

A. K. Isaev¹

ABOUT THE PRESENT SITUATION

Our old and now new Chinese friends are known to have an ancient saying: “God forbid you live in an era of change.” The Slavic mentality is different from the Chinese mentality. “There is delight in battle, and the gloomy abyss on the edge, and in the furious ocean...” “Blessed is he who has

¹ Deputy Head of the “United Russia” party faction in the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, member of the State Duma Committee on Labor, Social Policy and Veterans’ Affairs, Deputy Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Candidate of Political Sciences, Professor of SPbUHSS. Editor-in-Chief of the “Solidarnost” newspaper (1991–2000), Secretary of the FNPR (1995–2001), Deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation of III–VIII convocations (1999 – present day). Author of a number of publications on the problems of social, trade union and labor movement, including books: “Social Environment,” “Social Environment in Crisis,” “Economic Democracy – Modern Ideology of Traditional Trade Unions of Russia,” “History of Russian Trade Unions. Stages, Events, People” (co-authored), Major Changes in the Labor Legislation of Russia, and others. One of the authors of the current Labor Code of the Russian Federation. Member of the General Council of the United Russia Party. Honorary Doctor of the Russian Academy of Advocacy and Notaries. Awarded the Order of Merit for the Fatherland IV degree, the Order of Honor, Friendship, P. A. Stolypin Medal II degree and others. Awarded a Commendation from the President of the Russian Federation, Honorary Diplomas of the Government of the Russian Federation, the State Duma, the Federation Council of the Russian Federation, etc.

visited this world in its fatal moments” are quotes from the national classics.

In the twenty-first century, Russians are having enough “bliss” and “delight.” What is happening today can be compared without exaggeration with such turning points in Russian history as the Great Unrest of the early 17th century, the invasion of Napoleon in 1812, the national catastrophe of February 1917, and even the Great Patriotic War.

Today’s events really resemble the Great Patriotic War, as the so-called collective West, led by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain – an active participant in this duo – is waging war against Russia. The war is being waged on all fronts, including culture, and it is not just the banning of Tchaikovsky and the declaration that Pushkin and Dostoyevsky were imperialists. This is primarily “dehumanization” of Russians, creation of their demonic image. Why are they doing this? It’s because a mentally well-to-do person is uncomfortable when his kin are destroyed; so the object of aggression has to be deprived of human characteristics, and then destroyed without worry or fear of redemption. This is exactly what is now being done to Russians practically all over Europe.

However, the war unleashed against Russia is not only about culture, but primarily about trade and economy. Actions taken to the detriment of our economy cannot be called sanctions, not even “infernally.” Generally, in world practice, the purpose of any sanctions is to force a country to do or, on the contrary, not to do something, in accordance with some legal decision. But the sanctions that have been announced and are applied against Russia do not even pursue the goal of ending a special military operation, but are aimed at total destruction of the economy. Both French Finance Minister Bruno Le Maire and U.S. President Joe Biden were quite frank about this when they said that Russia should be thrown back into the 19th century.

That is, we are talking about a conscious policy aimed at humiliation, impoverishment, and ultimately the suffering and death of tens of millions of people. A “hot” war has been unleashed against Russia in Ukraine. But we are all well aware that, in fact, NATO is at war with us using the hands of the Ukrainians. NATO officers plan operations, NATO aerospace reconnaissance data and NATO weapons are used in military operations.

It is not by chance that Ukraine was chosen as a combat force directed against us. There are several prerequisites for this. The first is that the school of Zbigniew Brzezinski (and the entire modern establishment of the US Democratic Party are Brzezinski’s disciples) taught: Without Ukraine, Russia ceases to be a superpower and becomes a mediocre regional country.

The second premise is that Ukrainian nationalism is an ideal sparring partner to fight Russia, because it has unique generic features: first, its ideology is anti-Russian from the onset; second, in all periods of its short history, it has entered into alliances with those who at that time were the strongest and most dangerous enemies of Russia.

Why is Ukrainian nationalism directed primarily against Russia? If we agree with our president that Ukrainians and Russians are essentially one nation, then how do we separate one part from the other? Only by opposition; according to Dmitry Dontsov, one of the classics of Ukrainian nationalism, by “etching everything that is Russian out of the Ukrainian people.”

