitude toward Ukrainians is further proof that Russia is waging a war of liberation, not conquest.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_138047](https://vk.com/wall7006326_138047)

6. Critical support for the SVO is in the interests of the Russian working class. In general, the SVO is essentially a revolutionary struggle!

My post, March 6, 2023

Why relative support for the SVO is class struggle in the interests of the proletariat!

To be more precise, it's a demand to crush the Western imperialist scum and the Nazi regime in Ukraine, not support for the contradictory SVO.

So, in my opinion, the SVO is an attempt by the Russian ruling regime to demonstrate to its Western partners that they are ready to defend national interests. This attempt, in my view, is unsuccessful, primarily due to the lack of professionalism among the upper elites, especially in military matters. And also because of the umbilical cord connecting the Russian bourgeoisie to their Western patrons. Moreover, in my opinion, I especially emphasize that the majority of the Russian bourgeoisie, which is essentially comprador and vassal-dependent, is afraid of severing this umbilical cord. But for ordinary citizens, victory in this conflict is a vital issue, just as defeat in this conflict would pose mortal danger to Russia as a state. And this mortal danger is not some abstraction; it will push tens of millions of citizens of today's Russia to the brink of survival.

I have already substantiated my position thousands of times, explaining why Russia is the defending side in this conflict and, overall, is waging a just war from a Marxist-Leninist perspective.

But without lyricism or theoretical postulates, I would like to outline concrete steps from a class perspective, explaining why the defeat of Western imperialism and Ukrainian Nazism benefits workers in Russia, Ukraine, and the entire world.

So, a political crisis is clearly brewing in Russia. The authorities have failed to achieve the objectives set in the Central Military District in a short timeframe and with limited resources.

Consequently, in my opinion, a significant rift has developed within the bourgeoisie and continues to deepen. Likewise, bourgeois ties with Western masters and partners, frightened by the Western hegemon's sanctions measures, are being severed!

These facts give reason to believe that part of the Russian ruling class will have to seek support among the masses, and above all, among the working class. This is especially true because part of the bourgeoisie has significantly separated itself from its Western patrons and is, by and large, de facto candidates for criminal prosecution in various courts and tribunals in the event of a total victory for the Western coalition. And there, the sentences will in many cases be short and, de facto, extrajudicial. We can assert and recall as much as we like that the Russian regime has been integrated into the Western world order for decades. But denying the obvious—namely, the Kremlin's monstrous conflict with the West—is simply foolish.

So, Russian leaders clearly don't want to end up on the gallows. But a section of the Kremlin's bourgeoisie may well be eager to facilitate the dispatch of the Kremlin's hawks to The Hague.

Therefore, even if the war ends relatively quickly, the authorities will still have to take steps to accommodate the working people. Moreover, they will demonstratively suppress and curtail both the oligarchic interests and appetites!

But the war, alas, looks set to be with us for a very long time. And it won't stop, even if the Ukrainian Armed Forces reach the 1991 borders!

Therefore, the demand for more skilled workers, engineers, and other technical professionals will increase exponentially. More and more passionate and even ambitious people will enter the blue-collar professions, people who won't silently tolerate injustice. Overall, the importance of the working person will grow exponentially!

And as their importance grows, so will their class consciousness. This means the country will become more progressive in the Marxist-Leninist sense of the word. Which, ultimately, could lead to a change in the socio-economic structure. But that's a somewhat distant future. But it's inevitable, because quantity will transform into quality!

And when we demand a new industrialization from the government today, and to achieve this, the nationalization of key sectors of the economy, including the banking sector, we demand a leftward turn to achieve victory over global improvisation. We are thereby laying the foundation for the emergence of progressive and revolutionary soil in Russia! For the advancement of our socialist victory!

Well, and then we will be able to extend a helping hand to all other representatives of the great army of labor throughout the world!

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_161441\\_r161511](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_161441_r161511)

My comment in the salvo on November 3, 2025.

We are talking about Marxists from various countries supporting Russia in the conflict in Ukraine and what this could lead to in a world revolution!

...Dozens of decisions have been made on this subject at Marxist international conferences, involving dozens and even hundreds of Marxist organizations from around the world. The fact is that Russia today is a defending force against global imperialism! And any resistance by the Russian masses against the army now will lead to catastrophe at the front and a clear victory for the Western forces. Ultimately, there will be a catastrophe for the entire world, as the world will lose one of the few independent states, especially those with nuclear potential—well, almost an independent Russia... Lenin repeatedly said that the 1917 Revolution was victorious only because two imperialist blocs clashed, weakened in this war, a revolt developed in their countries, and they were unable to respond to the Revolution in Russia. Who is weakened now? Germany, France, England, the USA? And so on. Where is the revolt? Which countries will be able to advance westward into Ukraine without NATO troops invading Russia, and so on? You see, if the Greeks derail two trains, it will be 0.0001 of NATO's power. And if the leftists in Russia derail two trains, that would be, say, 1% of their power... In general, we need to speak mathematically here, not emotionally. What is the goal of these actions? The victory of the socialist

revolution in Russia? I wrote above that it won't happen as long as Western countries are strong. But we can cause a catastrophe in Russia, and thus the West will win!

<https://t.me/zalpa1917/209654>

## 7. WHAT PRATICAL RESULTS DO WE EXPECT FROM OUR POSITION?

Post from: July 26, 2022

You often hear some misguided leftists say that today we must oppose special operations. And then they immediately cite the experience of World War I.

Well, that was a war of alliances of states and empires. Now it's a war of Western empires against the sovereignty of Russia and in defense of the Nazi regime in Ukraine. Technically, advocating for the defeat of one's governments back then was progressive, as it could have led to proletarian revolutions in a number of countries. Russia's defeat now would lead to its dismemberment, strengthening the ultra-right in these new countries and, in fact, throughout Europe, including Ukraine, of course.

And here, by the way, are some interesting thoughts from Lenin, largely on this subject...

"I had to point this out already at the beginning of 1918, and two years of experience since then have fully confirmed the correctness of this consideration. Such specific conditions as 1) the possibility of combining the Soviet coup with the end, thanks to it, of the imperialist war, which had incredibly exhausted the workers and peasants; 2) the possibility of utilizing, for a certain time, the mortal struggle between two globally powerful groups of imperialist predators, which groups were unable to unite against the Soviet enemy."

...

I hope you understand why Ilyich's opinion is important to us in practical terms today?

So, back then, there was no monolith among the developed countries, and they were extremely weakened by the world war. This is largely why Soviet Russia managed to retain power and sovereignty!

Now, with a military defeat in Ukraine, we will be torn apart if civil strife breaks out here, and even more so, they will assemble a powerful military force of fresh forces if a Red Revolution breaks out here. Because we will be presented to the Western public as the main warmongers and revanchists.

At the same time, just after the relative success of the special operation for Russia, the left could significantly strengthen its position within the country and launch an attack on the regime against the backdrop of a deteriorating socio-economic situation. And in such a situation, those same Western countries, in my opinion, will be more sympathetic to the left and are unlikely to be able to organize an intervention, even if the left takes power.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_137176?w=wall7006326\\_137176](https://vk.com/wall7006326_137176?w=wall7006326_137176)

My article in Svobodnaya Pressa, October 22, 2022.

Russia has launched an anti-colonialist uprising.

The special operation is the national bourgeoisie's response to the long-standing expansion of Western imperialism.

This is an anti-colonialist uprising! I admit that Vladimir Putin wanted to carry it out from the top, with a small force. That's the style of the secret services. But something went wrong on February 24. There's much to be said about this, but we don't know all the details, to put it mildly. Although I admit that even the president doesn't know all the nuances...

There are many theories about what happened in the first weeks after February 24. Perhaps Western intelligence agencies outmaneuvered Russia and drew Russia into "aggression," while the Kremlin thought it was heading where its people were waiting. There's a theory that the Russian side was simply run by idiots who screwed up for no apparent reason. In principle, both of these scenarios could be considered a single theory. But the fact remains: the special operation involved all of Russian society. Previously, the head of state could send signals to the entire country, saying, "We're in charge here and can decide everything as we please, and we don't really need you." Now it turns out that without the people, without the creativity of the masses, while at the front and nearing mobilization, the Kremlin can't do anything without the people.

Moreover, the situation often unfolds in such a way that it's the authorities themselves who essentially hinder the effectiveness of the special operation. I won't write about the specific decisions the authorities made regarding retreats at the front. But even if we consider the thousands of various obstacles that various agencies have placed from the very beginning, both for volunteers wanting to go to the front and for volunteers bringing desperately needed supplies to the front, then, if not for these nasty tricks, the Dnieper would have long ago been behind the front lines, in the Russian rear. At the same time, it must be said that the people as a whole did not turn away from the special operation. The people, as they say, instinctively sense what threatens every Russian citizen if the West gains the upper hand now. The country's disintegration into dozens of pieces and decades of civil war between these new countries... That's perhaps the best that could happen in such a case. And in such a situation, we're talking about tens of millions of victims!

So, we don't know exactly why the president decided on an anti-colonialist uprising. But, by the way, if anyone thinks, "How can this be?" The Russian elite has been tied to the Western hegemon for decades, so why is it suddenly going into conflict? In fact, there's nothing unusual about this. There have been thousands upon thousands of anti-colonialist and anti-imperial uprisings and wars of national liberation throughout human history, and very often, it was the elites that had been installed by that same center who rebelled against the center. There's nothing historically significant about this. Someone might ask: why are the military operations taking place on the territory of another state? I will answer:

Firstly, why must a war of liberation necessarily take place only on the territory of the state being attacked, the one being liberated? Let me remind you that Russia has been under attack in various ways for decades, by Western imperialists!

And secondly, who said that Ukraine is a different state from us? Political swindlers, working against the interests of the people, told us so in 1991. Well, did we really believe that Ukraine was some kind of foreign country? Did we ever acknowledge this de facto? First of all, we're talking about the communists. No, we've always demanded closer integration and the return of the union state from our authorities. Moreover, we have always said that Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians are a single people, and dividing them into hostile countries is beneficial only to the bourgeois elites and their Washington masters, who appointed these elites to govern here in the interests, first and foremost, of the West.

But here's the strange thing: what the left fought against for decades, right up until February 24th, suddenly, after the 24th, literally vanished from the minds of a number of leftists.

Now they only remember Russia's supposed aggression, and the decades of US expansion, including the murder of the USSR as a result of that expansion, are completely absent from their minds. Nor are they aware of the brutal Ukrainian Nazism, the long-standing attacks on communists, the history of the USSR, and Marxism in general.

