



We must have a correct understanding of Putin

Anti-hegemonist or
arch-imperialist?
Worthy of support or
condemnation?
Veteran Chinese
Maoist Comrade Xiang
Guanqi makes a
valuable class analysis
of Putin and what he
represents.

Translator's Preface

We are publishing here an excerpt from a study of the origins and nature of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine written in 2022 by veteran Chinese Maoist Comrade Xiang Guanqi.

This particular excerpt is addressed in the first place to those people in China who have supported Putin's aggression against Ukraine as a blow directed against hegemonism and a necessary step to prevent the eastward march of NATO.

Such views are prevalent among young Chinese infected with a reactionary bourgeois nationalism following the restoration of capitalism in China and its degeneration into social-imperialism.

This reactionary patriotism is fanned by Xi Jinping's China Dream and National Rejuvenation policies, and this so-called "patriotism" is extended to Putin because of his opposition to NATO and the European Union on the question of Ukraine.

But it is not just in chat rooms and social media platforms that such right-wing thinking festers. Even on what appear to be mainstream leftist websites like <https://redchinacn.org/> we find rubbish like the article *2025 will be the year of victory in the Third Great Patriotic War for Russia*:

The ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war is actually the third Great Patriotic War in the history of Russia. This war, in form, is a war between Russia and the Kiev authorities, but in fact a war between Russia and the entire NATO aggressor bloc led by US imperialism. The Russian state and people are about to achieve a brilliant victory in the Third Great Patriotic War!

Among the left organisations in Australia, there have been few expressions of support for Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Most immediately condemned the invasion when it occurred, including the tiny group called the Red Ant Collective, and the Trotskyite Socialist Alliance, publishers of *Green Left Weekly*. However, GLF journalist and Socialist Alliance member Renfrey Clarke has had opinion pieces published by Red Ant Collective which have supported Russia's position, such as his *2023 Is Russia 'sub-imperialist'?* in which he argues that "Russia is clearly not an imperialist power in the terms of the modern industrial-capitalist imperialism described by Lenin early in the last century."

There are others who, whilst opposing imperialism in a general sense, find in Zelensky's ties to the US and European imperialists, the existence of Banderaite fascists and Nazis in Ukraine, and the denial of the rights to self-determination of the ethnic Russian peoples of eastern Ukraine any number of excuses to justify Russia's imperialist aggression against Ukraine.

Now Trump has entered the scene, negotiating US imperialism's preferred outcome to the war in Ukraine directly with Putin and not just excluding Ukraine from those negotiations, but parroting Putin's allegations of Ukraine's having started the war.

As Comrade Xiang Guanqi argues, it is essential to have clarity about Putin's class position, his anti-Communist condemnation of Lenin and Stalin, and his pursuit of Great Russian Chauvinist ambitions.

Nick G.

February 25, 2025

We must have a correct understanding of Putin

— Excerpt from "Persisting in Using Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to Correctly Understand the Russo-Ukrainian War"

First opinion: We must have a correct understanding of Putin

The war was launched by Putin. It was the Russian army that armed itself into Ukraine in the name of "special military operations". The war is still being carried out in Ukraine, not in Russia. I am afraid that everyone has no disagreement on this fact, and this fact is still there.

The current disagreement is that there are fundamentally opposing views on the nature and significance of Putin's launching of this war.

There are many reasons for this difference in understanding, but one thing is clear: the primary and fundamental reason for the difference is that there is a fundamental difference in the understanding of Putin and the Putin regime.

In this case, this issue has become an issue that we must first clarify, so we would like to first put forward in good faith: we should have a correct understanding of Putin and the Putin regime.

How can we correctly understand Putin?

For our Maoist comrades, the most important point is to adhere to the viewpoints and methods of historical materialism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially to adhere to the method of dialectically unifying the historicism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the class analysis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. In simple terms, we must look at the class from a historical perspective.

Unlike some comrades who have praised Putin with many laurels, I have a negative view of Putin.

My negative view of Putin is naturally not recognized by these comrades. In their view, I am "putting a big hat" on Putin. Contrary to the views of these comrades, I think that these comrades do not have a correct understanding of Putin, do not see Putin's class nature, and especially do not realize how bad Putin is and the serious harm he will inevitably cause to the communist movement and the historical process of the world. The "hat" I put on Putin is very big, but it is just right to put it on Putin's head, because it is a scientific "big hat" revealed by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a tool of cognition.

Let me refine these "big hats".

First, Putin is the most hateful and detestable traitor to the communist movement

Putin was once a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and held an important position in the important state agency, the KGB, for more than 20 years. Putin

himself does not deny this, and no one denies it. Similarly, no one denies that he is now the supreme ruler of the bourgeois dictatorship in a monopoly capitalist country.

A former Communist Party member has now become the supreme ruler who serves the bourgeoisie, exercises bourgeois dictatorship, and exercises dictatorship over real Communists and the broad masses of working people. For such a person, from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, from the perspective of communism and the socialist movement, and from the standpoint of the proletariat, isn't it very realistic and appropriate to label him a "traitor"?

We Communists all have a painful personal experience, that is, we are most afraid of and hate traitors. Whether reading the revolutionary history of the communist movement or reviewing the revolutionary struggles we have personally experienced, whenever we see traitors betraying comrades and organizations, causing great damage to the party and causing bloodshed and sacrifice to comrades, we are all filled with indignation. So comrades always say that traitors are the most hateful and detestable. However, facing a traitor to the Communist Party like Putin, where have the class positions and class feelings of some of our comrades gone?

This is a very serious issue of party spirit.

The harm caused to the communist movement by traitors like Putin is incomparable to that of traitors who betray a certain comrade or a certain level of organization.

From Chairman Mao's theory, Putin is a capitalist-roader who sneaked into the Communist Party, a representative of the bourgeoisie, and an anti-party and anti-revolutionary careerist who usurped power. This is proved by Putin's own unchangeable history.

In order to make this clear, we need to look back to the tragic history of the dissolution of the CPSU and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, which led to the final and complete failure of Soviet socialism, and then the entire Eastern European socialism also suffered a final and complete failure.

As Chairman Mao repeatedly warned us, starting from Khrushchev's coming to power, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has gradually degenerated into a revisionist party, and Soviet society has also gradually degenerated into a bureaucratic autocratic privileged society with the bourgeoisie within the party as the ruling class. In the past, we also called it a bureaucratic monopoly capitalist society. However, as long as we respect historical facts, this bureaucratic autocratic privileged society is still clearly different from a typical capitalist society with the exploitation of surplus value as its basic feature.

Perhaps, it is precisely because of this difference, and the fact that the CPSU still called itself the "Communist Party", held the banner of Marxism-Leninism, and hung the sign of socialism, and the CPSU refused to accept Chairman Mao's theory of socialist continued revolution with the focus on opposing revisionism. Therefore, for a long time, the majority of

CPSU members had not launched a struggle against revisionism within the party, had not been trained in the practice of socialist continued revolution, and had not been educated in the theory of socialist continued revolution.

However, as Chairman Mao taught us, we must believe that the majority of members and cadres of the CPSU are good and want to revolutionize. This is indeed the case. The increasingly naked capitalist reforms of bourgeois representatives such as Gorbachev and Yeltsin were leading to a series of crises, and were about to lead to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Faced with this dangerous situation, it was inevitable that the majority of CPSU members would be alert and oppose it. As a result, the coup on August 19, 1991 inevitably occurred.

Now, the General Secretary and some others always say that "no one was a man"¹ when the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" took place. This is not in line with historical facts.

The historical fact is that at that time, the majority of Soviet Communist Party members represented by Nina Andreyeva had bravely expressed their different opinions to party organizations at all levels and various newspapers and periodicals through articles, letters or

¹ This phrase was explained by a contributor to a reddit page on China: **Personal opinion: "No one is a man" is a reactionary slogan that does not deserve to be quoted**

Since Xi Jinping's speech in 2103 about the collapse of the Soviet Union, he proposed that "no one in the CPSU is a man, and no one comes out to fight" for the disintegration of the country, this sentence has been frequently quoted, not only the official quote of this sentence to warn party members to love the party and the country, but even the anti-Xi and anti-party people also ironically quote this sentence.

For example, in the previous re-election of the constitutional amendment and the removal of Hu Jintao at the recent congress, there was no opposition from thousands of deputies at the scene, and they were also ridiculed as "not a man in the people's congress and party representatives."

This ridicule is on point, but I still don't think it's appropriate to use the phrase "no one is a man." Here's why. This sentence, which is said to be derived from an ancient poem, is full text:

The flag was erected on the king's city, and the concubine learned about it in the deep palace? 140,000 people were disarmed, and none of them were men!

It is said that in the face of foreign enemies, the king took the lead in surrendering, and his army had no resistance, and the woman was helpless about it. But the poem does not directly say that these people do not resist, but expresses this in a way that no one is a "man".

The implicit meaning of this expression is that guarding the country is a noble duty, a man's business, and if you don't do it, you lose your nobility and become a woman. Obviously, this expression is a reflection of the inequality of political power and responsibility between men and women.

Considering the background of Xi's quote and putting this matter on the collapse of the Soviet Union, then it can be known that what Xi really wants to say is that in the face of disintegration, there are tens of millions of CPSU, and none of them are party members. Therefore, in Xi's eyes, the people who really have political rights in contemporary times are party members, and ordinary people are like women in ancient times, and their status is low.

In other words, the slogan "No one is a man" has a double reactionary meaning, it is both discriminatory against women and anti-democratic, and such a reactionary slogan is really not worth quoting. I know it's ridiculous that Xi personally asked the whole party to do what he warned about back then, but I can't laugh when I think of the negative things above.

other means, but it was impossible to solve the problem of "the party changed its revisionism and the country changed its colour" in this way.