Here the Ukrainian nationalism classics agree with us and our president. Stepan Bandera wrote in 1950 in a paper entitled “The Ukrainian National Revolution, Not Just Resistance to the Regime”: “Our general line of liberation policy is based on the fact that the struggle for the state independence of Ukraine is a struggle against Russia, not only against Bolshevism, but against every invading Russian imperialism that is inherent in the Russian people in history and modern times.”

Bandera can be considered the “Lenin” of Ukrainian nationalism. And here are the words of its “Karl Marx” – Dmitry Dontsov: “It is not the slogan of independence that is relevant in and of itself. Our Ukrainians once dreamed of an independent Ukraine in alliance with Russia. What is relevant, more real, more concrete – more likely to be realized! – is the slogan of breaking away from Russia, of dissolving any connection with it.” For, he believed, the choice was either Ukraine or Russia.

And the fact that Ukrainian nationalists have always allied with Russia’s enemies is confirmed even at the level of symbolism. For example, there is a common belief that the modern yellow and blue national flag of Ukraine symboli-

cally depicts sprouting wheat and cloudless sky. In fact, its author is state traitor Ivan Mazepa, known for betraying Peter the Great by going over to the side of the enemy. At that time Russia’s enemy was Sweden; the flag of that state was a yellow Protestant cross on a blue background. During the Battle of Poltava, so that the Swedes could distinguish between the Ukrainian Cossacks fighting on Mazepa’s side and those who fought on the Russian side, they attached a small yellow and blue rectangle to their flag. And the red-black flag of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army is essentially the banner of the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (the only legitimate party in Nazi Germany).

So, a war is being waged against us using a variety of means, that is, a hybrid war. Its purpose is frankly articulated by our former compatriots who have fled abroad. They often argue with each other, but the two theses are constantly repeated. First: not only Putin, but also the United Russia party and all Russian people are responsible for everything that is going on, so we will have to repent for at least 70 years, just as the German people repented for Nazi crimes. In fact, this is, to put it mildly, a completely unfair comparison. Even if they really believe that the Russian military committed crimes in Bucha and fired rockets at Kramatorsk, is that comparable to Buchenwald and Auschwitz? To Holocaust, the mass genocide of the Slavs, the murder of tens of millions of people?

The second thesis is even more interesting; it can be found both in small essays and in multi-volume works, like Boris Akunin’s. In brief, the wording is something like this: the modern Russian state is a direct heir of the Golden Horde, it inherits Russian imperialism, so no matter how you put it together, it always turns out to be imperialistic. The tsarist Russia was an empire, the Soviet Russia after it, and the Russian Federation became an empire, too.

Consequently, the goal is to destroy this state so that its remnants could somehow adapt on the fringes of Europe and the America-centered world. Thus, we are faced with a quite clear challenge: either perish as a state and civilization, or win. There is simply no other option left to us by those who actually committed aggression against us.

And what does it mean to win when it comes to our confrontation with the mightiest country in the world – the United States of America and with the most powerful military political bloc, superior to Russia – NATO?

I don’t think taking hold of Washington is among our immediate plans. From my point of view, for us to win is to endure for the next few years. If Russia persists and strengthens during this period despite economic sanctions and military pressure, it will mean a failure for the United States and the entire America-centered world.

And what are the root causes of the war being waged against Russia? In my opinion, this war was largely predetermined by the contradiction between the economic and political order of the world as it emerged after World War II. The United Nations is the direct heir to the anti-Hitler coalition; within the UN, there is a Security Council whose primary mission is to maintain international peace. Five countries are permanent members of the UN Security Council, and each has the veto power. This is called the multipolar political system.

Meanwhile, in the economic world, things have turned out differently. In 1944, when the future victors were already considering how to arrange the world in the future,

Stalin demanded some of the territories, most of which we had lost by now (only the Kuril Islands and Kaliningrad remained). But Uncle Sam bought it with money – the Bretton Woods Agreement, under which the U.S. dollar became the world’s reserve currency and the main means of payment – that is, in fact, was turned into an analogue of gold. This agreement had three major economic consequences.