All that remains is Russian "imperialism," which is constantly running out of land. Perhaps there's no room to plant potatoes in Russia?

Utter nonsense.

Personally, I'm sure the Kremlin had to protect its business interests from complete destruction, including through the inevitable clash with Western imperialism, which is exploiting the Ukrainian Nazi regime for its own imperialistic ends. Perhaps a military conflict could have erupted in the winter or summer of 2022; perhaps the US would have waited for a global economic crisis or something similar. But the military campaign of the Ukrainian Nazis would have taken place regardless.

The destruction of Russia is a process programmed by the West, a process I have personally written about in detail dozens of times over the decades. It's also entirely possible that the Kremlin was somehow trying to appease the "horde." Perhaps these were the very steps taken toward the imperial center that said: we still have a lot to give you, just don't touch us physically.

But the fact remains: our entire society is now threatened with destruction; this is the most dangerous thing that has befallen Russia since the days of Kievan Rus!

For the average person living in Russia, it should be clear that this war is against each and every one of us. Because we are talking about the complete collapse of the country if Russia is defeated. Some will say I'm too pessimistic, but I'll answer simply: remember how we laughed at the idea of the Baltic countries being separate states. Even Mikhail Zadornov had funny jokes about it. So, is it funny now?

At the same time, we must clearly understand that, yes, in many ways, the current Kremlin "team" has brought the situation to what we see now. But the very fact of the course toward the destruction of Russia as a unified state was seized upon by Western predators right from the collapse of the USSR. So the causes of today's conflict lie not in the president's mistakes, but in Western strategy.

Some modern leftists, like brainwashed creatures, repeat the mantra that the proletariat has no bourgeois homeland, that there are only class interests. Lenin refuted this approach a thousand times, in numerous works, including in his personal correspondence with Armand. And yet, the leftists don't care. What do you think of Engels's arguments in a letter to Marx? "If Germany wins, then French Bonapartism will at least be over, the eternal strife over the creation of German unity will finally cease, German workers will be able to organize on a completely different national scale than hitherto, and the French, whatever government may be created, will undoubtedly have a freer field of action than under Bonapartism."

The entire mass of the German people, of all classes, understood that it was primarily a question of national existence that was at stake, and therefore immediately showed a willingness to act. It seems impossible to me that under such conditions any German political party, à la Wilhelm, would preach complete opposition and advance all sorts of secondary considerations in place of the main one."  
(ENGELS TO MARX, IN RAMSGOTH, Manchester, August 15, 1870)

Yes, friends, we are talking here precisely about Germany's war of unification, the gathering of German lands, and further about facilitating the struggle of the proletariat after victory in the war of national liberation! At the same time, of course, the people of France are not forgotten, who, in turn, according to Engels, will receive a freer bourgeois regime as a result of the defeat of the French monarch.

So, beyond a doubt, Russia is waging a defensive, anti-colonialist, and therefore anti-imperialist and national liberation "war," which we call a special operation. And there is absolutely nothing shameful for a Marxist to sympathize with this cause. This follows, among other things, from historical examples of how similar situations have been responded to. pillars of Marxism.

By the way, some might say that Russians and Ukrainians are supposedly different peoples. But this begs the question: who do you consider Ukrainians? Greek Catholics living in four regions of western Ukraine and speaking a predominantly Polish language, or, say, atheists, nominally Orthodox Christians living in southeastern Ukraine and speaking predominantly Russian?

Again, someone might say: what nonsense? What difference does a person's religion make? Hey, guys, that's how atheists, enlightened people, and, so to speak, representatives of the proletarian vanguard, reason, while a religious person might reason completely differently. And what seems like a worthless excuse to you, for a religious person, say, from western Ukraine, is the meaning of their entire life! For example, converting someone to the true Catholic faith and joining the true Church, and so on. And when they say that Ukraine is today effectively captured by Western Ukrainian religious fanatics, you should, in principle, understand that Ukraine has four western regions inhabited by ultra-religious populations with different views on life.

Incidentally, according to a number of studies, it is precisely in eastern Ukraine that people in a number of regions don't associate themselves with any religious cults at all, meaning they practically consider themselves atheists. Meanwhile, in the western regions, such citizens make up no more than one percent! And given the peasant-village nature of the smallholders typically living in Western Ukraine, all this turns into a reactionary Nazi-religious mixture.

So even in this sense, Ukraine is effectively held hostage by a reactionary minority. And progressive people living in Russia should, in any case, at the very least, sympathize with the people of Ukraine who find themselves in such a difficult situation. People who speak the same language as you, who think like the people of Russia, and who have the same life priorities as the rest of us.

<https://svpressa.ru/blogs/article/349914/>

Post from: May 28, 2023

We're arguing tooth and nail with the netwarists about who among us is a pro-Bandera supporter, an accomplice of Western imperialism, and who is a social chauvinist defender of the Putin regime, etc.

But let's figure out who's right. After all, it's wrong to admit that someone is doing something out of naivety, not understanding the harm they're actually doing to the triumph of bright ideas.

So, let's start with the netwarists.

What are the main arguments they cite for their position?

I think the following:

1. Russia is the aggressor, we're committing crimes in Ukraine, etc.
2. Russia is an imperialist in the Marxist-Leninist sense of the word, which means we should be for the defeat of our government.
3. Let Russia lose, then the regime will collapse, and we will be able to build our new, just world.

My text is written primarily for left-wingers. Frankly, I have no desire whatsoever to interact with liberal zombies, and I've long since stopped following their progressive schizophrenia.

So, let the ardent leftist non-warrior consider for himself the consequences, and indeed, his arguments are already being made when, for example, he claims that Russia is the aggressor, thereby undermining the morale of soldiers on the front lines, weakening social cohesion, and reducing the motivation of some members of society to support the Second World War. Yes or no?

If so, is he thereby playing into the hands of Ukrainian Nazis, the Ukrainian Armed Forces, American imperialism, and Western imperialism in general?

In my view, yes.

At the same time, the very accusation of Russian aggression, of course, sounds absurd, even if we take as a basis that this war is imperialist. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that it doesn't matter who moved troops first if many countries have been preparing for war for many years! Moreover, Lenin directly wrote that if a country is fighting for independence from colonial rule, or a national liberation war against more powerful predatory states, then that country's actions are entirely justified given its independence, given that it started the war first!

I don't want to blow this article out of proportion now, arguing that Russia isn't an imperialist. In fact, in this war, Russia is waging anti-imperialist actions. That's not the point. The point is that the first two points I'm examining, in my view, clearly demonstrate that the position of the left-wing non-warriors weakens Russia's military power, thereby strengthening the military power of Nazi Ukraine and the Western imperialists.

Well, in fact, this is partly confirmed by the third point: the non-warriors' desire for the defeat of the Russian government.

And here, in my view, it's crucial to understand that, given the current scale of the conflict, it's crucial to understand that: If there is a so-called defeat of the government, it will amount to a defeat for Russia as a state, and for society as a whole. It will very likely involve the occupation of Russia by external armed forces, the disintegration of the country, and so on.

The point is that, as I have previously written, the left-wing non-warriors fail to understand that the situation of the current conflict is fundamentally different from that of World War I. Back then, Russia was involved in a war between imperialist blocs fighting each other. This led to the weakening of all participants. Moreover, as early as the Basel Conference of Socialists in 1912, all those present concluded that the world would most likely soon experience a world imperialist war, which could lead to socialist revolutions, practically a worldwide revolution, in part due to the high level of organization and solidarity of workers in these countries. Lenin repeatedly declared that an imperialist war is the eve of revolution! This is precisely why he advanced the slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war, that is, he called for proletarian revolutions in the countries involved in the war. And this was not only his desire, nor even so much as the objective alignment of class forces both globally and in many countries at that time! Lenin repeatedly reiterated that the Bolsheviks were not opposed to the defense of the Fatherland, or even to the defense of a bourgeois country. Lenin repeatedly reiterated that the Bolsheviks were opposed to the defense of the Fatherland precisely in this imperialist war because the conditions for a proletarian revolution had arisen. This is precisely why Ilyich repeated this, to make it more intelligible!

Furthermore, in several works, Ilyich directly stated that Soviet power was able to win because the imperialist countries were exhausted by the war against each other and were unable to be distracted by

the events in Russia in 1917, while also recalling the solidarity of workers in various countries and the revolutionary situations there. In other words, if a civil conflict breaks out in Russia now, we would be torn apart by fresh NATO troops in a matter of weeks.

At the same time, I personally believe that active Russian society, including representatives of the frontline soldiers, could achieve significant changes within our country by expressing dissatisfaction with who and what they call our authorities and how they govern the country, including in matters of the Central Military District.

Next, let's move on to the so-called "social chauvinists." The latter demand that the country's economy be put on a war footing, the oligarchs be dispossessed, the prestige of blue-collar jobs be raised, and thus, labor collectives be given real rights, the transfer of funds to the West be stopped, the liberal economic development course be reversed, established sectors of the economy, including banking, be nationalized, and so on.

In other words, left-wing supporters of the SVO are attacking the foundations of Russia's capitalist regime. They raise pressing questions about the effectiveness of the SVO, etc. And I am confident that these demands resonate with the majority of Russian citizens, including front-line soldiers. At the same time, yes, left-wing supporters of the SVO are categorically opposed to the disintegration of Russia, as this would play into the hands of the most predatory countries of the imperialist West. The West, incidentally, is experiencing quite serious economic difficulties that have accumulated over many years. Russia's defeat and its continued plunder would precisely give the West a reprieve from social upheaval. In other words, those who today advocate Russia's defeat are actually opposing possible progressive revolutions in the Western world! Which, in turn, could lead to a revolution in Russia!

Actually, that's all I wanted to say in this article!

And I can only call on honest non-warriors from the left to try to lift the curtain in your minds on the future, including your actions!

Today, a Marxist, a revolutionary, is precisely someone who understands or has limited support for the SVO! Don't be led by the dogmas created by past Marxists for that war! I repeat, specifically for that war, and not for every war!!!

Learn to find reasons why this or that supposedly leftist figure on their YouTube channel tells you about the importance of Russia's defeat! Don't be foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics!

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_166435](https://vk.com/wall7006326_166435)

Post from: February 14, 2023

Lenin elegantly and meticulously explains to leftists that you can't win a revolution when you're itching in your privates. A successful revolution requires many conditions. Below I present one of the most important nuances of the victory of the 1917 Revolution, according to Lenin. Incidentally, I've previously cited this point, among others; it appears in both Lenin's and Stalin's works, including with reference to Lenin.