At the top of the party, a group of major leaders of the party and the country also tried to reverse the situation through a coup.

At that time, these leaders learned through KGB wiretapping that on July 29, Soviet President Gorbachev, Russian President Yeltsin and Kazakh President Nazarbayev had met to discuss the expulsion of national leaders who did not support Gorbachev's reforms, such as Prime Minister Pavlov, Defense Minister Yazov, KGB Chairman Kryuchkov and Interior Minister Pugo, and replaced them with liberal figures.

In this critical situation, these leaders decided to launch a coup. They tried to end Gorbachev's "reforms" that destroyed the Soviet Union with this move, especially to prevent the signing and entry into force of the "New Union Treaty" to be signed on August 20, because this treaty would make the Soviet Union a "federation of independent republics with a common president and the same foreign and military policies", which actually meant that the Soviet Union existed in name only.

Those who participated in the coup were the top leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the country, including: Soviet Vice President Gennady Yanaev, Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Soviet Defense Minister Dmitry Yazov, Soviet Interior Minister Boris Pugo, Deputy Chairman of the Soviet Defense Council Oleg Dmitryevich Baklanov, Gorbachev's Chief of Staff Valery Ivanovich Bolkin, Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Oleg Simonovich Shenin, KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov, etc. This lineup cannot be said to be not strong enough.

On August 19, Baklanov, Bolkin, Shenin and Valennikov returned to Moscow from Crimea after successfully placing Gorbachev, who was on vacation, under house arrest. The coup leaders immediately gathered in the Kremlin. Yanaev, Pavlov and Baklanov signed the "Declaration of Soviet Leaders". The "Declaration" announced that the country would enter a state of emergency due to the existence of "some unspecified terrorists in the Soviet Union" and announced the establishment of a "State Emergency Committee" to manage the Soviet state and maintain the regime in an emergency. The members of the Emergency Committee included: Vice President Yanaev, Prime Minister Pavlov, KGB Chairman Kryuchkov, Defense Minister Yazov, Interior Minister Pugo, Deputy Chairman of the Defense Council Baklanov, Chairman of the Soviet Union Peasants' Union Starodubtsev, and Chairman of the Union of State Enterprises and Industry, Construction, Transport and Postal Facilities Tizyakov, the so-called "Eight-Man Committee". Yanayev signed an executive order appointing himself as acting president of the Soviet Union on the grounds that "Gorbachev was ill and unable to perform presidential duties."

However, the coup plotters did not take decisive measures against the two biggest capitalist-roaders. First, they sent a delegation to Crimea again to try to "persuade" Gorbachev to

support the "State Emergency Committee", but failed, and no further strong measures were taken; second, against Yeltsin, although the KGB had surrounded Yeltsin's residence, Kryuchkov did not issue any strong measures to be taken next when answering the request of his subordinates. As a result, his subordinates allowed Yeltsin to go to Red Square to deliver a famous speech that demagogic people, allowing this ambitious man to successfully seize the leadership of the anti-coup struggle.

The coup failed in just three days. The main leaders of the coup were arrested, and the Pugs committed suicide. Then, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was dissolved, the Soviet Union disintegrated, and Soviet socialism suffered a final and complete failure, which is a historical inevitability that is easy to understand.

Why did the coup fail?

There are at least two points that deserve our deep reflection. First, since Khrushchev, revisionism has been going on for more than 30 years. In fact, "the party has changed to revisionism and the country has changed colour." Under such historical conditions, the coup has no support from the revolutionary masses. Such a coup cannot accomplish the revolutionary tasks, especially the tasks of the socialist revolution. Second, the leaders of the coup do not understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Chairman Mao's theory of continuing the socialist revolution against revisionism. Without revolutionary theory, it is impossible to guide the struggle against the restoration of capitalism. This is not only reflected in a series of indecisive and weak mistakes during the coup, but also in the lack of a correct struggle program and struggle strategy. Class struggle can only be carried out according to the laws of class struggle. Class struggle cannot be handled by coup.

If we compare and study the June 4th Incident in China in 1989, which happened at almost the same time, we may have a deeper understanding of some of the historical laws. These heavy historical lessons are worth careful study and summary by the successors of the communist movement. This is another historical topic, which will not be discussed here.

Here, the main issue we want to discuss is how did Putin behave at this important juncture of historical transformation related to the fate of the CPSU and the Soviet Union? What historical role did he play?

In a nutshell, he is a traitor to the Communist Party!

Now, Putin is solemnly saying that "the collapse of the Soviet Union is the greatest geopolitical disaster of the 20th century." However, he concealed the fact that he himself was one of the creators of this disaster. Moreover, the word "geopolitics" does not reveal the essence of the matter. The essence is that this is a disaster of the final and complete failure of the Soviet Union and Eastern European socialism. I added the word "finally" to indicate that the "disaster" began when Khrushchev usurped power and revisionism came to

power. This is a historical process. The "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" only put an end to this historical process and this historical disaster.

It was during this historical process of the complete restoration of capitalism that Putin, as a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, completely and firmly stood on the side of the forces of capitalist restoration, or more specifically, on the side of Yeltsin, the leader and careerist of capitalist restoration. Moreover, Putin did not choose sides as an ordinary party member, but served as Yeltsin's capable man, and thus made his fortune.

Putin's ugly and sinful performance during the "Soviet Union upheaval" (scientifically speaking, it should be the restoration of capitalism) is certainly not accidental.

1. Putin is a representative of the bourgeoisie who infiltrated the Communist Party and supports the capitalist road, takes bourgeois ideas as his worldview, and believes in Orthodox Christianity. It is easy to see that he is a typical person in power who is taking and insisting on taking the capitalist road, which is usually called a "capitalist roader".

Sobchak, who was once the mayor of Petrograd, had a significant influence on Putin's thinking and career. Sobchak was Putin's teacher when he was studying at Petrograd University. Putin regarded Sobchak as his mentor, and was a believer in Sobchak's ideas and a follower of his politics. During the period when Gorbachev was carrying out the so-called "reform", Sobchak served as the chairman of the Soviet of Leningrad (later changed back to St. Petersburg), and later served as the mayor. He was a famous representative of the Russian bourgeois liberals and was hailed as the "political godfather" of "modern Russia". Sobchak, Yeltsin (then the President of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic), and Popov (then the Chairman of the Moscow Soviet and then the mayor) were the "three flags" of the famous bourgeois liberal democrats at the time. A good teacher produces a good student. Putin inherited Sobchak's mantle and added his own colour. The origin of Putin's thought and his growth experience tell us that it is not accidental that Putin has become the Putin of today and plays the role he plays today.

2. It is precisely this kind of Putin who, unsurprisingly, played the role of a loyal follower of Yeltsin and Sobchak at the critical moment of the "August Coup".

When the "August Coup" took place, Sobchak was in Moscow, because the struggle between the two factions was already imminent. As the leader of the so-called "reformists" and Yeltsin's right-hand man, Sobchak was participating in the capitalist "reform" farce in Moscow. After the coup, Sobchak immediately publicly announced that he firmly supported Yeltsin. After they succeeded in Moscow, Sobchak immediately decided to take the earliest flight the next day to rush back to St. Petersburg in order to control St. Petersburg in time and echo Yeltsin in Moscow to jointly fight the coup.

This fierce political struggle of life and death provided Putin with an opportunity to fully demonstrate himself. Putin made great contributions to Yeltsin and Sobchak, and in fact, to the restoration of capitalism.

When the coup took place, Putin was on vacation in another place. After hearing the news, he immediately rushed back to St. Petersburg. As the second largest city in Russia, St. Petersburg's political importance is self-evident. The "National Emergency Committee" once tried to control St. Petersburg. In this severe political struggle in St. Petersburg, Putin's position was extremely clear and extremely important. Not only did he announce his withdrawal from the KGB the day after the coup; more importantly, as an important cadre of the St. Petersburg liberals, he played an extremely important role in the political struggle against the coup. Originally, Sobchak was included in the arrest list issued by KGB leader Kryuchkov, and the KGB in St. Petersburg was also preparing to arrest Sobchak. However, Putin learned the news through his old connections in the KGB. So Putin decided to take the risk and act first. He carefully selected several reliable armed guards, drove directly into the airport, and parked the car under the gangway of the plane that Sobchak was on. As soon as Sobchak got off the plane, Putin took him away before the KGB, and then implemented strict armed protection for Sobchak. This was Putin's first achievement at a critical moment in the political struggle in St. Petersburg.

Then, as Sobchak's main assistant, Putin participated in negotiations with KGB leaders and local military leaders in St. Petersburg who supported the "State of Emergency Committee", successfully preventing the seizure of power of the Sobchak government and the entry of troops into the city, stabilizing the rule of the St. Petersburg municipal government with Sobchak as mayor, and issued a public statement firmly opposing the coup of the "State of Emergency Committee".

At the same time, Putin assisted Sobchak in launching and organizing a demonstration of 1 million people in St. Petersburg to oppose the coup of the "State of Emergency Committee", which ultimately defeated the plan of the "State of Emergency Committee" to seize power in St. Petersburg.

In this sharp life-and-death political struggle, Putin showed his skills and helped Sobchak control the situation in St. Petersburg with his bold and effective actions, thus making great contributions to the success of Yeltsin and others in the anti-coup and the smooth seizure of power.

Putin started from this.

In 1993, history once again gave Putin a chance to show himself.