First: all trade transactions between countries are conducted in U.S. dollars. If Honduras decides to buy bananas from neighboring Guatemala, it must first buy dollars and only then can pay for the goods. In terms of world trade, this means that for every box of matches sold, the United States receives a certain amount (say, one cent), simply for the fact that it owns the means of payment.

The second consequence is that currencies around the world are pegged to the dollar; that is, they are issued only in the amount equal to the U.S. currency available with the country. If Russia needs to increase the money stock, we can only print money to the extent of our gold and foreign exchange reserve; otherwise, inflation can increase greatly. In general, it would be more true to say “foreign exchange and gold” instead of “gold and foreign exchange” because in the reserves of all countries, gold does not exceed 20% (and most have much less); the rest is “foreign exchange,” that is, mostly dollars. In order for us to print rubles to meet the economic need of the country, we must first buy U.S. dollars. But you can only buy them by selling some real goods! That is, in exchange for a natural product (oil, gas, ores, etc.) what we get is not even cut paper, as columnists say, but zeros in electronic accounts. You can call a certain country names like the Golden Horde, but natural tribute from around the world is actually collected by the United States.

Finally, a third consequence, that is also very important. Suppose we decided to print rubles without regard to the dollar. What does this lead to? The only possible answer is hyperinflation. Just like water, money will fill the entire volume given to it, limited by the size of the national economy, and this “water” will tear the entire economy apart. Savings will collapse, working capital of enterprises will depreciate, loans will become more expensive, etc.

Is there a country in the world that does not need to peg its national currency to the dollar? Yes. It’s the United States of America. Unlike other nations, the U.S. does not need to limit the amount of printed dollars to the amount of dollars it has. Therefore, the U.S. Federal Reserve System, which, as we know, is a private entity,¹ prints as many dollars as it sees fit. For example, according to experts, during the COVID-19 pandemic they stamped out up to \$4 trillion – the so-called “helicopter money,” which was generously handed out to who they wanted. If any other country did that, it would ruin its economy. But the U.S. economy is not a closed vessel, but rather a tub standing on top of other tubs. When it fills up, the “water” simply drains into other containers. Thus, by the end of the last century, the U.S. had mastered the best kind of export – the export of inflation.

The dominance of the dollar in global finance was called into question when a number of European countries established a single currency – the euro, and then Russia and China began negotiations on trade using national currencies. The U.S. does not like it very much, so in order to

¹ FRS includes 12 federal reserve banks and about 3,000 commercial banks. The form of capital ownership is joint stock.

strengthen the monopoly of the dollar and to zero out their huge national debt, they started this war. Ukrainian nationalists think they are fighting for their homeland, but in reality they are dying for another solitary goal – to strengthen the U.S. dollar. Western propagandists say that the United States is fighting for liberalism against Nazism, but in fact their ideology is described by a single word: dollar. Everything else is nothing but tools. Liberalism is good as soft power (defending minority rights, etc.), but Nazism is the weapon used for harder action. We remember that Maidan was unleashed by pro-Western “liberals,” but when force was required, Nazi units were put into action.

Victory over Russia is fundamentally important for the United States because its political history is a series of defeats. In the last 15 years they have not won a single more or less convincing victory. They promised to bring Iran to its knees, overthrow Maduro in Venezuela, Lukashenko in Belarus, and Assad in Syria – nothing worked out. Even from the little North Korea they bounced like a ball off the wall, and fled in disgrace from Afghanistan. If they lose to Russia once again in front of the whole world, it will mean the end of them. Then the dollars, bonds and other debt instruments, which are a huge system built on top of the dollar, will begin to return “home.” The U.S. economy won’t be able to take it. A country where half the adult population are bloggers and lawyers, and where the real industries (excluding the defence sector) have moved to other countries, cannot exist as it did before. Therefore, if Russia survives, the collapse of the America-centered world is inevitable. No one is hiding it. Both Russia, represented by Sergey Lavrov, and the United States, through Biden, have declared that they are fighting for a new world order. That is, it is essentially a world war, and we will have to deal with very serious blows.