But this is the first time I've encountered such a detailed commentary.

Further, Lenin...

I repeat, many of our young friends who consider themselves leftists have begun to forget the most important thing: why, during the weeks and months of the greatest triumph after October, we were able to so easily transition from triumph to triumph. Meanwhile, this was only because a specially formed international situation temporarily shielded us from imperialism. It had no time for us. We thought we had no time for imperialism either. And individual imperialists had no time for us only because the entire, enormous socio-political and military force of contemporary world imperialism had by that time been divided into two groups by internecine war. The imperialist predators, drawn into this struggle, had reached incredible limits, a death grip, to the point that neither group could muster any serious force against the Russian revolution. We arrived at precisely such a moment in October: our revolution arrived precisely—it's paradoxical, but true—at a fortunate moment, when unheard-of disasters had befallen the vast majority of imperialist countries in the form of the extermination of millions of people, when the war had exhausted the peoples with unheard-of hardships, when, in the fourth year of the war, the belligerent countries had reached a dead end, a crossroads, when the objective question arose: could the peoples reduced to such a state continue to fight? Only because our revolution arrived at this fortunate moment, when neither of the two gigantic groups of predators could immediately attack each other or unite against us—only because our revolution could, and did, take advantage of this moment in international political and economic relations to make its brilliant triumphal march across European Russia, spread to Finland, and begin to conquer the Caucasus and Romania.

Lenin. SEVENTH EMERGENCY CONGRESS OF THE RCP(b)

MARCH 6–8, 1918

Next, Lenin :-))) that is, my text :-)))

I am publishing this excerpt from Lenin's speech for those who believe the current situation is reminiscent of World War I and, supposedly, we must push the revolutionary situation forward at any cost.

Not friends, alas, the situation is completely different. The balance of power among the global bourgeoisie, unfortunately, is not conducive to the victory of a people's revolution in Russia. Even if all the conditions were right.

I believe that in this historical situation, we are obliged to negotiate serious concessions from the ruling regime to strengthen the position of the working class, its vanguard, and generally improve the lives of working people. But today the question cannot be posed as "either or." Because the forces of global reaction are now extremely united, the forces of global reaction have raised a powerful military fist over Russian territory, and any civil strife in Russia will lead our country to complete occupation and destruction! At the same time, left-patriotic forces must mercilessly criticize the current regime for its criminal mistakes, demand radical changes of a socialist nature, and demand a change in the government and other branches of government! As well as the very foundations of the state structure, including those enshrined in the constitution!

It's funny that Lenin says here that the "young leftists" have begun to forget these important circumstances. I think there's some kind of play on words here. After all, just under six months have passed since the beginning of the revolution, and young people should not forget such nuances in such a

short time. Moreover, de jure, WWI hasn't yet ended, and the global bourgeoisie is still busy with its own infighting.

By the way, the "infantile disorder of leftism" also refers to the childish impatience of inexperienced leftists who want to start a revolution exclusively when they feel like it, disregarding the objective state of society's development and its readiness for a possible revolution. Do you know those ardent "revolutionaries" who demand to take to the barricades immediately on social media?

What's your attitude toward them?

[https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326\\_158723\\_r158793](https://vk.com/id7006326?w=wall7006326_158723_r158793)

Yandex Zen post from: November 24, 2022

That's the tricky part. If you believe that the current conflict in Ukraine, including on Russia's side, is imperialist in nature, then having said A, you must also say B.

Of course, if you're a Marxist. If you're not a Marxist, then you're allowed to lash out like a broomstick. Unfortunately, you're not responsible for anything, as someone who understands! The truth is, dialogue with you is useless, because a non-Marxist is equally underdeveloped and not fully rational. What kind of responsibility can one expect from a madman or a baby, for example? True, in such a case, anyone particularly rowdy should be slapped on the back of the head and thrown out of the discussion, fortunately they're not children, but simply idiots.

So, let's analyze the mistakes of the left-wing non-warriors in a mature, Marxist manner.

First, a Marxist cannot be a "non-warrior" in an imperialist war!

Here are a couple of quotes from Lenin about the various kinds of pacifists on the left...

"Scumbags"

"These scumbags will gather, say that they are 'against the policy of August 4th,' that they are 'for peace,' 'against annexations,' and... and... they will thereby help the bourgeoisie extinguish the budding revolutionary mood.

Lenin in a letter to Radek. 1915."

Social Pacifists are equal to Social Chauvinists!

"The fundamental unity between the social-chauvinists (Plekhanov and Scheidemann) and the social-pacifists (Turati and Kautsky) lies in the fact that both of them objectively represent servants of imperialism: some "serve" it by embellishing the imperialist war by applying to it the concept of "defense of the fatherland," while others serve the same imperialism by embellishing the maturing and preparing imperialist peace with phrases about a democratic peace."

"A Turn in World Politics" Lenin, Social-Democrat newspaper, No. 58, January 31, 1917

So, in the imperialist war, Lenin categorically opposed a peace concluded according to bourgeois rules!

Of course, we all know the alternative Lenin proposed: correctly, transforming the imperialist war into a civil war...

"The transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war is the only correct proletarian slogan, indicated by the experience of the Commune, outlined by the Basel (1912) resolution, and flowing from all the conditions of an imperialist war between highly developed bourgeois countries." "No matter how great the difficulties of such a transformation may seem at any given moment, socialists will never abandon systematic, persistent, and unwavering preparatory work in this direction, once war has become a fact" (Lenin, "War and Russian Social Democracy")...

At the same time, of course, we are not talking here about a civil war in one country, but about revolutions within all countries participating in the imperialist war!

Lenin then poses a very stark EITHER-OR question! Either we recognize that we are in an imperialist war, and this means we are on the Eve of Revolution, or... Lenin then:

"Or we have no reason to proclaim an immediate renunciation of the defense of the country."

Below is an excerpt from the work

"V.I. Lenin, Fundamental Propositions on the Question of War, 1916."

"Firstly, We propose to the proletarians and exploited of all belligerent countries and all countries threatened with war to reject the defense of the fatherland." (ATTENTION: ALL (!) BELIEVE-IN COUNTRIES. I PERSONALLY BELIEVE THAT, IN OUR CASE, WE NEED, FIRST OF ALL, TO PROCLAIM THE SLOGAN OF CIVIL WAR IN THE WESTERN COALITION COUNTRIES, SINCE THEY ARE THE MAIN ACTORS IN THE CONFLICT IN UKRAINE)

"Now, from the experience of several warring countries, we know quite clearly what it really means to reject the defense of the fatherland in the current war. This means denying all the foundations of modern bourgeois society and cutting down the roots of the modern social order not only in theory, not only "in general," but in practice, directly, right now. Isn't it clear that this can only be done if we have not simply arrived at the firmest theoretical conviction that That capitalism is already ripe for transformation into socialism, but what if we recognize this socialist upheaval, that is, the socialist revolution, as practically, immediately, and directly achievable?

But this is almost always overlooked when talking about abandoning the defense of the fatherland. At best, they are willing to admit "theoretically" that capitalism is already ripe for transformation into socialism, but they won't even hear about an immediate, fundamental change in all party activity in the spirit of the immediately impending socialist revolution!

The people, as if, aren't ready for this!

But this is ridiculously inconsistent. Either—or. Either we shouldn't proclaim an immediate abandonment of the country's defense, or we must immediately launch, or begin to launch, systematic propaganda for the immediate implementation of the socialist revolution. In a certain sense, "the people," of course, are "not prepared" for either abandoning the country's defense or the socialist revolution, but it doesn't follow from this that we have the right, within two years—two years!— —to postpone the beginning of such systematic preparation!"

Further in the letter to Armand, Lenin seems to elaborate on his thoughts regarding when a communist can abandon the defense of "the defense of his fatherland."

"In the imperialist war of 1914-1917, between two imperialist coalitions, we must be against 'defense of the fatherland,' for (1) imperialism is the eve of socialism; (2) imperialist war is a war of thieves for

booty; (3) both coalitions have an advanced proletariat; (4) in both, the socialist revolution is ripe. Only for this reason are we against 'defense of the fatherland,' only for this reason!"

January 19, 1917.

So, Lenin seems to repeat: now is the eve of the socialist revolution; in all countries participating in the imperialist war, the socialist revolution is ripe! This is the only reason we are against "defending our fatherland." This is the only reason, Lenin repeats.

Further, I reinforce Lenin's idea of defending our fatherland with another letter to Armand.

...

"Generally speaking, it seems to me that your reasoning is somewhat one-sided and formalistic. You took one quotation from the Communist Manifesto (the workers have no fatherland) and want to apply it, seemingly without reservation, to the point of denying national wars.

The entire spirit of Marxism, its entire system, demands that each proposition be considered only (a) historically; (b) only in connection with others; (g) only in connection with concrete historical experience.

Fatherland is a historical concept. Fatherland is another matter in an era, or, more precisely, at the moment of the struggle to overthrow national oppression. It is another matter at a time when national movements are far behind. For the "three types of countries" (§ 6 of our theses on self-determination), the proposition about the fatherland and its defense cannot be applied equally under all conditions.

The Communist Manifesto states that the workers have no Fatherland.

True. But that's not all it says. It also says that the role of the proletariat in the formation of national states is somewhat special. If we take the first proposition (workers have no fatherland) and forget its connection with the second (workers are constituted as a class nationally, but not in the same sense as the bourgeoisie), then this would be extremely incorrect.

What is this connection? In my opinion, it is precisely that in a democratic movement (at such a moment, in such a specific situation), the proletariat cannot refuse to support it (and therefore, to defend the fatherland in a national war).

Marx and Engels said in the Communist Manifesto that workers have no fatherland. But the same Marx called for national war more than once: Marx in 1848, Engels in 1859 (the end of his pamphlet "The Po and the Rhine," which directly inflames national sentiment). Germans, directly calling them to a national war). Engels in 1891, in view of the then looming and impending war between France (Boulangier) and Alexander III against Germany, directly recognized the "defense of the fatherland."

Were Marx and Engels muddleheads, saying one thing today and another tomorrow? No. In my opinion, recognizing the "defense of the fatherland" in a national war is entirely consistent with Marxism. In 1891, German Social Democrats would indeed have had to defend the fatherland in a war against Boulangier and Alexander III. This would have been a unique version of a national war.

September-December 1916.

What do we see in these two letters (and this opinion is also expressed in other works?)