At that time, although Yeltsin had already gained power, his capitalist "reform" was not successful and there was a serious crisis. The political manifestation of this crisis was that the two factions represented by President Yeltsin and Supreme Soviet Chairman Khasbulatov

had been experiencing sharp contradictions and fierce struggles since 1992. There is no need to elaborate on the historical process of this struggle here. We just want to emphasize that in October 1993, Khasbulatov staged a "White House coup" and Yeltsin "bombed the White House", and the two factions launched an armed and bloody conflict. At the critical moment of this fierce struggle, Putin once again stood firmly on Yeltsin's side together with Sobchak, successfully controlling the order in St. Petersburg, maintaining the political stability of St. Petersburg and his firm support for Yeltsin. In particular, under Sobchak's instructions, Putin secretly dispatched a regiment from the special forces in St. Petersburg to Moscow to support Yeltsin. After arriving in Moscow, this regiment did not participate in the battle of the White House, but was ordered to go to the Moscow City Government and the Peace Hotel to wipe out the stormtroopers of General Makashov, the coup's armed forces, in one fell swoop.

Putin once again made great contributions to Yeltsin in the acute political struggle crisis and began to be favoured by Yeltsin. And the current Defense Minister Shoigu, like Putin, also dared to fight and show his skills in this armed conflict. As a result, he, who had never served as a soldier for a day, jumped to the rank of major general, and then jumped several levels, and finally became the Minister of Defense. Putin and Shoigu's partnership was established from then on.

Thirty years later, Putin now claims that "the disintegration of the Soviet Union is a geopolitical disaster." But this KGB "warrior" deliberately concealed that he was the active creator of this "geopolitical disaster" and played a not insignificant role. It's just that historical conditions have changed. Now, starting from the Great Russian chauvinism and his ambition to dominate, he has turned his face and denied it, and changed his statement to deceive the Russian people.

The historical fact is that NATO and the Warsaw Pact have been fighting for decades, but they have not been able to bring down the Soviet Union and Eastern European socialist countries. It was the revisionism since Khrushchev came to power that brought down the Soviet and Eastern European socialism, brought down the Communist Party, and caused the disintegration of the Soviet Union. It was the bourgeois representatives such as Putin who mixed in the Communist Party, that is, what we often call capitalist-roaders. These communist traitors did what the open bourgeois enemies with guns wanted to do but did not do. Now some people like to talk about the "fifth column" and "traitors", please at least don't forget these people, in fact, the most important, the most terrible and the most hateful are these people.

It is sad and ridiculous that some of our comrades who claim to be Maoists, as Chinese people whose vast territory was plundered by the old tsar and the new tsar, actually believed in Putin's nonsense and praised Putin's nonsense, because Putin claimed that he

still had a piece of Soviet Communist Party membership card, so he thought it was incredible. To use an online joke: Is your brain filled with water?²

3. History has clearly told us that Yeltsin played a completely reactionary role in the historical process of capitalist restoration during the Soviet Union's dramatic changes. He was a historical sinner of the Soviet Union and Russia. Putin was not only a loyal follower of Yeltsin, but also a brave and talented thug of Yeltsin. It was precisely because of his "outstanding" performance in the cruel political struggle that he was favoured by Yeltsin, who was restoring capitalism, and by the Russian bourgeoisie that he was able to rise suddenly from a low-level Soviet Communist Party member and official to become the President of Russia by "taking a helicopter". This is certainly not accidental. In order to maintain its rule, any class always selects talented people from its own class to serve as powerful rulers to implement its class dictatorship. Even the reactionary class has not forgotten this, and the more reactionary it is, the more it needs this. Putin's rise to power is in line with this historical law.

The only thing that must be seen here is that people's talents are class-based. The more courageous and talented the characters of the reactionary class are, the stronger and more terrible their reactionary nature is. Putin is such a character. We have the historical experience of the "April 12" in 1927³, and it is easy to understand this truth. So, when the General Secretary⁴ ran to Moscow and said to Putin, my character is the same as yours: tenacious, didn't the General Secretary put himself together with a traitor who was trying to restore capitalism? What a stupid attempt to take advantage of the fact that he was touting someone else, only to end up vilifying himself instead!

Like all traitors, Putin climbed up rapidly with great strides, stepping on the blood of countless revolutionary martyrs since the October Revolution and on the corpses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union created by Lenin and Stalin. In the end, he leaped from the mayor of St. Petersburg to the president of Russia.

If we still give unlimited praise to such a historical figure who is not difficult to understand, and give him a golden crown, and affectionately call him "Putin the Great", thinking that

² "Brain water" is a Chinese word that means to describe someone's abnormal thinking, to ridicule being confused, unresponsive, stupid, doing stupid things, not understanding, and having no knowledge. It means that if the brain is flooded, it will affect people's normal thinking, and they will do stupid things and make low-level mistakes. "Brain water" comes from Hou Bai in the Sui Dynasty, which has been circulated for more than 1,000 years, and is recorded in the Sui Dynasty's "Qiyuanlu". Yang Su, the Duke of Yue of the Sui Dynasty, asked Hou Bai one day on a whim: "If one day I dig a deep pit and let you jump in, how can you get out?" Hou Bai: "I would pierce my head with a needle, and the water in my head would flow out, so that I would float up." Yang Su: "You have so much water in your brain?" Hou Bai: "If I didn't have so much water on the brain, why would I jump into the pit?" Of course, everyone has water on the brain, or cerebrospinal fluid. If there is too much, it can become the medical condition of hydrocephalus – Trans.

³ On April 12, 1927, the Kuomintang New Right led by Chiang Kai-shek launched an armed coup d'état against the Kuomintang Left and the Communist Party in Shanghai, the "April 12 Counterrevolutionary Coup", massacring Communist Party members, Kuomintang leftists and revolutionary masses, placing the achievements of the first period of KMT-CCP cooperation under a white terror – Trans.

⁴ i.e. Xi Jinping

such a person can serve as a leader against the world's number one hegemonist, the US imperialism, and even think that the courage to launch an aggressive war against Ukraine proves that Putin is an "anti-hegemon hero", what is even more ridiculous is that some people even compare Putin with Chairman Mao. From which class standpoint and class feelings do these comrades look at people and history? These comrades also claim to be Maoists and believe in Chairman Mao's thoughts. Is this out of their own ignorance and stupidity, or is it intentional to support the reactionary standpoint of the Chinese revisionist rulers who stand with Putin?

This is probably a fundamental issue worthy of deep thought by comrades.

Second, Putin has practiced and is continuing to practice the worst kind of capitalism under the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

Chairman Mao has repeatedly expounded a truth: when revisionism comes to power, the bourgeoisie comes to power, and it will implement fascist bourgeois dictatorship and the worst kind of capitalism.

History has verified this truth.

However, from Putin, including Gorbachev and Yeltsin, we can further see that once these outright traitors to the Communist Party come to power, they will throw away even the fig leaf of revisionism and openly declare their betrayal of the Communist Party, change their flags, completely and thoroughly throw themselves into the arms of the bourgeoisie and take the capitalist road.

This is what Putin did.

1. The Great Anti-Lenin and Stalin Movement

Khrushchev started to engage in revisionism and promote his revisionist line from the great anti-Stalin movement. However, he still held up the banner of "Leninism", kept the name of the "Communist Party", and hung the sign of "socialism", but actually established a bureaucratic monopoly privileged class society. We used to call it a bureaucratic monopoly capitalist society. However, in fact, it is indeed not a typical bureaucratic monopoly capitalist society. History tells us that they are still one step away. This step was completed by the Chinese revisionists. The Chinese revisionists, through the so-called "reform and opening up" that implemented Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, truly and completely established a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society in China. The Soviet Communist Party had not yet reached this step. From Khrushchev to Brezhnev, they basically went around in circles within the scope of revisionism, and even in foreign aggression and hegemony, they still appeared in the guise of social-imperialism.

However, from Gorbachev, Yeltsin to Putin, it is completely different. They are all openly anti-communist and anti-socialist. To use an old saying, they are all naked "anti-party and anti-socialist counter-revolutionaries". Gorbachev publicly confessed that his greatest

achievement in his life was to eliminate communism; Yeltsin even launched a naked counterattack against everything in the socialist Soviet Union from the political, economic, ideological and cultural aspects. There are countless notorious examples such as "shock therapy". These two traitors to the Communist Party, traitors to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, unrepentant capitalist-roaders, and historical criminals are not the focus of our discussion here, and we disdain to talk about them.

We are only talking about Putin here.

Putin is not only against Stalin, but also against Lenin.

Some people often say that Putin still recognizes Stalin's contributions in the Soviet Patriotic War. This is a misunderstanding. Putin affirms Stalin's contributions in the Soviet Patriotic War from the perspective of Great Russian chauvinism, which is a distortion of Stalin. The great victory of the Soviet Patriotic War led by Stalin was, in the final analysis, a victory in defending socialism and defeating fascist capitalism. To use Chairman Mao's teachings, in the final analysis, this was a great victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, and it was by no means a victory of Great Russian chauvinism.

In fact, once it comes to the "Stalin era", Putin's reactionary position is exposed. Putin always fundamentally and thoroughly denies the Soviet socialist era led by Stalin. In his view, it is an era full of "evil" and "disaster". Such words and such examples are everywhere. For example, there was a period of time when people called for the restoration of the name of the city of Stalingrad, but in the end, Putin firmly opposed it. Putin's reason for opposing it is very simple and thorough. He said: "Today, restoring the name of Stalingrad will generate suspicion and make people feel that we are going back to the Stalinist era, which will not bring benefits to all of us." It is very clear that Putin completely and thoroughly denies the Stalin era. He is afraid that the Russian people will affirm the Stalin era and miss the Stalin era.

This is politics. Politics is class struggle. Political right and wrong are always very clear and sharp. Putin's clear class stand and keen political right and wrong are worth learning. To this day, some of our comrades still understand domestic problems like children. Once they hear a very pleasant word, they get extremely excited. They say "return" on the left and "social reform" on the right, and they also want to add "strong support". They are completely trapped in fantasy and completely deviate from the principle of class struggle. In fact, they deceive themselves and anesthetize themselves. Instead of being revolutionaries who dare to rebel, they become slaves who indulge in fantasy. They are far inferior to Putin in terms of firm class stand and keen political right and wrong.