Here I would like to discuss the role that our political party has to play in this difficult situation. We are now seeing a very high level of national unity: the overwhelming majority of people supports Putin’s decisions and the special military operation. But we understand that this is largely an emotional reaction, largely due to the sanctions imposed on Russia. People understand who challenged us and what the challenge is. There is a long struggle ahead. After the special military operation is over, one way or another, the confrontation with our real enemy will not stop. So we will need a lot of political power to bring the society together, just as we needed it to lead the country out of the economic crisis in the early 2000s.

Only the United Russia party can play the role of such a political power. It may be an axiom for you and I, but when we meet with voters, we must be prepared to answer one and the same question, “Why you?” After all, communists also say, “We are patriots, we approve of the return of Crimea and the people’s republics of Donbass. In fact, we were the ones who proposed the resolution. We support the president in all his foreign policy endeavors. What makes us different from United Russia is that we are kind. They’re mean, they don’t want to give you money, but we’ll distribute it among everyone. So choose us.”

What can we say to these arguments? First: as of today, the only party that really supports V. Putin is United Russia. V. Putin is United Russia. Fruit are impossible without root. Were it not for a whole series of decisions voted for by the United Russia alone, the president would not be able

to conduct a strong, independent foreign policy today. One such example is the parliamentary vote for the mineral extraction tax, when the law introduced by the president received the necessary number of votes only after the United Russia faction voted for it.

Let me remind you of another important episode. In the early 2000s, Vladimir Putin suggested that the first priority would be paying off debts to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We understood that this debt entailed not only economic but also political dependence. In the course of my work in trade unions, one of my duties involved studying of the memorandum of the Russian government to the International Monetary Fund, where we committed ourselves to some articles of the Labor Code of the Russian Federation. It is unclear what IMF has to do with our labor law, and yet it has begun to dictate its terms. And then Putin offered to settle accounts with IMF. The opposition parties were categorically against it: why should we? All states have debts, let us better spend on pensions and salaries, etc. But what would happen to our pensions and salaries today if we continued to be in debt to IMF? And only United Russia supported the president at that time.

In those years, the country withstood the first blow to our economy. What has kept us going? The budget rule and the strict budget policy United Russia insisted on. When voters asked if the government would be able to pay pensions and benefits on time and in full, we could honestly look them in the eye and answer, "Yes, the budget law passed for three years provides for that. All obligations will be met because each article was calculated on the basis of real conditions." And indeed, social problems began to be solved little by little – thanks to United Russia. The system of social support established during those years still helps us mitigate many adverse effects on the Russian economy today. Establishment of such a system was made possible by Federal Law No. 122, known as the "law on monetization of benefits," which, yet again, was approved only by United Russia. The other factions did not dare vote for this law, very unpopular at that time.

We are often rebuked for approving significant budgetary expenditures on such items as defense and security. Every time budget discussions begin, my colleagues and I have to listen to the disapproving comments about health-care and education spending. But it has long been known that the nation that does not want to feed its own army will soon be forced to feed someone else's. If we do not allocate the necessary funds for defense and security, after a while we will not be able to determine for ourselves how much we need to spend on health and education. Nevertheless, only our party has consistently defended these budget items.

Another important point: United Russia is a party that has branches in most localities across the country, so we are accessible to almost every voter. No other party has such an extensive structure. Many opposition parties participate in elections to the State Duma and legislative assemblies of the constituent regions of the Federation at all times, but when it comes to elections at the local level, say, CPRF "closes" 30% of seats at best. United Russia, unlike other parties, is represented everywhere. This is very important because Russian Federation is a huge country with many regions and national entities, so the preferences and interests of our population are very diverse. And only United Rus-

sia can respond to the request of any voter, regardless of class, nationality, or social background. All this means that we have been playing a unifying role for many years, and quite successfully.

Finally, United Russia is an actual party of Russian political culture. We do not reject any period of our history.

Liberal parties say that the seven decades of the Soviet state were a dark, totalitarian time. We object – of course, tragic mistakes and even crimes were committed, but in those same years, the country achieved victory in the Great Patriotic War, the first flights into space, and other success in various fields – in science, culture, etc. We respect veterans and their views, including their memory of the past. They do not contradict the ideology of our party in any way.