In my opinion, the main idea here is that "defense of the fatherland" is not an alien value to the proletariat. Lenin writes: "What is this connection? In my opinion, it is precisely because, in a democratic

movement (at such a moment, in such a specific situation), the proletariat cannot refuse to support it (and, consequently, to defend the fatherland in a national war).

That is, from all of the above, we can conclude: imperialism is the eve of socialist revolution; a revolutionary situation has matured in the participating countries, and therefore, it is high time to move on to the slogan of transforming the war from an imperialist one into a civil war, that is, to call for revolution in all countries participating in the conflict.

Why is this important? Lenin and Stalin both write about it in their works. Lenin, in "Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder," and Stalin, in "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists: Preface to the Book 'On the Road to October,'" write about why the Revolution triumphed, again citing Lenin:

"Russia," Lenin writes, "in the concrete, historically extremely unique situation of 1917, easily began the socialist revolution, whereas continuing it and bringing it to completion will be more difficult for Russia than for the European countries. I had to point this out already at the beginning of 1918, and two years of experience since then have fully confirmed the correctness of this argument. Such specific conditions as 1) the possibility of combining the Soviet revolution with the end, thanks to it, of the imperialist war, which had incredibly exhausted the workers and peasants; 2) the possibility of utilizing, for a certain time, the mortal struggle between two world-powerful groups of imperialist predators, which groups were unable to unite against the Soviet enemy." So, what do we see in the paragraph above? Both Lenin and Stalin, citing Lenin, consider one of the most important factors in the victory of the Revolution in Russia to be the fact that the most powerful capitalist countries were engaged in a deadly struggle with one another, a circumstance that prevented the imperialist predators from uniting to fight the Soviet Revolution! I hope you now understand that the issue of acute revolutionary contradictions within a number of the most powerful countries of the capitalist system (although in our case, we must also keep an eye on the PRC) is a question of the success or failure of the socialist revolution in one or several countries where the conditions for it are ripe! After all, we all know from past history how progressive revolutions in neighboring countries were stifled by Prussia, Tsarist Russia, and others throughout virtually the entire 19th century. At the same time, returning to the letter to Armand of January 19, we see that there are no conditions for revolution in a number of countries today, which means there are no conditions for abandoning "Defense of the Fatherland"! I'll republish the excerpt: "(1) imperialism is the eve of socialism; (2) imperialist war is a war of thieves for loot; (3) both coalitions have an advanced proletariat; (4) in both, the socialist revolution is ripe. This is the only reason we are against "Defense of the Fatherland," this is the only reason!"

January 19, 1917.

And how did this situation arise? There is war, but no revolutionary situation in the world? In my opinion, this is due to the fact that a de facto Western ultra-empire, led by the United States, has now emerged! And it is precisely she who is to blame for the conflict in Ukraine, and the fact that the West is now fighting against Russia primarily with the hands of the natives, as Lenin wrote about in the same work "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism." Here you go...

"VIII. Parasitism and the Decay of Capitalism...

2) Raising an army from dependent peoples. "The first is the custom of economic parasitism, by virtue of which the dominant state uses its provinces, colonies, and dependent countries to enrich its ruling class and to bribe its lower classes to keep them quiet." For such bribery, in whatever form it takes, to be economically feasible, requires—we would add—a monopolistically high profit.

Regarding the second circumstance, Hobson writes: "One of the strangest symptoms of the blindness of imperialism is the carelessness with which Great Britain, France, and other imperialist nations take this path. Great Britain has gone further than anyone else. Most of the battles by which we conquered our Indian Empire were fought by our troops, composed of natives; in India, as more recently in Egypt, large standing armies are under British command; almost all the wars connected with our conquest of Africa, With the exception of its southern part, they were carried out for us by the natives."

That is, the Ukrainian people today are, alas, those very same natives who are being used by the Western ultra-empire to achieve its goals both in its relations with Russia and in establishing a more monopolistic position of capitalism in Europe itself!

Someone will say: but how can this be? After all, Russia invaded Ukrainian territory and allegedly started military operations. And Lenin has an answer to this in his work "Russian Südekums."

On the Western countries' silencing of preparations for war!

"The German bourgeoisie is sophistically accused of violating the peace, while the bourgeoisie of the 'Triple Entente's long and persistent preparations for war against it are hushed up." Here is a more detailed view of Ilyich on the current question of whether it matters who attacked first - "Abstract on the topic 'The Proletariat and War', October 1 (14), 1914":

"We all expected this imperialist war; we prepared for it. And since that's the case, it doesn't matter who attacked; everyone was preparing for war, and whoever attacked at that moment considered it more advantageous."

So, for Lenin, and I think for any sensible Marxist, it doesn't matter who attacked first! This isn't a reason to judge whether a particular country is to blame for the mere fact of an attack. An attack can be launched by the true culprit, or, in principle, by the victim of a conflict, since by the very act of attack it may be attempting to resolve the military situation in its favor. In general, a Marxist must look at the situation, as they say, at its core, and not judge it based on the date of the attack.

But perhaps the most important thing for today's Marxists is to understand that a perfectly just war can be waged using less-than-progressive methods, with a non-progressive leadership at the helm of a country waging a progressive war. Consider Lenin's following argument. An excerpt from Lenin's "Russian Südekums."

"Engels wrote to Marx in 1870 that W. Liebknecht was mistaken in making anti-Bismarckism his sole guiding principle..."

The unification of Germany was necessary, and Marx, both before and after 1848, always recognized this. Engels, as early as 1859, openly called on the German people to wage war for the sake of unification. When revolutionary unification failed, Bismarck did so counterrevolutionarily, in a Junker-like fashion. Anti-Bismarckism, as a sole principle, became absurd, for the completion of the necessary unification had become a fact."

So, we know that Bismarck was a staunch conservative, but wars for the liberation of German lands, for the unification of Germany, were recognized by Marx and Engels as progressive, until Bismarck began to interfere de facto in the affairs of other states! And, of course, neither Marx nor Engels could have allowed themselves to oppose Germany's wars of liberation in such a situation; doing so would have clearly gone against the will of the German people!

In this regard, it remains to be seen that at least tens of millions of Russians have lived in compact settlements since time immemorial, and the territory of today's Ukraine—in fact, most of Ukraine's territory—is also ethnically Russian, which only became the territory of an independent state as a result of political intrigue and the outright crimes of the corrupt elites of the former USSR! Moreover, all treaties between Russia and Ukraine have always declared that our countries would not undertake any hostile actions against each other. But isn't the ban on the Russian language, the mockery of the historical memory of pro-Russian Russian-speaking Ukrainians, outright Russophobia, the desire to join NATO, and so on—aren't all of these hostile actions? Some will, of course, say that all this Russophobia began after Crimea's annexation by Russia, but this is, to put it mildly, untrue: dozens of laws aimed at infringing on the rights of Russian-speaking people, Russophobia in school textbooks, the cultivation of Nazi ideals at the state level, and much more—all of this was happening long before 2014, and even before 2004, before the first Maidan! I am certain this was a deliberate policy of Ukraine's comprador elites, who carried out the will of their Western masters, who, in turn, deliberately prepared Ukraine for a clash with Russia! And I am writing this as a half-ethnic Ukrainian who has maintained constant contact with my relatives living in Western Ukraine, where the Nazi contagion has been spreading since the late 1980s! In other words, I witnessed many stages in the development of Ukrainians' Nazi consciousness with my own eyes! Incidentally, I myself have relatives who have been involved in Nazi movements in Ukraine for decades! But now a huge portion of Ukraine's population wants to live closer to Russia, not wanting to be under the heel of Western imperialism, etc. Isn't all this grounds for attempts to unite the primordial Russian lands and the Russian people? That is, to act in the same way as Marx and Engels approved of the unification of Germany?

But let's return to Lenin...

This is an excerpt from Lenin's work "On the Defeat of One's Government in the Imperialist War."

Here Lenin enters into a polemic with opponents of the slogan about the defeat of one's government!

"Anyone who seriously wishes to refute the 'slogan' of defeat for their government in an imperialist war would have to prove one of three things," writes Ilyich: "either 1) that the war of 1914-1915 is not reactionary; or 2) that revolution is impossible in connection with it; or 3) that the revolutionary movements in all the belligerent countries cannot coordinate and cooperate with one another..."

So, paraphrasing these points of Lenin's for today, I ask those who believe that the current war is truly imperialist to answer points 2 and 3 honestly. After all, if you are right, then a socialist revolution is now possible in various countries, isn't that true, based on Lenin's classical understanding of imperialist wars? Point 3 then goes on to say that assistance to our eventual revolution is now possible from the revolutionary masses and, likely, from the revolutionary governments of other countries! Can you imagine a revolutionary Germany or France today, or even more so Poland or the Baltics, or the United States, Italy, Canada, and so on?

So, without a doubt, this conflict does not bear the classic hallmarks of an imperialist war on Russia's part. In other works, I have written that the "conquest" of Ukraine is not, in principle, an economically advantageous undertaking for the Russian ruling bourgeoisie!

Today, Russia is de facto confronting an aggressive, ultra-imperialist bloc of Western countries, led by the United States. And a war between the Western empires and Russia, in principle, does not create revolutionary situations within Western countries! The forces are simply too unequal! Russia has about 2% of global GDP, while the Western coalition has over 50%, while Western sanctions extend virtually worldwide. So, we cannot even dream of any solidarity from the Western proletariat, even if we stage a

revolution here, the most correct one from a Marxist perspective. Moreover, Western countries would crush precisely such a revolution very quickly, sensing the genuine danger it poses.

The conflict in Ukraine today is, without a doubt, an attempt at an anti-colonialist uprising by the Russian bourgeois elite against the global imperialist West. This uprising is largely elite-level, with elements of collusion with those same Western elites with whom the Russian bourgeoisie is unwilling to completely sever the comprador umbilical cord.

And I personally believe that Russian Marxists are obligated to do everything possible to open the eyes of Russian citizens to the fact that the Russian leadership, having at the outset of the special operation raised absolutely justified grievances against the Ukrainian Nazi regime and the West, is now attempting to conduct behind-the-scenes peace negotiations, apparently largely out of fear for the fate of its capital tied to Western countries. Russian society must understand that the dangers to Russia emanating today from the Western ultra-empire, primarily in the Ukrainian direction, are mortally dangerous!

And, frankly speaking, the so-called current Kremlin government is clearly incapable of responding to the challenges of the times. Frankly, the current government is incapable of saving Russia from the impending catastrophe!

And, by and large, Russian citizens must do everything possible today to consign the main figures of the current government to the dustbin of history.