Putin always praises Yeltsin who handed over the presidency to him infinitely (it is not worth quoting those super-praising nonsense). On the contrary, Putin's anti-Leninism is often vicious and thorough.

In order to deny Lenin from the root, Putin first denies the October Revolution.

Putin does not admit that this was a great revolution at all. He called it the "October coup" more than once, and more than once declared that this revolution was wrong and led Russia on the wrong path and into a "dead end". Therefore, during his tenure, the October Revolution Day was cancelled. This went even further than Yeltsin. When Yeltsin was in power, he first reduced the two-day holiday to one day on November 7, and then changed the "October Revolution Day" to "Harmony and Reconciliation Day". When Putin came to power, he changed it again and again, and finally set November 4 as "People's Unity Day". The purpose is just as he put forward in his article "Russia at the Turn of the Millennium": "In today's Russia, no political force should call for revolution." Putin's thoughts and intentions are very clear. To use a fashionable phrase in China, it is called "farewell to revolution",⁵ which is actually a denial of revolution. As the Chairman of the Russian Communist Party Zyuganov said: "Putin has actually gone much further than Yeltsin in the road of fighting against the legacy of the Soviet era." Of course, it is impossible for Zyuganov, who does not understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and is also engaged in revisionism, to explain the essence of the problem clearly. However, what he said was that Putin had gone much further than Yeltsin in opposing socialism, and this phenomenon was accurate.

Contrary to our respect, love and nostalgia for Lenin, Putin has great hatred for Lenin, and therefore has thrown a lot of dirty water involving major historical events on Lenin. Just as we cannot tolerate the enemy's vicious attacks on Chairman Mao, we cannot tolerate Putin's vicious attacks on Lenin.

During the Cultural Revolution, there was a slogan called: Whoever opposes Chairman Mao will be overthrown. Today, we can also say that whoever opposes Lenin will be overthrown!

Putin distorted the nature of the First World War and the reactionary position and role of the Russian Tsar in the war. Putin attacked and denied the very correct proletarian position and strategy formulated by Lenin for the Bolshevik Party in the First World War, especially the "Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty" advocated by Lenin, and repeatedly sold the shameless lie that Lenin was a "German spy" and a "Russian traitor". For example, in June 2012, when answering questions in the Federation Council (the upper house of parliament), he clearly stated: "The Bolshevik government made a separate peace with Germany, and Russia lost the First World War because of its traitorous behaviour."

⁵ "Farewell to the revolution: Looking back at 20th Century China" was the name of a book by Li Zehou published in 1995 following his move to the US in 1992. The essence of "farewell to revolution" is the theory of "class reconciliation" and bourgeois conservatism and reformism. In 2015, Li Zehou's collaborator Liu Zaifu said that they were bidding farewell to a French-style violent revolution, not an English-style "Glorious Revolution". "Moreover, this farewell is not a denial of the historical justice of the revolution, but the belief that a revolution of this nature should not be the only choice of history, that is, it is not the only way for history... we believe that there will always be contradictions between classes and strata, but it is better to choose the method of 'class reconciliation' than the method of 'class revolution'" – Trans.

It is not surprising that Putin has said such nonsense that slanders Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. Because it is impossible for this traitor of the Communist Party to understand and correctly evaluate this period of history from the standpoint of the proletariat and Marxist historical materialism; as long as we analyse Putin's remarks, we can clearly see that Putin understands and expresses this period of history from the standpoint and viewpoint of Russian imperialism's Great Russian chauvinism.

Putin has completely distorted the true history. It was precisely because the Bolshevik Party under the leadership of Lenin adopted the correct proletarian strategy for the First World War and insisted on "transforming the imperialist war into a domestic revolutionary war" that the great victory of the October Revolution was achieved, and after the victory of the revolution, the land lost temporarily by signing the "Brest-Litovsk Treaty" was recovered. History has proved that Lenin was right, and Putin, standing on the reactionary standpoint of the Tsar, distorted the historical truth out of the need to attack Lenin.

Similarly, as one of the creators of the historical tragedy of the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Putin shamelessly puts the historical blame for the disintegration of the Soviet Union on Lenin today.

In January 2016, at a meeting of the Science and Education Committee to discuss the formulation and implementation of the long-term strategy for national science and technology development, when talking about the issue of ideological control, Putin used Lenin's ideas and strategies of national self-determination and "the right to freely withdraw from the union" as targets of attack, claiming that this was "the atomic bomb that led to the disintegration of the Soviet Union", and repeatedly promoted this view everywhere.

In December 2019, Putin once again attacked Lenin at a large press conference for 2019 at the Moscow World Trade Centre: "Lenin may not be a politician, but more like a revolutionary. Lenin's biggest mistake was to transform a unified country with a thousand-year history into a national union."

Of course, Putin does not understand Lenin's great ideas. His words are just an expression of his class prejudice.

Lenin advocated and insisted on building the Soviet Union, which was a great creation guided by the Marxist thought on ethnic relations and based on the reality of the existence of multiple ethnic groups and countries such as Russia at that time. Practice has proved that it was precisely because of such a correct approach that the attempt of the bourgeois reactionaries to use narrow nationalism to oppose the Soviet socialist revolution was crushed, and the Russians, Ukrainians and other ethnic groups were successfully united under the banner of the socialist Soviet Union.

This is a major development of Marxism by Lenin and an important content of Leninism.

There are at least two points that are worth our serious study today.

First, Lenin adhered to the fundamental principle of Soviet socialism, that is, the Soviet Union is a socialist Soviet Union under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the class foundation and class bond of the Soviet republics.

Second, Lenin, starting from the historical reality of Russia, was very vigilant and opposed the historical influence of Great Russian chauvinism formed since the Tsarist era, and respected the national equality and self-determination rights of all ethnic groups.

These two reflect Lenin's Marxist-Leninist line of correctly handling the relationship between national issues and class issues. Great!

Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, after the founding of the People's Republic of China, starting from our national conditions, we adopted the form of establishing ethnic autonomous regions, opposing both Han chauvinism and ethnic separatism, which is actually the persistence, inheritance and development of Lenin's thought.

It is precisely because Lenin's line was correct that during the Lenin and Stalin era, there was no and could not be a problem like the disintegration of the Soviet Union, let alone a problem like the Russo-Ukrainian war.

Why?

You can refer to the opinion of Ligachev⁶, a former member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: "What is the Soviet Union? First, it is a fair and just country, with representatives of farmers, workers, and intellectuals accounting for 60%, while the current parliament (referring to Russia) has none; second, the Soviet Union means that the state controls the economic lifeline; third, the Soviet Union means free medical care, housing, and education; fourth, the Soviet Union means no distinction between class and rich and poor, there is no super rich, and no extreme poverty."

This is the truth. It can be said that only socialism is the unbreakable social foundation for all nations to live in brotherly friendship and equality. It is this social foundation that determined that in the Soviet Union during the Lenin and Stalin era, the Russians, Ukrainians and other nations could live in brotherly friendship and equality. There were problems, but it was certain that they would not and did not lead to the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

⁶ Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev was born on November 29, 1920 in a peasant family in the village of Dubinkino, Chulin District, Novosibirsk Region. He joined the CPSU in 1944. He worked as an engineer, but increasingly took on roles in the CPSU, serving as Minister for Culture from 1953-1955. Having supported Khrushchev's revisionism, he was one of the initiators of perestroika. However, he opposed the liquidation of the USSR and said that participating in the nomination of Gorbachev for the post of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee was what he considered his "biggest personnel mistake". Between 1993 and 2013, Yegor Ligachev was a member of the Central Committee of the revisionist Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF), which was formed in February 1993. He is the author of "Warning", "Truth and Fabrication about the Soviet Past and the Present of Bourgeois Russia", "Deception and Truth", "Rus and Siberia", "The Mystery of Gorbachev", and "What is Russia?". He died on May 7, 2021 in Moscow at the age of 100 – Trans.

But now, in order to create a historical basis for his invasion of Ukraine, Putin has completely denied the historical fact that the Ukrainian nation and country once existed, starting from Great Russian chauvinism, and once again fabricated rumors and slandered Lenin on this issue. Just before sending troops to attack Ukraine, Putin delivered a speech of more than 10,000 words on the situation between Russia and Ukraine and recognizing the independence of the Donbas region. In this speech, Putin said: "I will start from the fact that 'modern Ukraine was completely and entirely created by Russia'. More precisely, it was Russia in the Bolshevik and Communist eras that created Ukraine. This process began almost after the October Revolution in 1917. Lenin and his comrades adopted a very rude way of ruling Russia - separating and tearing off part of its own historical territory." "The source of Ukraine - dividing part of Russia, then Stalin transferred some land that previously belonged to Poland, Romania and Hungary to Ukraine, and then Khrushchev transferred Crimea from Russia to Ukraine. This is the process of the formation of Ukraine." That is to say, in Putin's view, Ukraine has never existed at all, so it should not exist. Ukraine is just a part of the territory separated from Russia, and Lenin must be held responsible for this. This distortion of historical facts and the bandit logic of the Great Russian chauvinism to expand territory are so absurd! According to Putin, even if Kiev is captured, it is just "taking back what originally belonged to them."

Can we discuss right and wrong with bandits? We are not so naive.

For us, it is more important to take this opportunity to seriously study Lenin's very important Marxist theory and line on handling national issues.

In order to correctly answer and correctly handle the acute and complex national issues faced by the Bolshevik Party at that time, Lenin successively published "A Letter to Workers and Peasants on Victory over Kolchak" on August 24, 1919, and drafted "Resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on the Ukrainian Soviet Power" for the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in November, and published "A Letter to Ukrainian Workers and Peasants on Victory over Denikin" on December 8.⁷ These brilliant Marxist-Leninist documents on national issues, as well as Lenin's articles on national issues before this, are Lenin's true inheritance and major development of Marxist theory on national issues, and are a valuable ideological and theoretical wealth left to us, which is worth our re-study today.