Communists, on the contrary, fight for the "purity" of their ideology, arguing that Russia had a terrible regime before the October Revolution, otherwise there would have been no revolution at all. We believe, however, that even in tsarist times Russia had considerable achievements and conquests. It is true that today we can hear, for instance, from Gennady Zyuganov that he largely approves of the activities of Alexander III. But Gennady Andreevich should know that Alexander Ulyanov, brother of his idol Vladimir Lenin, participated in the preparation for the attempted assassination of Alexander III. We can also refer to the text of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, whereas Marxism continues to be the main ideology of CPRF. The Manifesto proclaims that workers have no Homeland. Vladimir Mayakovsky praised this Marxist "truth" and dreamed of "living in a world without Russias, without Latvias, in a single human community." The ideology of cosmopolitanism, and in fact anti-patriotism, was conceived by the classics of Marxism, who, however, never treated all nations equally. They especially did not like the Russians.

In the Soviet period, as we remember, a complete collection of V. I. Lenin's works was published, while the works by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, even the multi-volume ones, were never really "complete." The ideological department of the CPSU Central Committee knew perfectly well that some lines by the classics should better not be published in Russia. Nevertheless, something did make its way into print. In particular, in one of his works, Marx quotes the Polish politician Duchinski: "The very name Rus' was usurped by the Muscovites. Not only are Russians not Slavs, they do not even belong to the Indo-European race. They are aliens who should be kicked back behind the Dnieper." And here is how Marx himself feels about this point of view: "I wish it were true, or at least that this view would become predominant among the Slavs." And here is a quote from Engels' polemic with M. Bakunin: "Europe has only one alternative: either submit to the yoke of the Slavs, or finally destroy the center of this hostile force – Russia." In another letter to Bakunin, Engels writes: "A merciless life-and-death struggle with the Slavs who betray the revolution, a struggle for destruction and ruthless terrorism, is not in the interests of Germany, but in the interests of the revolution."

It would seem that the Russian Communists should have taken it all into account. But, unfortunately, this did not happen. We remember that the Bolshevik Party was probably the only one in the history of our country which openly called for our own defeat during World War I. This view was considered correct until the mid-1930s.

In 1930, there was a debate in the capital about the Master Plan for the reconstruction of Moscow. It consisted in demolishing the Church of St. Basil and removing the monument to Minin and Pozharsky. Eventually, the cathedral and the monument, fortunately, remained in place. But in the course of the debate, a poem was published in the Bolshevik magazine (later *Kommunist*, now *Svobodnoe Slovo*) of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks. It deserves to be reproduced:

The Minin and Pozharsky
should be melted! Why do they need above all heads to rise?
The two shopkeepers vainly celebrated,
October caught them selling merchandise.
We didn't break their necks – they were lucky,
Although I know it would have been a fit.
They say, they have saved Russia in their market,
But was there a point in saving it?

All this happened before the Great Patriotic War. Then there was the war, an invocation of the Russian roots, Dmitry Donskoy, Alexander Nevsky, and some adjustment to the Communist ideology. But we must remember that there are two components to the ideology of modern Communists – the Marxist class ideology and the patriotic one that has been introduced in recent years. It is difficult to predict which one will prevail if we encounter economic problems because of the sanctions. All the more so because in the recent past, in 2021, the Communists entered into an alliance with the obvious enemies of the nation – the Navalists, who have been pushing the CIA's tactics of the so-called smart voting in elections. We also remember that it was our fellow Communists (albeit only a few of them) who declared that they did not support the special military operation.

As for the other political parties represented in the Duma – LDPR, Fair Russia, and New People – anyone can see that they cannot claim to be a national leader. Fair Russia leader Sergei Mironov has recently taken a strong patriotic stance (for which he deserves credit), but in 2011–2012, during the first attempt to shatter our country, deputies from this party came to the meetings wearing white ribbons – symbols of protest. And it was Fair Russia that included the current state traitors in the lists for the State Duma: father and son Gudkov, Ilya Ponomarev. We remember that, and we have learned some lessons.

And New People? When the Duma was voting for an appeal to the President of the Russian Federation to recognize the Donetsk and Lugansk People's Republics, it was the only faction that voted against it. Now they are taking a more patriotic stance, and we welcome that.