In these difficult times, only a bloc of left-wing patriotic forces can save the country. A government of popular trust must be urgently created, the foundation of which could be State Duma deputies from left-wing factions, prominent public figures from left-wing patriotic forces, and so on.

The country needs a major leftward turn!

Such shameful phenomena as oligarchy, nepotism, lack of popular control over power, the permissiveness of officials and security forces, government policies favoring the rich, and so on, must finally disappear from the country.

Government must become globally fair and accountable to the people.

Only such changes will bring us victory in any confrontation.

If there are no changes in the near future, there will be chaos and the collapse of the country, or even greater dependence on Western countries, to whom the Kremlin seems ready to sell us out once again!

<https://dzen.ru/a/Y39Olxk5h3LtnGmT>

Article in SP: October 28, 2022

Perhaps some haven't received Lenin's letter to Armand from January 19, 1917, but true Marxists know about it, as well as dozens of other works by Ilyich in which he openly ridiculed idiots and leftist pacifists. We read:

In the imperialist war of 1914-7, between two imperialist coalitions, we must be against the "defense of the fatherland," for (1) imperialism is the eve of socialism; (2) imperialist war is a war of thieves for booty; (3) in both coalitions there is an advanced proletariat; (4) in both, the socialist revolution is ripe. Only for this reason are we against the "defense of the fatherland," only for this reason!

War is an extremely varied, complex, and diverse thing. A general approach is impossible:

(I) Three main types: the relationship of an oppressed nation to an oppressor (every war is a continuation of politics; politics is the relationship between nations, classes, etc.). As a general rule, war is legitimate on the part of the oppressed (regardless of whether defensive or offensive in the military sense).

(II) The relationship between two oppressor nations. The struggle for colonies, for markets, etc. (Rome and Carthage; England and Germ[any]sia 1914-1917). As a general rule, war of this kind on both sides is robbery; and the attitude of democracy (and socialism) toward it falls under the rule: "Two thieves fight, let them both perish"...

(III) The third type. A system of equal nations. The question is much more complex!!! Especially when tsarism stands alongside civilized, relatively democratic nations. This is what happened (approximately) in Europe from 1815 to 1905.

Ilyich lashes out at all sorts of modern pink leftists who mistakenly consider themselves Marxists. In this letter, Lenin clearly states that whether a war is defensive or offensive, February 24, 2022, cannot be viewed as some kind of independent date by which we must interpret the current events one way or another. Judging the causes of the conflict must be based on the events that preceded February 24 over many decades. Moreover, judging the phenomenon can only be done by understanding who is involved in these events, what their role is—again, over the course of decades! What their goals are, and who benefits from this situation. Furthermore, it's important to consider whether there are oppressed peoples, classes, and so on within it. And what a revelation: tens of millions of those oppressed in Ukraine are Russians and Russian-speaking citizens, oppressed by Nazi fanatics and Bandera supporters under the control of imperialist countries, primarily the United States. In short, this is a typical example of colonial expansion by Western countries. Moreover, even the most ethnically pure Ukrainians are, in essence, oppressed, since their Western masters simply use them as second-class natives to achieve their goals in the confrontation with bourgeois Russia.

At the same time, in a moral sense, Ukraine's borders weren't formed over thousands of years, but were drawn by negligent politicians whom the communists of our countries never recognized—neither politicians nor borders! After 1991, of course. Although they tolerated this phenomenon until a veritable Nazi orgy began within these borders. Moreover, it was the communists in Russia who always said that Russians are the largest divided people in the world, and that this is wrong!

Therefore, the oppression of Ukrainian citizens directly affects Russia, because tens of millions of Ukrainian citizens are as Russian as most Russians. And these people have lived in their historical homeland for over a thousand years! Thus, this is an uprising of an oppressed people, which began in 2014 in Crimea, Donbas, Odessa, Kharkiv, and elsewhere.

And this uprising is anti-colonialist at its core, as the rebels do not want the country to be governed by puppets paid by Western masters. Well, we seem to have sorted out the moral side of the issue, which proves the rightness of those who sympathize with the Russian side in this conflict.

Now let's get to the most important thing. Lenin writes, "Only for this reason are we against the 'defense of the fatherland,' only for this reason!" That is, not against the defense of the bourgeois fatherland in general, as the half-educated leftists claim, but specifically in that war... And what was so unique about it? So, the First World War pitted two major imperialist alliances against each other, two global centers of imperialism, in which Russia, by the way, was the weak link (I want to point out that "weak link," in my view, doesn't simply mean a weak imperialist, but perhaps a country that couldn't be an imperialist on its own. The Russian Empire was an imperialist only because it was allied with developed capitalist countries that were genuinely fighting for the opportunity to do business

capitalistically, including in conquered countries—that is, for the export of capital and for markets for their capitalists. And, of course, for access to cheap raw materials, which were primarily found in backward colonial countries). Well, I have no sympathy whatsoever for the Russian Empire—so it died, as they say, and to hell with it. I simply want my clarification to reach those who doubt it: you can't consider any country you don't like and that's at war imperialist, even if it's wrong. Imperialism is a strictly scientific concept, clearly defined by Lenin, and it certainly has nothing to do with Russia's current special operation in Ukraine.

Moreover, Lenin goes much further than my reflections.

We must be against "defense of the fatherland" because (1) imperialism is the eve of socialism; (2) imperialist war is a war of thieves for booty; (3) both coalitions have an advanced proletariat; (4) in both, the socialist revolution is ripe. That's the only reason we oppose "defense of the fatherland"—that's the only reason!

So, according to Lenin, the First World War was the eve of a series of socialist revolutions, precisely in both coalitions! Whether this was Ilyich's fantasy, I personally don't think so. Because the objective processes of that period showed that in all the warring countries of the coalition, the people had suffered enormous losses. They didn't understand why they, the citizens, needed this war. People practically everywhere took an active anti-war stance, and the well-organized proletariat was at the forefront of this anti-war, anti-imperialist campaign.

And naturally, revolutionaries around the world viewed these developments with great hope. That's why slogans like "Let's transform the imperialist war into a civil war, that is, a revolutionary one," were common.

Alas, nothing even remotely resembling this exists today. The Western masters are united; they are flooding the Ukrainian puppet regime with all the necessary resources, from weapons to funds, to maintain a minimum standard of living for citizens. There is no labor movement in Nazi-controlled Ukraine, where the security services eradicate any leftist thought at the root. There is, of course, no revolutionary movement, neither in European countries nor in the USA, especially.

But the most important thing is that there is no struggle between equal imperialist coalitions, as they did back in 1914. This very fact, in essence, guaranteed the success of socialist revolutions in many countries. Because other countries were weakened, preoccupied with internal struggles, and unable to fully participate in suppressing socialist revolutions, as had happened so many times with progressive revolutions before. In fact, many have probably forgotten why the October Revolution in Russia had such an impact on our planet. Simply because the Bolsheviks succeeded in doing what revolutionaries in other countries had failed to do many times before.

And, I repeat, most often, the reason for the defeat of progressive revolutions was external intervention, when, for example, Russia, Prussia, and others introduced their regular troops into a country and suppressed popular revolutions there. Seeing this historical perspective, Lenin called for a focus on organizing socialist revolutions, not defending the fatherland.

I'll repeat Lenin's words once again: "That's the only reason we're against 'defending the fatherland,' that's the only reason!"

So, the myth that the proletariat has no fatherland is just that, a myth, given to us as a metaphor in the Communist Party manifesto compiled by Marx and Engels. We Marxists take this concept as a foundation, and no one rejects it, but that doesn't mean we're obligated to destroy our bourgeois fatherland when, for example, the most powerful empire in human history attempts to colonize it or

divide it into tiny pieces, using, among other things, hordes of Nazi thugs. Based on everything Ilyich said above and the actual state of affairs, leftists involved in the Ukrainian conflict should not only avoid advocating against the defense of the Fatherland, but, on the contrary, should promote the defense of the bourgeois fatherland, including by proposing to society that it make serious left-wing changes.

And perhaps Russian society should even seriously study Roosevelt's reforms, which helped lead the United States out of a long depression—reforms with a serious leftist course. At the same time, as a maximum program, we must certainly propose to society a transition to a socialist path of development, since only this path will enable us to overcome any challenges facing our fatherland today.

<https://svpressa.ru/blogs/article/350620/>

Can the revolution win now? Article in SP: September 23, 2022

The aggression of the super-imperialist "united West" will prevent the left from retaining power in the country.

In conversations with some ardent left-wing revolutionaries, dreams of a revolution often come up. You know, the kind of colorful one, like something out of a Soviet propaganda postcard. Bunches of carnations, the Aurora's salvo, Lenin on an armored car. Hurray, we won...

However, in reality, a revolution may not take such a romantic path. More often than not, a revolution involves bloodshed, economic collapse, and a collapse in the social and social ties of society. Moreover, it can also fail, both at the outset and after formally seizing power in certain key regions. And what's more, it can even fail if power is seized nationwide, even if power there was won through elections, as happened in Spain, for example. In general, there are countless variations on the failure of revolutions and even seemingly established progressive models of social order. Perhaps even more than the number of positive outcomes. Especially considering the experience of the collapse of the USSR and the entire bloc of socialist countries.

So, revolution and the retention of power are not a romantic adventure, but serious work, primarily by the vanguard, trained enthusiasts capable of involving millions of previously indifferent individuals in the process of managing the struggle and governing society, including through self-government.

Without a doubt, revolutionary struggle, and especially maintaining power after a revolution, is a great undertaking, founded on a solid scientific and theoretical foundation.

We Marxists, who have suffered defeats throughout history, though also experienced successes, differ from other political movements in that we have a tremendous foundation for measuring the steps of our struggle against the paths trodden by our great predecessors.

Perhaps this fact deprives us of a certain romantic aura, a recklessness so often celebrated in hymns.

But even in modern Russia, experience shows that it is precisely thanks to these qualities that the Russian left movement stands firm, even during the period of a harsh authoritarian regime. It stands and resists, with its head held high. However, now, at the height of the conflict in Ukraine, some leftists, sometimes even calling themselves Marxists, seem bewildered, perhaps by the dizzying prospects that this historical turn of events could seemingly soon bring us. Some argue that now, under the blows of foreign bourgeois forces, the regime we all hate will collapse, and the people will joyfully follow us in making a socialist revolution. And then they back up their dreams with phrases from Lenin and others about the "imperialist nature of THIS war" of 1914-1918. At the same time, without realizing that Lenin wrote those phrases specifically about THAT war, he directly writes: THIS war is imperialist—not any

war, but this one... But how can one reach the minds of ardent revolutionaries when, in their imagination, a crowd of sailors is about to carry them through the gates of the Spasskaya Tower, or, at worst, into wine warehouses?