I will briefly talk about a few learning experiences:

1. Lenin correctly pointed out the general principles for understanding and solving national problems.

Lenin emphasized, "The interests of labour require the fullest trust and the closest unity between workers of all countries and nationalities. Landlords, capitalists, and supporters of

⁷ These works are available on the www.marxists.org website – Trans.

the bourgeoisie try their best to divide workers, intensify national disputes and national hatred, in order to weaken the power of workers and consolidate the capitalist regime. Capital is an international force. To defeat this force, we need international unity and international friendship among workers. We are against national hatred, national disputes, and national isolation. We are internationalists. We demand that workers and peasants of all countries in the world unite closely and fully merge into a unified Soviet Republic of the whole world." This is the only correct fundamental principle of internationalism for communists to deal with national issues.

Lenin also emphasized: "In striving to achieve the unity of all nations and ruthlessly combating all acts of national division, we should be very cautious and patient, and make concessions to the remnants of national distrust. But in the struggle to get rid of the oppression of capital, on all matters concerning the basic interests of labour, we will never make concessions or compromise." "As long as the Communists can unite in the struggle against the oppression of capital and for the dictatorship of the proletariat, they should not disagree over the question of national boundaries or whether the relationship between the two countries should take the form of a federation or other form." (Lenin: "On the Workers and Peasants of Ukraine for the Victory over Denikin", Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 4, pp. 147-149. People's Publishing House, 1972 edition.)

Lenin's teaching is very clear. In the words of Chairman Mao, with whom we are familiar, the handling of the national question must be guided by the class struggle, that is to say, the class struggle must be used as a platform to govern the handling of the national question. The essence of national issues is still a class issue. National struggle, in the final analysis, is still a class struggle. Lenin clearly tells us here that the general principle for handling national issues is still to carry out class struggle, and to unite the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people of all nations to overthrow the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, overthrow capitalist society, and defeat capitalism with the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. In Lenin's words, on this issue, "never give in, never compromise."

Under the command of the general principle of class struggle, "when striving to achieve the unity of all nations and ruthlessly cracking down on all acts of national division, we should be very cautious, very patient, and adopt a concessionary attitude towards the remnants of national distrust." Lenin has always been very practical. Like Chairman Mao, he always proceeds from reality. Lenin admitted that the national issue still has a national issue aspect, and there are "remnants of national distrust". The handling of these issues, including national border issues and alliance forms, must be "very cautious, very patient", and even "adopt a concessionary attitude."

This fully demonstrates the essential difference between Lenin and Putin. Putin observes the Ukrainian issue from the standpoint of the Great Russian chauvinism of the Russian monopoly bourgeoisie, while Lenin observes the Ukrainian issue from the standpoint of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. Their understanding and conclusions

will certainly not be the same, but can only be fundamentally opposed; rather than saying that this is Putin's deliberate vilification of Lenin, it is better to say that this is an inevitable manifestation of Putin's class nature.

2. Lenin insisted on starting from reality and firmly opposed two erroneous ideas on the national question. He opposed both the "ugly and shameful prejudice of Great Russian chauvinism" and the "national prejudice of the petty bourgeoisie and small owners".

Lenin profoundly revealed the class roots of national issues and national prejudice: "Capitalism divides nations into a minority of oppressor nations and the nations of the great powers (imperialists) that enjoy full rights and privileges, and the majority of oppressed nations, that is, dependent or semi-dependent nations without equal rights." "The dissatisfaction and distrust of the dependent nations without full rights towards the oppressor nations of the great powers, such as the dissatisfaction and distrust of the Ukrainian nation towards the Great Russian nation, have accumulated for hundreds of years." Therefore, the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia has always been synchronized with the national liberation and national independence of the oppressed nations in Russia.

The proletariat's strategy on the national question formulated by Lenin reflects this historical demand. In the "Resolution" drafted by Lenin for the Bolshevik Party, it was specifically written: "In view of the fact that Ukraine's culture (language, schools, etc.) has been destroyed by the Russian tsarist system and the exploiting class for centuries, the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party specifically instructs all party members to use various methods to help eliminate all obstacles that hinder the free development of Ukrainian language and culture. Long-term oppression has made the backward masses of Ukraine have nationalist tendencies. Therefore, members of the Russian Communist Party must treat them with great patience and caution, and must explain to them with a comradely attitude that the interests of the Ukrainian and Russian working people are the same." This is in stark contrast to Putin's contempt for the Ukrainian people and country. This is simply a painful criticism of Putin's fallacy.

2. Putin does not understand that "the right to withdraw from the union freely" is a very important socialist principle.

Lenin clearly explained the importance of this principle in his article "Socialist Revolution and the Right of National Self-Determination" written in 1916: "Whether at present, during the revolutionary period or after the victory of the revolution, if the socialist party does not prove with all its actions that it must liberate the enslaved nations and establish relations with them on the basis of a free union - without the freedom of separation, a free union is a lie - it is a betrayal of socialism."

Putin looks at the principle of "the right to withdraw from the union freely" from the standpoint of betraying socialism.

From this we can clearly see how deeply Putin has fallen into Great Russian chauvinism, and how right the great Lenin was!

Lenin revealed the evil of Great Russian chauvinism in practicing national oppression. Now, the new Tsar Putin wants to reverse the history that has been reversed in theory and practice, and trample the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian state under his feet again.

It is on the basis of criticizing the Great Russian chauvinist prejudice and narrow nationalist prejudice that Lenin sincerely told the workers and peasants: "We advocate the establishment of a voluntary national alliance. This alliance does not allow one nation to exercise any coercion on another nation. Its basis is full trust, a clear awareness of fraternal unity, and complete voluntary agreement. Such an alliance cannot be achieved all at once. When realizing this alliance, we must be very patient and very cautious, not to mess things up, not to cause distrust, and to try to eliminate the distrust caused by centuries of oppression by landlords and capitalists, caused by private ownership, and caused by mutual hatred due to the division and redistribution of private property."

When these words are compared with Putin's words, is it not crystal clear that Lenin's communist and internationalist sentiments are noble and Putin's Great Russian chauvinism is despicable?

4. Lenin also made an important proposition in his 'Letter to the Workers and Peasants of Ukraine for the Victory over Denikin', which is: 'Great Russian nationalism is, namely, imperialism'.

This is a very important opinion, and the word 'namely' makes clear the class attributes and class substance of Great Russian nationalism.

This proposition is not only correct, but also hits the nail on the head for Putin. It is of great practical significance for our understanding of the class attributes and class essence of Putin's Great Russian chauvinism.

Some comrades should stop being confused on this issue. This proposition proposed by Lenin tells us clearly that Putin's Great Russian chauvinism and Putin's imperialist nature are consistent and are actually the same thing.

Great power chauvinism, Nazism, and fascism are all manifestations of the imperialist nature. They are the same thing in terms of class attributes and class essence. They are all imperialist, that is, they are all monopoly bourgeoisie.

Understanding and accepting these teachings of Lenin are of great practical significance for us to recognize the class nature of Putin's Russian monopoly bourgeoisie, why he launched an aggressive war against Ukraine, and what class nature this aggressive war has.

The reason why I have said a few more words about Lenin's theoretical thoughts and political practice on the national question is, on the one hand, to criticize Putin's slander and

attack on Lenin, and on the other hand, because narrow nationalism is very popular in China now, and has led to fundamentally wrong views on Putin and the Russo-Ukrainian war.

Some young people like Peter the Great, and they like the new version of Peter the Great, Putin the Great, but this is very ignorant, stupid, and of course very wrong. Let us quote the views of the proletarian revolutionary mentor Stalin on this issue as the end of the discussion on this issue.

On December 13, 1931, Stalin was interviewed by the German writer Emil Ludwig.

"Ludwig: Some of the questions I am going to ask you may seem strange. Today I am here, in the Kremlin, and I have seen some relics of Peter the Great, so the first question I want to ask you is: Do you allow yourself to be compared with Peter the Great? Do you consider yourself the successor of Peter the Great's cause?"

Stalin: Absolutely not. Historical comparisons are always risky. Such comparisons are meaningless.

Ludwig: But you must know that Peter the Great did a lot to develop his own country and to transplant Western culture to Russia.

Stalin: Yes, of course, Peter the Great did a lot to improve the landlord class and develop the emerging merchant class. Peter did a lot to establish and consolidate the nation-state of landlords and merchants. At the same time, it should be said that improving the landlord class, helping the emerging merchant class and consolidating the nation-state of these two classes were all carried out by cruelly exploiting serfs.

As for me, I am only a student of Lenin, and the purpose of my life is to be worthy of being a student of Lenin.

My lifelong task is to raise another class, the working class. This task is not to consolidate any "national" state, but to consolidate the socialist state, that is, to consolidate the internationalist state, and any degree of consolidation of this state will contribute to the consolidation of the entire international working class. If every step I take in raising the working class and consolidating the socialist state of this class is not for the purpose of consolidating and improving the conditions of the working class, then I believe that my life is meaningless.

It can be seen that your comparison is inappropriate.

As for Lenin and Peter the Great, Peter the Great is a drop in the ocean, while Lenin is the entire ocean."

Stalin not only made it clear that Lenin and Peter the Great had fundamentally different historical positions, but more importantly, Stalin proposed that "socialist countries" were "internationalist countries" rather than "national countries." This idea is completely consistent with Lenin's teaching quoted above: "We demand that the workers and peasants

of all countries in the world unite closely and completely merge into a unified Soviet Republic for the whole world." However, some of our young people who are dazzled by narrow patriotism may not understand or even accept this truth. Only by understanding this truth can we truly and profoundly understand the truth of Marxist communism and proletarian internationalism.