All this makes United Russia the only option. Especially considering that this is the only party that has experience in pulling the country out of crisis. The Communist party has another sort of experience – one of immersing itself in a crisis. There was a period when Mikhail Gorbachev was General Secretary of the Central Committee, not of United Russia, but of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and then the party officials signed the notorious devastating Belovezh Accords. Unlike them, we lent a shoulder to the president when it was necessary, and worked with him to overcome the economic problems that had piled up in the 1990s.

Let me remind that the global financial crisis broke out in 2008, triggered by the bursting of the mortgage lend-

ing bubble in the United States. Russia, too, found itself in the crisis zone. People began withdrawing money from their accounts en masse, and then Putin proposed several urgent measures: first, to issue loans to banks so that they could pay all those who wanted their money, and to increase the amount of deposits subject to insurance. The opposition was outraged: "Why do you finance the deep pockets, let's give the money directly to people!" Our answer was, "If the banks close, what and how you will give to people?" We did a great job together with the government and the president at that time. We managed to keep on our track, and overcome the crisis. As of today, there are no other parties in Russia who have the experience of overcoming the national crisis.

Why is this especially important right now? Nowadays Russia has many problems to solve because of the sanctions imposed by the Western countries, mostly related to the economy. An immense job has to be done to ensure that these sanctions have minimum effect on the country's life. Combating unemployment, curbing the growth of prices, supporting businesses, providing medicines – all these tasks will have to be addressed on a daily basis.

But the main thing that is expected of us (we are not the executive branch, after all) is the renewal of ideology. As far as the past is concerned, the ideology of United Russia is clear and unambiguous. We have studied history and formulated all the necessary assessments, so we know exactly what we are up against. But our vision of the future is not as clear. What are we building? Do we want to take America's place in today's world, which is still America-centered? But this is unlikely to be supported by other countries. We have abandoned the socialist model, which was an alternative to American financial capital, but we have not yet constructed a new model that would be a worthy goal for us. We will have to embark on this mission, and I am sure that the United Russia party can tackle this challenge.

Among the most important and urgent issues is the behavior of the Russian elite. The president spoke of national traitors, but are there many of them among farmers, workers, teachers, and doctors? There are practically none. But there are plenty of them among those whom we, as the ruling party, have coddled and showered with awards and honors for years. But we're not the only ones to blame. Betrayal of the elites is a chronic disease of Russia. In the early seventeenth century, the noble boyars ruling the country (the famous rule of seven boyars), who actually lived better than most in Russia, turned out to be the agents of Poland. And who betrayed the emperor in 1917? Front commanders who said, "Leave." And the Soviet Union? The top of the Communist Party. Can this problem stop reoccurring? It can.

And what about other countries? British elites, for instance, have always stood up for the country's national interests, which is why the Conservative Party representing them has always had the support of voters, and Prime Minister Winston Churchill is known as the most fervent patriot whose achievements are still considered unsurpassed.

Units of light cavalry of Great Britain made up of members of the most noble families were sent to Russia during the Crimean War to assault the battery at Balaklava. It was a pointless undertaking, they all died. But in Great Britain they are considered to have accomplished a heroic act because they did as their country told them to. I think we have to learn that from them.

As members of the State Duma, we will have to pursue one of the wills of Vladimir Zhirinovskiy: to return to the Russian language. Language is a way of thinking, people think in words. Cashback, hashtag, and other such words belong to the language of our adversary, and if we think in their language, it makes us less strong in fighting them. Virtually any Anglicism has a normal counterpart in Russian, and it would be wise to insist on using the words of the mother tongue wherever possible. We can do this at least at the legislative level.

In general, there is a lot of work to be done. Today we are often asked the question, “When will all this end and

normal life start again?” The answer is: there will be no more of that life. There will be a new one, a different one; and as for the current turbulence, be patient. We have an example of a country with far fewer natural resources and opportunities compared to what we have. It is right next to the U.S., and the big neighbor has been strangling it with all its might for decades. They have landed their troops in it, made attempts to kill their leader, introduced imaginable and unimaginable sanctions... To no avail! Yes, I am speaking of Cuba. And I suggest that we remember the motto under which the patriots of Cuba live and win: “Homeland or death!”