Meanwhile, the events in Ukraine, from Russia's side, have nothing to do with the imperialist war. Moreover, the Central Military District is an anti-imperialist response to semi-colonial Russia, aimed at defending its right to independence and freeing the fraternal Ukrainian people, as well as the millions of Russians living there on their historical lands, from colonial dependence. In other words, this war is a war of national liberation, unification, anti-colonialist, and anti-imperialist nature. But even if we stubbornly ignore Russia's moral rightness in this conflict, we're ignoring the very fact of Russia's lack of imperialism, based on Lenin's definition of this phenomenon, which essentially considered the export of capital to be the primary characteristic of imperialism. That is, capitalism in an imperialist country must develop to such an extent that it essentially becomes cramped in its own homeland, and it conquers various countries to build new factories there, etc. What kind of developed manufacturing we have in Russia, that we supposedly intend to establish new factories in Ukraine, remains an unsolved mystery.

Also, a crucial aspect of the era of imperialist wars was that these wars were between alliances of imperialist countries against alliances of other imperialist countries. During WWI, as during World War II, which I also consider essentially imperialist, the USSR was forced to act alongside a number of imperialist countries. Simply because fascism clearly stood outside the framework of a classical bourgeois state system understood and accepted even by Soviet society.

But are there now alliances of imperialist countries fighting each other, at least openly? No, there are no such alliances. So what is there? There is a single alliance of the Western super-empire! Incidentally, Kautsky himself, though largely mistaken, predicted that it could emerge at the beginning of the 20th century.

I would like to reiterate this fact; it is key to this article, and indeed key to assessing the current conflict in Ukraine! We are not dealing with an imperialist war similar to that of 1914-1918. We are dealing with a confrontation between a global capitalist super-empire and a bourgeois, capitalistically underdeveloped, Russian power. Yes, Russia is a vast country, with powerful nuclear weapons, but its population is ten times smaller than the combined population of the countries opposing us, and most importantly, its economic potential is ten times smaller than the combined GDP of the union of these super-empire countries! Only someone with a diseased imagination could imagine that Russia is capable of opposing such a power without apparent reason. It is perfectly clear that in this situation, Russia is the victim of the conflict.

However, let's return to the burning thirst for revolution. In his work "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists," Stalin offers a number of arguments for why the socialist revolution of 1917 was victorious and retained power. And in addition to his own opinion, he cites a well-known passage from Lenin's work "Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder."

Here is this passage, especially point 2, read it carefully and think about how important it is for our situation today: "I had to point out this circumstance back at the beginning of 1918," writes Lenin, "and two years' experience since then has fully confirmed the correctness of this consideration. Such specific conditions as 1) the possibility of combining the Soviet revolution with the end, thanks to it, of the imperialist war, which has incredibly exhausted the workers and peasants; 2) the possibility of utilizing for a certain time the mortal struggle of two world-powerful groups of imperialist predators, which groups could not unite against the Soviet enemy; 3) the possibility of enduring a comparatively long civil

war, partly thanks to the gigantic exchanges of the country and poor means of communication; 4) the existence of such a profound bourgeois-democratic revolutionary movement among the peasantry that the proletarian party took the revolutionary demands of the peasant party (the Socialist-Revolutionaries, a party sharply hostile, for the most part, to Bolshevism) and immediately realized them through the proletariat's conquest of political power; such specific conditions no longer exist in Western Europe, and the recurrence of such or similar conditions is not easy. This is why, among other reasons, Western Europe finds it more difficult to initiate a socialist revolution than we do.

So, today, inexperienced Marxists want to see some analogies with WWI in current events. But both Lenin and Stalin clearly state that things aren't so simple. All classical Marxist thought states, firstly, that the Russian side is not and cannot be considered an imperialist in this conflict. Most importantly, if the Russian revolution were to repeat itself, the modern left would have virtually no chance of retaining power in the country, and the revolution would most likely be suppressed by external forces.

This has happened many times in human history. We know how many progressive, albeit bourgeois, revolutions were crushed by Russian Tsarism, we know how Prussia crushed the French Revolution, and so on. However, never before has the world seen a situation where such a powerful bloc of imperialist countries—the Western coalition today—was confronted by a technologically inferior country, Russia, of course!

I repeat, this is the cornerstone of a proper understanding and, therefore, a proper approach to the conflict in Ukraine! Never before in human history has the might of all the great Western powers been so united and unified in their combined actions against a single country! And in this sense, it is precisely this alliance of Western countries that tells us that for the first time in human history, we are facing a super-empire in such a large-scale conflict!

I will venture to say that this proves that the imperialism recognized by Lenin at the beginning of the 20th century was not the final stage of capitalism. Because at the moment, we are dealing with a new stage of super-imperialism. And it is quite possible that this stage will be the final one in the history of capitalism.

The collapse of the country not even into several pieces, but into dozens of pieces, is perhaps the best that could happen if the Putin regime were to fall revolutionary today! The worst possible outcome would be a civil war throughout Russia, with decades of carnage. And both scenarios presuppose a significant deterioration in the life of society across all indicators, for decades, and possibly even hundreds of years. Can we, Marxists, dream of realizing such a scenario for Russia? I don't think so, because I believe revolution should bring about a qualitative improvement in the lives of all society, perhaps after a period of devastation. But overall, a revolutionary must see clear horizons for when the population's lives will improve exponentially. But to think that the very fact of a just life in some small territory, where all the tools are a hoe, an axe, and a wooden plow, but where food is distributed evenly, that's not communism, forgive me! That's not the goal we should strive for. Communism is, above all, advanced scientific and technological technologies and the possibility of using them now or in the foreseeable future for the common good!

If your goal is to create something resembling a revolution—to create more bloodshed, explosions, gallows for all dissenters, and so on—then forgive me, I'm not on the same page.

Does this mean that revolution can never win in Russia, and am I even against revolution? Of course not. Revolution could have won, for example, in December 2011, if people had marched from a rally to the center of Moscow (Udaltsov\* was in prison at the time). Revolution likely could have occurred in 2018,

on the wave of pension protests, again, if the opposition had joined them seriously and if leftist organizations had received significant financial support at the time. And revolution could possibly happen in the foreseeable future, 5-10 years after the Ukrainian conflict subsides and NATO countries withdraw their troops from Russia's borders. But, alas, we must wait this time out, control our emotions, and not expose ourselves, Russian citizens, and the country as a whole to mortal danger! But we must definitely wait this period out, actively developing theory and revolutionary practice, and there is no contradiction here. Because, for example, every created trade union or action in defense of a public garden is a revolutionary practice, and there is no need to be embarrassed about it! We can and should speak about this openly and everywhere, even to the most ardent revolutionaries who dream of firing a salvo from the Aurora today!

<https://svpressa.ru/blogs/article/346886/>

Below is a post about Lenin's attitude toward the Ukrainian question, which he certainly emphasized, but it's not that simple! Posted: July 30, 2022

Lenin on the Ukrainian question in a letter to Armand, January 30, 1917.

..... It was extremely interesting to watch and listen. I spent a year in German captivity (it was a nightmare there) in a camp of 27,000 Ukrainians. The Germans organized the camps by nationality and tried their best to separate them from Russia; they sent clever lecturers from Galicia to the Ukrainians. The results?

Only 2,000 were for "independence" (independence in the sense of autonomy rather than separation) after a month of propaganda efforts!! The rest, they said, were furious at the thought of separating from Russia and joining the Germans or Austrians.

A significant fact! You can't help but believe it. 27,000 is a large number. A year is a long time. The conditions for Galician propaganda were extremely favorable. And yet, proximity to the Great Russians prevailed! This, of course, doesn't mean that the "freedom of secession" is wrong. On the contrary. But it follows from this that perhaps fate will spare Russia from the "Austrian type" of development.

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_137476](https://vk.com/wall7006326_137476)

Epilogue.

So, we have examined the most important phenomenon of the modern era.

Now we understand that the leftist slogan that communists should support "no war but a class war" is a direct distortion of Marxism!

We have determined that, from a Marxist perspective, communists not only can rise to the defense of the bourgeois fatherland, but in some cases are obliged to do so!

We have established beyond any doubt that the conflict in Ukraine, on the Russian side, is defensive, national liberation, anti-colonialist, and even anti-imperialist in nature, and is essentially a torch for revolutionary struggle for all countries and peoples wishing to throw off Western imperialist hegemony!

From the works of the classics, we now understand that it is Ukraine that is currently carrying out annexation in the southeast! And the annexers have always been enemies of the communists! This can be seen in the many examples I have cited in this brochure.

We have finally determined who the real imperialists are today. And in the language of numbers, the assertion that Russia is an imperialist sounds, to put it mildly, laughable. We realized that war as a phenomenon cannot be assessed unequivocally by Marxists—as good or bad—especially if the war is just!

Finally, we realized that critical support for the SVO is not only in the interests of the working class. The war itself, on Russia's part, is essentially a class struggle and a stage in the socialist revolution in the world—even if Russia's ruling class doesn't realize it!

But you ask: why do the time-tested preachers of the red idea, who call themselves Marxists, believe that Russia is an imperialist, an aggressor, and so on down the list?

If we exclude the mentally ill from this list, we'll still be left with perfectly sane and even highly professional individuals.

The answer to the question of why these people have radically different views, in my opinion, is again hidden in the figures I published above! The structures that control tens of trillions of dollars and essentially print these candy wrappers have no problem spending not just millions, but even billions of dollars on propaganda in Russia!

There's a war going on. It's a brutal war, a particularly vile one waged by the Nazi regime in Ukraine and the Western elites! And buying a few dozen left-wing propagandists is a mere trifle for them!

What practical results do we expect from our position on the Central Military District?

Of course, we should have—and it's not too late now—begun working more closely with the military: supporting the front, conducting agitation and propaganda. Especially in such a way that even on the front lines they see that we propose strengthening the army, improving the soldiers' lives, restructuring the entire economy and public life of the country, directing it toward achieving Victory! In general, this is how the Russian authorities should have acted from the very beginning of the Second World War (my post from May 23, 2023):

"...Since it has come to war, everything must be subordinated to the interests of war. The entire internal life of the country must be subordinated to the war; not the slightest hesitation on this matter is permissible."