If we understand these basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, we can clearly realize that Putin's search for various excuses to oppose Lenin and Stalin on all these issues is, in the final analysis, still a question of class struggle, the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road.

The facts are very clear. Putin's opposition to Lenin and Stalin always ends with opposing socialism, and his purpose is always the same, which is to deny the socialist road that the Soviet Union had taken under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, and should take the so-called "civilization" of "converging with the West" and "converging with Europe" as Putin said. In a word, it should take the capitalist road.

But what is the result of taking this path? Let us answer with facts.

2. Restoration and regression into a "worst capitalist society"

Perhaps because Putin was once a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and served in the KGB for a long time, he did not escape Chairman Mao's theory. Since he came to power, he has gradually transformed Russia into a "worst capitalist society."

There is no need to compare with some developed capitalist countries, especially Nordic capitalist countries. Even compared with his predecessor, Yeltsin, who authorized him, Putin's Russia is actually more backward, more backward, and therefore more reactionary than Yeltsin's Russia.

As a negative lesson, it is worth doing some research on this. In particular, in light of China's reality, a comparative study of the historical lessons of "the party changes to revisionism and the country changes colour" in China and abroad, including a comparative study of Putin and the "sole emperor"⁸, will definitely help us further understand Chairman Mao's theory of socialist continued revolution and the historical tasks we are facing now.

Politically, Putin has indeed implemented the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

He not only repeatedly attacked the Russian Communist Party led by Zyuganov, who no longer wanted to start a revolution, but also attacked all politicians and political forces that opposed him. Arrests and sentencing were commonplace, and he even resorted to assassination. Many political leaders, journalists, and various figures died in accidents. Even Nemtsov, the former deputy prime minister and an important political leader who opposed Putin, was shot and killed by a car-driving murderer just 100 meters away from the Kremlin

⁸ le Xi Jinping – Trans.

wall. One of the murderers was a subordinate of Kadyrov⁹ from Chechnya, and was praised by Kadyrov as a "brave fighter." It has not been "found out" who paid for the murder, but isn't this obvious?

It is by relying on such fascist dictatorship means, which are typical Nazi means, that Putin has gradually embarked on the road of autocracy. Take the current Russian-Ukrainian war as an example. The demonstrations against Russia's invasion of Ukraine were brutally suppressed by the police in Moscow, and thousands of people were arrested; and in the entire public opinion circle, no anti-war voices were allowed to be expressed.

In order to stay in the position of president, he did not hesitate to play tricks and amend the constitution, and achieved the goal of being re-elected as president for more than 20 years since 2000; and the political system he promoted is the so-called "strong presidential vertical power system", which has a bit of our "two safeguards" and "two maintenances"¹⁰. Naturally, it is not learned from China. I am afraid it still reflects an inevitable law - the law of the ambitious, because the goal to be achieved is the same, both want to implement personal autocratic dictatorship. Since both of them want to be emperors, they must end up in the same place.

However, there is another side to this rule. Ambition is not equal to talent, and it is often inversely proportional. Everyone knows Putin's famous saying: "If you give me 20 years, I will give you a strong Russia." Everyone also knows that this is just a boast. According to the World Bank: In 2021, Russia's GDP was 1.77 trillion US dollars. In the same year, Guangdong Province's GDP reached 12.44 trillion yuan, and Jiangsu reached 11.63 trillion yuan, both exceeding Russia. Moreover, you must know that Lenin and Stalin once left them a relatively well-off country.

It can be seen that capitalism is not a panacea, and Putin is not necessarily a good person to govern the country. This incident has given us a very practical inspiration: those who seek re-election are actually personal ambitionists, and they will eventually implement personal dictatorship and autocracy. Re-election is just a form. The essence and seriousness of the problem lies in the fact that this is a regression and reaction of the political system.

It is precisely from these facts that it is true to say that Putin's political rule is more backward and reactionary than that of the Yeltsin era; and to expand the scope a little, it is also true to say that he is more backward and reactionary than other countries that implemented

⁹ Ramzan Akhmatovich Kadyrov (born 5 October 1976) is a Russian politician and current Head of the Chechen Republic. Since November 2015, he has been a member of the Advisory Commission of the State Council of the Russian Federation. Kadyrov has abused the human rights of opponents, including assassinations and torture, has advocated restricting the public lives of women, and led anti-gay purges in the Republic – Trans.

¹⁰ According to the official www.cpcnews.cn, these two policies were established in October 2022 and were explained as being: "necessary to 'resolutely safeguard the core position of General Secretary Xi Jinping's Party Central Committee and the core position of the whole Party, and resolutely safeguard the authority and centralized and unified leadership of the Party Central Committee', making it clear that socialism with Chinese characteristics has entered a new era..." – Trans.

bourgeois democratic republics after the collapse of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It can be said that this is Putin's "characteristic", or more accurately, this is Putin's more reactionary "nature".

Putin now seriously criticizes Ukraine for practicing Nazism and uses it as one of the excuses for invading Ukraine. In fact, Putin, like Western capitalist countries, always attacks socialist countries, including the former Soviet Union during the Lenin and Stalin era, which implemented centralized autocratic rule. He always labels his own rule as "freedom and democracy" and uses this issue as the most basic and important basis for overthrowing socialism and restoring capitalism. However, the fact that Putin is increasingly implementing the fascist bourgeois dictatorship and depriving even the most basic bourgeois democracy has completely shattered this lie. Putin cannot see that the hat of Nazism, of who advocates the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, is the most suitable for him. Even in the current war, Putin and his colleagues' series of outright Nazi rhetoric has once again proved this point.

In terms of economy, Putin has built the worst capitalist economic form in Russia - bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist economic form - by means of the reactionary and criminal means of restoring capitalism.

This fact is not denied by anyone. Even Putin himself does not deny it. In line with his repeated public claims of "de-communization" and "Want to be anti-communist? This is very suitable for us", his purpose is to restore capitalism. In February 2005, Putin stated during a meeting with US President Bush: "Russia has chosen the path of democracy... This is our final choice, and we will not go back." Since he is so determined to take the capitalist road, I think it is too easy to understand what Putin will do in terms of economy and what social problems will arise, based on the painful "Chinese lessons" we have personally experienced. Therefore, there is no need to elaborate on such specific facts here.

What is worth further study is why Chairman Mao predicted that these Communist Party traitors would engage in the "worst capitalism" when they came to power. What exactly is this "worst"? What are the inevitable regularities? Combining the historical facts of Putin's restoration of capitalism in Russia and the historical lessons of the restoration of capitalism in China, we should be able to find some regular patterns.

In this historical process of restoring capitalism, the fascist bourgeois dictatorship was implemented politically. This was directly stated by Chairman Mao. As mentioned above, Putin also acted according to this law.

Here, we can find a few more regularities from the economic perspective.

1. The reason why it is called "the worst" is that this historical process of restoring the capitalist economy is manifested as an open, rapid, and cruel process of plundering national resources and national wealth through corruption and power-for-money transactions under

the protection of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. It is in this process of economic plunder linked to corruption that a new monopoly bourgeoisie was formed and produced.

This class can be analysed as the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie and the private monopoly bourgeoisie (also known as the "oligarchs"). Such a process that allows a very small number of bureaucrats and a very small number of capitalists to become rich overnight and quickly leads the country to a bureaucratic monopoly capitalist society is very different from the path that general capitalist countries have taken to a monopoly capitalist society. Some countries that have undergone "dramatic changes", including Russia and Ukraine, have all come this way.

In his 2001 State of the Union Address, Putin proposed to protect private property, demanded the acceleration of the passage of privatization laws, and opposed the confiscation of property that people had taken for themselves during the privatization process. In order to explain the rationality of privatization, he put forward the view that "new private owners are much more efficient". He said: "When the state began to implement privatization and transfer to the market, the basis at that time was: the new private owners would be much more efficient. In fact, this is also true - the efficiency of private owners in the world is always higher than that of the state." How similar is this to the remarks of Chinese revisionists!

According to the annual personal income of senior officials of the Putin government announced by the Russian government, Putin only has 8 or 9 million rubles, and Foreign Minister Lavrov has only more than 10 million rubles, but many officials have an annual personal income of over 100 million. Although they are all called wages and income, quantity and quality are dialectically unified. Incomes of over 100 million reflect that these officials have degenerated into bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. The reason and regularity here were clearly explained by Chairman Mao in his "Important Instructions" in 1976¹¹ when analysing the privileges of "big officials". The only difference is that Chairman Mao was talking about some privileged phenomena at that time, while now it is plunder with income exceeding 100 million.

Yeltsin was a corrupt official. The Yeltsin family was a wealthy family. When people wanted to investigate Yeltsin and his family for corruption, Putin manipulated the law that allowed Yeltsin to enjoy immunity as president. The old trick was repeated, and Putin just got such immunity.

Putin's ex-wife and two daughters all have assets overseas. The wealth of the two daughters is more than 1 billion or 2 billion US dollars. Putin's defenders say that these are all earned

¹¹ See: [ChairmanMao'sPrimaryDirectives-CCP-CC-1976-Doc4-EngWithNotes.pdf](#) - Trans.

by the daughters with their own talents. To paraphrase a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, it is called "You know."¹²

As for the truth of the stories between Kabaeva, we are not interested in exploring it, but one thing is clear, Kabaeva's political rocket and economic explosion are the inevitable result of corruption in the Russian officialdom. It doesn't matter who the father of her three sons and one daughter is. What is important is that this "father" who must be hidden must be a powerful person. This is the inevitable regular phenomenon that corruption can achieve.¹³

Perhaps for this reason, citizens of Russia, Belarus and Ukraine launched a petition calling on the Swiss authorities to expel Kabaeva, who was living in seclusion in Switzerland with her billions of assets and four children, and deport her back to Russia. The petition directly described Kabaeva as "the favourite wife of the dictator and war criminal Putin" and even sarcastically said: "It's time for Eva Braun to reunite with her Fuhrer." Now, Kabaeva has really returned to Russia, and her assets in Switzerland have really been frozen.

However, foreigners seem to be unaware that a legal Chinese citizen has provided a very funny story: the title of the article recording this story is: "My Home Became Putin's Home" (original title: "Old House Notes", author: Dapu. Written on January 31, 2019, published on Laochenguang.com). At the end of the article, it is written that his family's original house, after several changes, finally became Putin's house. Let me quote a passage from it as a break from reading this random article of mine: "The old resident told me mysteriously, which surprised me. Later, at a dinner party, I met the relevant supervisor of this area, and finally confirmed the rumour that was already well known: This is Putin's home! --- Yes, you heard it right, it is Russian President Putin! The courtyard where our family used to live has become Putin's home! It is said that the house was bought in the name of Yeltsin's grandson and transferred to Putin, but it was not directly in Putin's name, but in the name of Putin's nephew. As for how Yeltsin's grandson, a foreigner, could buy this courtyard house, I don't know. It is also said that when Putin visited China for the first time, he asked the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to go to Houhai Ya'er Hutong for a walk. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was surprised and didn't know the purpose of his visit, but still agreed to his request. It turned out that he wanted to see his house! A few dozen meters west of him is the big house of the daughter of the Deng family. " As to the value of this house, the author also provides a

¹² "You know" is a Chinese internet buzzword and an alternative language used for words and deeds that cannot be spoken or are inconvenient to express publicly. Generally after the first half of the sentence is finished, add "you know" to the second half of the sentence, and those who understand will naturally understand – Trans.

¹³ Alina Malatovna Kabaeva (May 12, 1983—) is a Russian gymnast born to a Soviet Tatar father and an ethnic Russian mother. She was a gold medallist at the 2004 Athens Olympics but her career has been dogged by reports of her using banned substances. In 2007, Kabaeva won the Russian State Duma election on behalf of Putin's United Russia party and became a member of the lower house. In 2008 she denied rumours that she and Putin were to marry, but in May 2022, according to the Swiss Sunday newspapers a Swiss gynaecologist of Russian descent assisted Kabaeva in giving birth to two sons, the eldest in 2015 and the younger in 2019, both of whom were Putin's children – Trans.

reference statement. "Our courtyard, was not built, and had been demolished for nearly 20 years, and always been a "ruin". Later, a wall was built first, and then the new house was quietly built. It was not until 2008 that it was completed. It is said that the total value of this courtyard house is already 1 billion yuan!"

Comrades who are interested can verify the truth of this story. However, there is one truth that is certain. With the integration of the global capitalist economy, corruption is also moving towards global integration. China's corrupt officials and wealthy people, with their huge wealth and families, have been involved in this integrated global corruption tide. This is a fact we have all seen. Understanding the repeated pattern of "the worst capitalism" we can more deeply understand this characteristic of the Russian bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie represented by Putin, and can also more deeply understand why the Russian bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie represented by Putin has a special historical reactionary and aggressive nature. A group of robbers who have made their fortunes by looting, do you want them not to rob or invade? This may be the key to correctly understanding Putin's war of aggression against Ukraine.

2. The reason why we say "worst" is that countries like Russia, which have undergone "dramatic changes" and restored capitalism, are not only in the process of eliminating the socialist public ownership economy, but also in the process of plundering the wealth created by the socialist public ownership economy.

It is in this process of stealing the wealth created by the original socialist countries that, on the one hand, the working people "returned to the pre-liberation era overnight", and on the other hand, a very small number of Communist Party traitors and bureaucrats and a very small number of speculators became rich overnight.

This is completely different from the historical process of capitalism from primitive accumulation and after hundreds of years of development to monopoly capitalism. It is a special historical feature of the restoration of capitalism in most countries that have undergone "dramatic changes", including Russia. It is called "dramatic changes" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and "characteristics" in China. The essence and form are the same. They are all based on the plunder of the wealth created by the original socialist public ownership. The new cruel bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist economy was established explosively. It seems that this is a universal law in the process of the failure of socialism and the restoration of capitalism, and it is a "worst" universal law.

From Yeltsin to Putin, Russia's restoration of capitalism has not deviated from this law. Compared with the development process of general capitalist countries, this is of course obviously "worse" in terms of its predatory cruelty!

It is this "worse" process of depriving the wealth created by socialism in the past that determines that its results are also "worse".

Stalin left behind a powerful Soviet Union, but Russia, which inherited the main legacy of the Soviet Union, is now a country with a major economic recession. As mentioned earlier, the GDP of the entire Russia is not as good as the GDP of Guangdong Province in China. Yeltsin's "shock therapy" shocked the Russian economy, but activated the wealth of the Yeltsin family. Although Putin has made some "improvements", the essence and nature of capitalist restoration cannot be improved. In the birdcage of capitalism, the Russian economy can only be sluggish, and it has to sell resources - oil, natural gas, etc. as its main means of survival.

Putin declared that "Russia's only choice is to become a strong country." However, a country that relies on selling resources for food cannot become a truly powerful country, but can only lead to national weakness and inevitably be in a dependent position.

This is also a rule.

Moreover, as we all know, in 1965, when Chairman Mao returned to Jinggang Mountain, he had foreseen and revealed such a rule when he talked with Comrade Zhang Pinghua, the provincial party secretary.¹⁴

Recently, in the face of increasingly severe economic sanctions from the West, Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov said without any shame that we should focus on strengthening economic exchanges with China in the future, because China's current level of scientific and technological development is also leading in the world. The descendants of China's former "big brother" and "model for learning" actually "highly praise" China so much after the restoration of capitalism. Don't they feel embarrassed? Shouldn't they think more about why Russia has such a decline? For the needs of the election, Putin once boasted: Give me 20 years, and I will give you a strong Russia. History has eloquently proved that this is just a satire on Putin.

What is the reason? It is still a question of the road. Is it better to take the socialist road or the capitalist road? From the Soviet Union to China, history is answering this question.

Socialist economy is an economy that enriches the people and strengthens the country, and the "worst" capitalist economy is an economy where the rich steal the country. Enriching the people and strengthening the country, and the rich stealing the country, are the fundamental differences between socialist economy and capitalist economy.

The most profound lesson Putin has left us in the economy is that we once again understand why Chairman Mao said that these people would engage in "the worst capitalism" when they came to power. We already have the lessons of China, and now we have another negative education like Putin, who can help us understand Chairman Mao's teachings more deeply.

¹⁴ There is a long, but very interesting account of Chairman Mao's conversations during his return to the Jinggang Mountains (Jinggangshan) in 1965. It is on this Chinese website and can be read in English using an online translator. See: [毛主席 1965 年重上井冈山时的谈话 - 激流网](#) - Trans.

3. The “worst” is also reflected in the fact that Putin has rebuilt Russia into a hegemonic country with Great Russian chauvinism as its theoretical basis.

This is another important “feature” of Putin. In this regard, Putin is quite different from Gorbachev and Yeltsin. If Gorbachev and Yeltsin can be barely regarded as bourgeois liberal democrats, then Putin can only be regarded as a bourgeois authoritarian, and he has the smell of both Tsarist authoritarianism and fascist Nazism.

To correctly understand Putin, we must correctly understand this issue. This is an important manifestation of Putin’s class nature, and it is also an important reason why Putin would dare to launch an aggressive war against Ukraine.

Saying that Russia has restored itself to the “worst” capitalism and revived Great Russian chauvinism is a very important manifestation of the “worst”. Launching an aggressive war against Ukraine is the unfolding of this “worst” inevitability.

The war of aggression against Ukraine has brought great bloodshed to the people of both Russia and Ukraine, and has also brought great difficulties to the economy and life of people all over the world. Isn't this "worst" enough?

Once a socialist country led by the Communist Party is infiltrated by revisionists and representatives of the bourgeoisie, who usurp the leadership and political power of the party and the country and lead to the restoration of capitalism, it is easy to embark on the road of hegemony.

Chairman Mao thought of the severity and reality of this problem. He had repeatedly mentioned this danger to Kim Il Sung, Ho Chi Minh and other comrades who visited China since 1965. Deng Xiaoping's speech at the UN General Assembly in 1974 was also written based on Chairman Mao's conversation: "China is not and will not be a superpower in the future." "If China changes its colour one day and becomes a superpower and dominates the world, the people of the world will join the Chinese people in overthrowing it." (Now some people think that Deng Xiaoping ordered these words spoken at the UN General Assembly to be written in this way. This is not true. These are Chairman Mao's words. If you check Chairman Mao's conversation with Kim Il Sung and others in 1965, you can't say it is word for word, but it is basically Chairman Mao's original words.)

Correctly understanding this issue is crucial to correctly understanding Putin and the Russo-Ukrainian war. Unfortunately, the problem here is that many blindly fanatical young people regard the hegemonism criticized by Chairman Mao as a heroic thought and performance of daring to oppose hegemony.

This is a wrong ideological trend that completely reverses right and wrong. Therefore, below, I would like to further criticize Putin specifically on this issue.

Third, Putin is a hegemonist whose ideology is based on Great Russian chauvinism.

Although Putin was once a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had degenerated into a revisionist party at that time. As a member of such a party, Putin naturally would not accept the true Marxist-Leninist ideology and theory, nor would he have, let alone adhere to the belief in communism. His belief, at most, is the Orthodox Church inherited from his mother, but I don't think he is devout.