I'm publishing this excerpt from Lenin's speech so that Russian citizens understand how communists would act if they were in power today in the current situation!

And so, let everyone answer for themselves. What would have been the results of the conflict in Ukraine if we had applied Lenin's approach?

Would the special operation there have lasted so long?

And most importantly, would such a Leninist approach have been possible without Soviet power? With all these Putin-era oligarchs, who even now, in the most difficult period for the country, are proposing to plunder state property for private pockets!

I'm certain that without adopting Lenin's approach, and with a Leninist-style state, we will have no success on the front lines! And those naively following the Kremlin's leaders must clearly understand that the impending catastrophes of Russia and themselves personally are not the fault of mythical reptilians, but primarily of those who have ignored the Communists for decades. Those who, for decades, have been finding a multitude of excuses to justify their thesis, "I am beyond politics!"

\*\*\*SPEECH AT THE JOINT MEETING OF THE

ALL-RUSSIAN CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW COUNCIL,

TRADE UNIONS

AND FACTORY COMMITTEES

MAY 5, 1920

[https://vk.com/wall7006326\\_166103](https://vk.com/wall7006326_166103)

APPENDIX.

I am enclosing with this brochure several important declarations adopted at international Marxist forums, signed by nearly a hundred different Marxist and workers' parties from many countries, as well as leading contemporary Marxist scholars from various countries!

Paris Declaration: The Rising Tide of Global War and the Tasks of Anti-Imperialists!

Paris Declaration: The Rising Tide of Global War and the Tasks of Anti-Imperialists

We are experiencing a moment of grave danger for working people and oppressed peoples throughout the world, when the imperialist war machine is pushing us toward a third world war and a nuclear conflagration.

Despite the fact that NATO aggression in Ukraine is failing both militarily and economically, the US's desperate desire to maintain its hegemonic position in the world means that it will not retreat, but will seek ways to expand and prolong the conflict. Despite all their accumulated experience, the imperialists still seem to hope that they can crush any resistance to their rule and emerge victorious.

As a result, we face the prospect of the conflict in Ukraine spreading to neighboring countries in Europe and Central Asia, as well as the possibility of military action in several other theaters of war further east. Recent US provocations in Taiwan, as well as the continued escalation of tensions with North Korea and China on all fronts, make this clear.

At this historic moment, we, the undersigned, agree that the following important points must be brought to the attention of the general public worldwide and should guide our anti-war and anti-imperialist work:

1. The conflicts that have already erupted or are about to erupt are not isolated local issues, but are integral to the US drive to maintain its global hegemony. 2. The current war in Ukraine is not the result of "Russian aggression," but the result of the Western imperialists' desire for war, particularly the US desire for war.
3. That the war actually began when the US and its allies financed, armed, and organized the fascist coup in Kyiv in 2014, and that the Russian side, in alliance with the peoples of Donbas, is waging a war of self-defense and national liberation against imperialist attack.
4. That military actions against China and the DPRK are also the result of imperialist aggression, and that, regardless of who fires the first shot, if conflicts break out in Korea or Taiwan, these wars will also be wars of anti-imperialist self-defense and national liberation, waged by the Korean and/or Chinese peoples.
5. The ability of Russia and China to defend themselves and others does not indicate expansionist ambitions or an imperialist economy. It is based on decades of self-defense planning initiated by the socialist governments of the USSR and China.
6. There is no economic data that justifies the characterization of China or Russia as imperialist states. These countries do not live by super-exploitation or plundering the world. They do not enslave other countries militarily, technologically, or through debt. On the contrary, favorable trade terms, as well as the technological and military assistance they offer, give small developing countries a chance to escape imperialist slavery.
7. Russia and China are targets of imperialist aggression because, by maintaining their independence and helping other countries achieve it, they pose a serious threat to imperialist global hegemony.
8. The growing alliance between Russia and China gives hope to people around the world: hope for an alternative to US dominance and imperialist super-exploitation. A strong anti-imperialist camp is our people's best defense against the aggressive designs of the bloodthirsty NATO alliance—our best defense against the looming threat of nuclear war.
9. Anti-war activists must mobilize the masses in their countries to wage a campaign of active non-cooperation with imperialist military forces, aimed at sabotaging NATO's military machine in every possible way. We must refuse to fight alongside NATO armies or assist them (directly or indirectly). We must refuse to transport NATO personnel and equipment. We must refuse to grant NATO bases unimpeded access to our territories. We must refuse to manufacture or supply weapons and other vital equipment to NATO. We must refuse to broadcast, print, or distribute false imperialist propaganda, as well as to cooperate with imperialist trade and sanctions wars.
10. The accelerating escalation of military action, the economic crisis, the food crisis, the environmental crisis, and much more clearly demonstrate that the need to abandon the imperialist economic system is more urgent than ever.
11. The slogans of true anti-imperialists in our time should be: "Defeat the imperialist alliance led by NATO!" "Victory for resistance!" "No cooperation with the imperialist war!"

List of signatories in chronological order

1. Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist), Great Britain
2. People's Democracy Party, South Korea
3. Korea - one, Belgium - the other
4. Baltic Platform
5. Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan, Kyrgyzstan
6. Hungarian Workers' Party, Hungary
7. Communist Party of Italy
8. Italian Communist Party, Italy
9. Communist Party of Switzerland
10. Eastern Initiative, Europe
11. New Communist Party of Yugoslavia, Serbia
12. National Association of Communists, France
13. Pole of Communist Rebirth in France, France
14. Communist Party of Chile (Proletarian Action), Chile
15. Socialist Workers' Party of Croatia, Croatia
16. Platform for Independence - Greece, Greece
17. Communist Party of Peru (Patria Roja), Peru
18. Collective "Struggle for Revolutionary Unification of Humanity, Greece
19. People's Party of Panama, Panama
20. Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain, Spain
21. New Communist Party of Montenegro, Montenegro
22. United Socialist Party of Venezuela, Venezuela
23. Union of the Proletariat, Spain
24. Communist Union, France
25. Communist Party of Lebanon, Lebanon
26. Communist Party of Mexico (formerly Mexican Communist Movement)
27. Pan-African Unitarian Dynamics, 23 organizations in Africa
28. Party of Communists of Kyrgyzstan, Kyrgyzstan
29. Belarusian Communist Workers' Party, Belarus
30. Belarusian Republican Organization of the CPSU, Belarus
31. Communist Party of the USA
32. Center for Political Innovation, USA

33. Communist Party of Quebec, Canada
34. All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, Russia
35. Workers' and Peasants' Party, Pakistan
36. Communist Party of Kenya, Kenya
37. Communist Initiative, Spain
38. Socialist Platform, Georgia
39. Communist Party of Belgium, Belgium
40. Communist Workers' Party of Turkey/Leninist, Turkey
41. Communist Party of Peru, Peru
42. Anti-Imperialist Camp, Europe
43. Workers' Party of Ireland, Ireland
44. Borotba, Ukraine
45. Bulca Herri Ekimena, Euskal Herria (Basque Country)
46. Anti-Fascist Former Resistance Members, Netherlands / Anti-Fascist Association, Netherlands
  
47. CARC Party, Italy
48. Syrian Communist Party (Unified), Syria
49. Popular Resistance, Italy
50. Congolese Communist Party (CCP), Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)
51. Union of Political Emigrants and Political Prisoners of Ukraine
52. Communist Party of the USA
53. Communist Cry, Catalonia
54. Communist Party of the Galician Republic, Galicia
55. Communist Party of Armenia, Armenia
56. Socialist Forum of Tanzania, Tanzania
57. African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC), Guinea-Bissau
58. Juwa Party, Comoros
59. Left Front, Russia
60. Communist Party of the Philippines [CPFP 1930], Philippines
61. United National Democratic Assembly, Kingdom of Bahrain
62. Andalusian Nation, Andalusia
63. Communist Party of Venezuela, Venezuela

64. Chairman of the Socialist Party Antonio Gramsci, Mexico

Posted on the website of the "World Anti-Imperialist Platform"!

<https://wap21.org/?p=566>

The fight against fascism is a common, urgent task for progressive forces throughout the world. Address of the II International Anti-Fascist Forum

Moscow,

April 23, 2025

We, the participants of the II International Anti-Fascist Forum in Moscow, reaffirm and support the Manifesto for the Unification of the Peoples of the World, "Protect Humanity from Fascism," adopted on April 22, 2023, in Minsk during the First International Anti-Fascist Forum.

The course of events has confirmed the correctness of the assessment that the cause of imperialist aggression in the modern world is the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. At the end of the 20th century, counterrevolution in the USSR and Eastern European countries temporarily weakened the socialist pole of the planet and untied the forces of reaction. In full accordance with Lenin's theory.

The US imperialists and other capitalist predators are fighting for global hegemony using the most vile methods, including cultivating neo-fascist regimes.

Over the past decades, globalists have tainted themselves with aggression against Yugoslavia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and Syria. Imperialism is preparing a similar fate for other countries and peoples. Coups have been attempted in Belarus, Venezuela, and Nicaragua.

NATO countries aimed to demonize Russia, defeat it militarily, and dismember it following the example of the Soviet Union. To achieve this, they created an aggressive foothold in Ukraine. A form of Nazism, Banderatism, was nurtured. By February 2022, nearly 50 satellite countries were involved in NATO's anti-Russian policy, led by the US. The economic, political, and military resources of global capital, including military mercenaries, have been thrown into the attack against Russia.

Revanchist motives are increasingly evident in the ideology and policies of the Western bloc. These are being driven by the same forces that suffered defeat in 1945 at the hands of the Soviet Union and its Red Army. Anti-Sovietism, anticommunism, and Russophobia are on the rise in most Western countries. Sanctions have been imposed on the peoples of Russia, China, Cuba, North Korea, and Iran. Military threats, political blackmail, and terrorism are being widely used.

The same evil gang that funds and arms Ukrainian neo-Nazis supports the Israeli Zionists who have unleashed the massacre in Palestine. The imperialists are escalating tensions in various regions of the world, threatening a new world war. At the same time, contradictions within their camp are growing. The United States seeks to solve its economic problems by suppressing any competitors, including the European Union. The future of Ukraine must be decided based on the interests of the country's workers and the goals of long-term peace in Europe. The neo-Nazi regime in Kyiv must not be allowed to strengthen itself or be pumped with weapons. A decisive denazification of Ukraine is necessary to prevent the very possibility of further bloodshed. The Banderite punitive forces and their Western

patrons must be justly condemned, and the fascist regime in Kyiv must be eliminated. We insist on lifting the ban on the Communist Party of Ukraine, on the free use of the Russian language, on banning the glorification of Banderites, and on the restoration of demolished monuments to anti-fascist heroes.

We emphasize that one of the main signs of the revival of fascism in Ukraine, the Baltics, and other countries is anti-communism. This is entirely consistent with the practices of the Hitlerite fascists who created the Anti-Comintern Pact. It is essential for the peoples of the world to stop any attempts at Nazi revenge. We demand the complete rejection of all forms of decommunization in state ideology and policy. We express our readiness to unite in the fight against all forms of neocolonialism, aggression, and genocide. We call for an end to the war against the Palestinian people, for their right to live peacefully and develop freely in their homeland, and for the implementation of relevant UN resolutions. We condemn imperialist aggression against Lebanon, Yemen, and Syria.

We express solidarity with all peoples subjected to imperialist attacks. We resolutely oppose the latest round of anti-Cuban actions by the US government. We demand the removal of the Republic of Cuba from Washington's arbitrarily compiled list of state sponsors of terrorism.

The fight against neo-Nazism, neocolonialism, and militarism is the task of all thinking, courageous, and dignified people on the planet. It cannot be postponed. It must be waged here and now – by any available means, uniting all possible allies!

On the eve of the 80th anniversary of the Great Victory over Hitler's Nazism and Japanese militarism in World War II, we declare: fascism and the threat of world war can be forever ended only by ending imperialism. The only force capable of achieving this is the working class and the working classes, led by communists. We wholeheartedly welcome the transformation of the fight against fascism into a struggle for the socialist renewal of all countries on the planet.

The battle against fascism cannot allow respites or truces!

Rise in the ranks of the fighters against neo-fascism, for social progress and socialism!

We will not allow the world to be blown up!

No pasarán! They shall not pass!

Long live the united front of progressive forces!

P.S.

The Forum was attended by 160 delegations from communist and workers' organizations from 90 countries around the globe. (As a reminder, I personally participated in this conference and saw a huge number of revolutionaries from various countries. Many of them had extensive practical experience in struggle: prison sentences lasting decades, participation in guerrilla warfare, etc. But, in addition, this Forum was attended by the most prominent Marxist scholars from all over the world!)

<https://kprf.ru/party-live/cknews/233919.html?ysclid=mi4ttlkp50590411888>

Here is a statement from one of the largest organizations of Marxist practitioners, the World Anti-Imperialist Front (not to be confused with the WAP).

NATO, EU, American imperialists – take your bloody hands off the people of Donbass and Ukraine!

Imperialism wants to establish NATO bases around the world and install reactionary, fascist governments that will serve its interests.

Stop the military provocations of NATO, the US, and the EU! Solidarity with the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist forces in eastern Ukraine!

The latest events surrounding Russia and Donbas are developing extremely rapidly. On February 24, the world woke up to the news that "Russia attacked Ukraine."

To fully assess these events and their developments, more time is needed to observe and analyze them. But we can say a few things today.

Just yesterday, we were discussing Russia's recognition of the Donbas republics as independent states.

The imperialist media hysterically declared that international law had been "violated." While we were pondering how to clarify these claims, the military operation launched by Russia appeared on the agenda.

The Ukrainian state has been waging an open war against Donbas for eight years now. According to official figures, 13,000 people have died in this war waged by the Ukrainian army and fascist paramilitary organizations, supported by NATO and the EU, against the residents of eastern Ukraine.

In the last week before the military operation, Ukraine subjected Donbas to continuous shelling. A hail of bombs rained down on the residents of both republics.

If we set aside Russia's interests as a state in this region and focus on the events of recent years, we can clearly see how this war arose.

The US and the EU, having supported the fascist coup in 2014, attempted to completely seize control of Ukraine. The imperialists, who forced Ukraine to join NATO, strengthened the political and military blockade of Russia and paved the way for the outbreak of war.

While imperialist media accuse Russia of "violating international law," they say not a word about Ukraine's killing of residents of Donbas. In 2014, to end the war in Donbas, the Minsk Agreement was signed between Ukraine and representatives of the DPR and LPR, with the participation of three other countries as guarantors. With the signing of this agreement, it became part of international law, with the UN acting as guarantor.

Furthermore, no one except Russia has fulfilled the terms of the Minsk Agreements. But what does the 13-point Minsk package of measures include?

First and foremost, heavy weapons must be withdrawn from the region. Frankly, both parties to the agreement have failed to do so.

Next comes a conflict resolution through dialogue, in which representatives of the DPR and LPR will be recognized as equal participants in the negotiations.

Over the past eight years, Ukraine has never done this. It has never begun negotiations with the DPR and LPR.

According to the Minsk Agreements, the autonomy of Donbas was to be guaranteed by amendments to the Ukrainian constitution by March 2015. By the end of 2015, local elections under OSCE supervision were scheduled to be held in both republics.

To ensure that anti-fascists would not fear criminal prosecution by the Ukrainian authorities, a general amnesty was to be declared in the country.

As can be seen from the above, Russia had no intention of annexing Donbas and separating it from Ukraine.

Had Ukraine complied with the Minsk agreements signed in 2015, peace could have reigned in Donbas since 2015.

But Ukraine never did. In October 2021, Germany and France, the guarantors of the agreement, declared that "Ukraine no longer needs to meet with representatives of Donbas," thereby effectively "burying" the agreement.

But despite this, Russia was always blamed for everything.

Who violated the Minsk Agreements?

Who violated international law?

First of all, it's worth noting the following: not a single one of the 13 points of the Minsk Agreements states that "Russia cannot recognize the Donbas republics as independent states." Russia is a guarantor of the agreement, not a party to it, like the DPR, LPR, and Ukraine.

Did Russia "bury" the Minsk Agreements after recognizing the independence of the two Donbas republics?

Did this violate international law?

To some extent, yes, since after recognizing the DPR and LPR, the Minsk Agreements effectively "died." Because they can no longer be returned to Ukraine. But Russia became the "last country" to violate them.

And this after eight years of effort.

There are two fundamental principles in international law. These two principles contradict each other.

The first principle is the territorial integrity of each country.

The second principle is the right of peoples to self-determination. Why did Donbas demand independence? Because a fascist and neo-Nazi regime, which came to power in Kyiv through a coup supported by imperialists, is in power. And the people of Donbas have achieved an anti-fascist breakthrough.

This break is called secession in English. In this sense, the secession of Donbas occurs within the framework of international law.

Furthermore, the decision of the International Court of Justice on the status of Kosovo is pending. Therefore, the secession of Donbas is fully consistent with the principles of international law.

At the time, the imperialists did not consider Kosovo's separation from Yugoslavia a violation of international law, as it served their interests.

On October 8, 2008, the case was referred to the International Court of Justice in The Hague, Netherlands. On June 22, 2010, the International Court of Justice ruled that "Kosovo's declaration of independence is not contrary to international law." What applies to Kosovo also applies to all other parts of the world, including Donbas. This concludes the debate on this issue.

Russia's military operation against Ukraine

We, the Anti-Imperialist Front, always oppose imperialism and always side with the people. We are guided by these principles.

In determining our position on Russia's military operation against Ukraine, we are guided by this principle.

The real victims of all this are the people of Ukraine. And we do not want this to happen.

But responsibility for this, as for the actions of all other governments serving imperialism, lies with the Ukrainian government. It is currently leading its people to disaster.

Russia has repeatedly stated that it opposes Ukraine's accession to NATO. It has also repeatedly stated that it perceives the aspirations of NATO, and especially American imperialists, and to some extent EU imperialists, to move closer to its borders as a threat.

We continue to monitor developments.

Imperialism must remove its bloody hands from the peoples of Donbas and Ukraine.

If imperialism goes away, the people will have no problems.

Anti-Imperialist Front

February 27, 2022

<https://anti-imperialistfront.org/nato-eu-us-imperialists-get-your-bloody-hands-off-the-peoples-of-donbas-and-ukraine/>

Another statement from the Anti-Imperialist Front!

New Year's message from the Anti-Imperialist Front: LET'S STRENGTHEN RESISTANCE AND VICTORIES OVER IMPERIALISM AND FASCISM!

HAPPY NEW YEAR! LONG LIVE RESISTANCE AND VICTORIES!

LET'S UNITE, FIGHT, AND DEFEAT IMPERIALISM AND FASCISM!

2025 will be the year of resistance victories. From Palestine and the Middle East to Turkey, Greece, Europe, Donbas, Africa, Latin America, and the entire world—the resistance of oppressed peoples will triumph over imperialism and injustice.

As the Anti-Imperialist Front, we will continue the fight against the EU, the US, NATO, and all these murderous policies. The year 2024 ended with the genocide of the Palestinian people perpetrated by Zionists and imperialists, but at the same time, the Palestinian resistance shows people around the world that the only path to victory is resistance. Resistance in Yemen and Lebanon continues against imperialist and Zionist aggression. After 13 years of imperialist intervention, the US, EU, British imperialism, Israeli Zionism, Turkish fascism, and their collaborators have completely occupied Syria. In Turkey, revolutionaries continue the struggle against imperialism and fascism both in and outside prisons, opposing the harsh isolation of the S, R, and Y types. Comrades have become martyrs in the revolutionary struggle for justice. NATO and the Nazi regime in Kiev continue their war against the people of Donbas and Russia. Thousands of political prisoners in all countries are held in isolation and

subjected to torture. In 2025, we must intensify the anti-imperialist struggle against the common enemy of the peoples of the world—American imperialism and its satellite states! We will intensify the fight against NATO and the EU—the enemies of the peoples of the world. We will continue to combat disinformation and spread the voice of the world's oppressed peoples!

Even under conditions of repression, we will continue to develop the Resistance movement in all countries and strengthen international solidarity.

Because our duty as anti-imperialists and revolutionaries is to defeat imperialism, the most vile system, by any means necessary. We know full well that our struggle is just, and therefore we will win.

A new year with freedom for Palestine and freedom for all political prisoners. A year full of struggle and victories!

HAPPY NEW YEAR, VICTORY OVER IMPERIALISM, FREEDOM FOR ALL OPPRESSED PEOPLE OF THE WORLD AND FOR ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS!

LONG LIVE THE RESISTANCE! LONG LIVE THE PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE!

<https://anti-imperialistfront.org/anti-imperialist-fronts-new-years-message-lets-grow-the-resistances-and-the-victories-against-imperialism-and-fascism/>

\*Udaltsov is listed on the Rosfinmonitoring register of extremists and terrorists.