In the historical process of the "dramatic changes" in the Soviet Union, Putin stood on the side of the bourgeois liberal democrats, but from the perspective of ideology and world outlook, he is not even a thorough bourgeois liberal democrat. He is more of a Great Russian chauvinist inherited from the Tsar.

This is not surprising.

As long as we can understand how serious the influence of China's feudal imperial autocratic ideology and culture is still on contemporary Chinese society, we can fully understand that the long-standing historical tradition of Great Russian chauvinism in Russia is still a social root that has a profound impact on people's thoughts and worldviews and cannot be shaken off by contemporary Russian society. Putin is deeply influenced by the historical tradition of Great Russian chauvinism. To put it bluntly, Putin is a Great Russian chauvinist. Putin can be accepted and even supported by the Russian people. The ideological basis is also because he is deeply influenced by the historical tradition of Great Russian chauvinism. The Russian people can actually support Putin in launching an aggressive war against Ukraine. The Great Russian chauvinism incited by Putin is an important driving force. This is a sad reality in Russia today. This fact shows that Putin's becoming a new version of Peter the Great and becoming the contemporary Putin the Great is by no means an accidental historical phenomenon. There is historical inevitability. Historical inevitability plays a decisive role.

We did not impose the label of "Great Russian chauvinism" on Putin. Putin has never been obscure about his Great Russian chauvinist stance and sentiments. Take a look at Putin's speeches and articles, which are full of such reactionary and retrogressive clichés. Putin's colleagues are also bear-like (polar bears). It is not surprising, as this is the theoretical and spiritual basis for them to maintain their autocratic rule.

Putin has a fascist fanaticism. No matter what the occasion, whether it is internal or external, as long as it is possible, Putin will incite Great Russian chauvinism and incite the Russian nation to follow the path of hegemony that the old tsar and the new tsar have taken. This kind of not heroic but crazy rhetoric has not only confused Russian youth, but also deeply influenced some Chinese youth. For example, "Russia's only choice is to become a strong country", "If there is no Russia, what is the use of the earth?" "Although Russia's territory is vast, not an inch is redundant," "We are just taking back the land that belongs to us." This kind of arrogant propaganda of Great Russian chauvinism and hegemony has

spread widely, not only in Russia, but also in China, it is also very popular among some young and inexperienced Chinese youth.

However, this is incorrect thought and speech, and has nothing in common with the noble sentiment of striving to realize communism and thus realize the liberation of all mankind. This is nothing but the arrogance of wrong, reactionary Great Russian chauvinism and hegemonism. This is not only fundamentally opposed to the Marxist proletarian internationalism we believe in, but even goes further than narrow conservative nationalism. In terms of its class essence, Putin's thought is actually a new version of Great Russian chauvinism, hegemonism, and naturally Nazi thought, which is a mixture of the old tsar, the new tsar and the contemporary Russian monopoly bourgeoisie.

This is a temporary setback in history, and it is an inevitable process of the tortuous development of history. Lenin denied Peter the Great, and now Putin has denied Lenin again, trying to show himself as a new version of Peter the Great after the negation of negation. However, this is very stupid, very sad, and very pitiful.

As misunderstood by some young people in China who have misplaced their passion, Putin seems to be a "tough guy", "strong man", a "national hero", an "anti-hegemony hero", a re-edition of Peter the Great - Putin the Great. Didn't Zyuganov also compare Putin with Peter the Great?

In the context of the rampant Great Russian chauvinism, this is natural, because Putin just wants to play the role of a contemporary Peter the Great. However, Putin, who is ignorant and can only play tricks and act arrogantly, does not know that Marx once said a truth: "Hegel said somewhere that all great world historical events and figures can be said to appear twice. He forgot to add that the first time they appeared as a tragedy and the second time as a farce."

"The nephew takes the place of the uncle." Marx was referring to Napoleon and his nephew, who played such a historical role. This truth falls on Putin today. Peter the Great played an active role in Russian history, but Putin, who imitated Peter the Great, can only leave a farce in history. The Chinese say "Dong Shi Xiao Pin"¹⁵, which is about the same truth. Greatness cannot be imitated, and the result of imitation is to show one's own insignificance and patheticness. The truth is the truth, but the ambitious people always repeat this scene, and the "melon-eating masses"¹⁶ can only watch this scene repeatedly. Now, here, don't we also

¹⁵ In Zhuangzi's Heavenly Fortune there is a story of an ugly village girl, Dong Shi, who wanted to improve her looks. She saw a local girl known for her beauty, but unfortunately on this day, the girl was in pain and passed by clutching her chest and grimacing. Dong Shi thought that by copying the girl's mannerisms she could improve her own looks, but when she clutched her chest and grimaced, people thought she was even uglier. The story has become a metaphor for imitating others only to make a fool of oneself – Trans.

¹⁶ The "melon" in "melon-eating masses" actually means "melon seeds". Anyone who has been to China has probably seen people whiling away their time cracking melon seeds between their teeth. In fact, packets of "guazi" can be bought in most supermarkets. In 2016, some people referred to ordinary netizens who wasted

have a Putin-like figure who wants to re-enact a historical farce? Chinese poets have a deep sense of history: the flowers fall helplessly, and the swallows return as if they have seen them before.

Tsar Peter is Putin's idol. When he went to work in the Petrograd government, the portrait of Lenin in his office was removed. The staff asked him if he wanted to hang another portrait and whose portrait he wanted to hang. Putin answered without hesitation: Peter the Great. This little thing can reflect Putin's class position and class nature, as well as his world view and historical view. Putin wants to be a new version of Peter the Great in the contemporary era. This is the highest ideal he pursues, the political direction he puts into practice, and, in the final analysis, the fundamental reason why Putin has become Putin in terms of ideology and world view.

Understanding this is very important for understanding why Putin launched a war of aggression against Ukraine. Just recently, at an event commemorating the 350th anniversary of Peter the Great's death, Putin spoke out and claimed that the war Peter the Great launched against Sweden was just "taking back what originally belonged to Russia", rather than external expansion or aggression; and claimed that this is still what is being done now. This is to clearly tell people that Putin also admits that his so-called "special military action" against Ukraine is the same as what Peter the Great did, but it is just "taking back what originally belonged to Russia". This naked confession wiped out all the "reasons" for aggression against Ukraine that were spread in the past. The purpose is actually one: territorial expansion.

The logic of this kind of invader is completely understandable. Not only Peter the Great, but all invaders will not put the hat of "aggression" on their heads. On the contrary, they will create "legal" and "just" grounds for their aggressive behaviour. "Taking back what originally belonged to you" is just the most arrogant and undisguised kind of bandit logic.

It is precisely from the Great Russian chauvinism's demand for territory that Putin looks back at the disintegration of the Soviet Union and always feels that it is a "geopolitical disaster" that has caused "Russia to lose its status as a world power." What "geopolitics"? What "power status"? It is nothing more than a nostalgia for the vast territory of the Soviet Union. Russia is big enough, but compared with the former Soviet Union, it is still small. This has become the heart disease of the Great Russian chauvinist Putin. So he has to take back "what originally belonged to him." This is the fundamental and inevitable reason why Putin launched an aggressive war.

Putin's worries were originally created by themselves. Specifically, from Khrushchev to Brezhnev, to Gorbachev, Yeltsin and Putin, it was this group of bourgeois representatives

their time reading the opinions of others on social media posts without engaging in the discussions themselves as "melon-eating masses", which was used to indicate a kind of non-concern and non-expression of opinions. The phrase was selected as one of the top ten new words in Chinese media and one of the top ten online terms in 2016 – Trans.

who first promoted the revisionist line, causing "the party to change to revisionism and the country to change colour", offending the people; then, they simply opposed socialism nakedly and openly restored capitalism. It was in this capitalist restoration activity that these traitors of the Communist Party who hated the Soviet Union created by Lenin and Stalin incited bourgeois nationalism, which was actually Nazism, and thus the disintegration of the Soviet Union became a historical inevitability. Moreover, bloody history cruelly proved that some of the former Soviet republics that took the capitalist road after the disintegration inevitably changed from brotherly relations to hostile relations, and nationalism at this time became a spiritual drug that incited national hatred and national killing. Over the past few decades, from the Soviet Union to Eastern Europe, have we seen enough historical tragedies written with the disasters and blood of the working people? The Russian-Ukrainian war is just another performance of this historical tragedy.

Putin keeps claiming that Russia wants to return to the status of a "powerful country" and that Russia's only choice is to become a "powerful country". The "powerful country" that Putin wants is actually hegemony! It seems that Putin is opposing the hegemonic status of the United States, but the essence of the matter is that Putin wants Russia's hegemonic status, which is the inheritance and continuation of the hegemony of the new tsarist social-imperialism. Seeing through this point is of great significance for understanding Putin's war of aggression against Ukraine. The banner raised by Putin is to oppose the eastward expansion of the United States and NATO and to oppose the hegemony of the United States. However, if he really opposes the hegemony of the United States, should he launch an aggressive war against Ukraine? If this approach of launching an aggressive war is right, then why doesn't Putin directly declare war on the United States and NATO and launch a war? The more than 100-day Russian-Ukrainian war has clearly told people that Putin, like all reactionaries, is just a paper tiger. All the high-sounding excuses are just to realize his dream of a great Russia.

Judging from the current war situation, Putin has probably realized that he cannot take over the whole Ukraine, so he has to settle for the second best, take over the Donbas region in eastern Ukraine, and try to legalize the occupation of Crimea, so as to initially meet Russia's requirements for expanding its territory to the west.

Is this anti-hegemony? No. This is not anti-hegemony, this is hegemony, but due to insufficient strength, it can only do some regional hegemony.

Through the above preliminary research and discussion, we can have a relatively correct understanding of Putin under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism:

Putin is a traitor to the Communist Party who betrayed the cause of communism; a representative of the reactionary bourgeoisie who is practicing the worst capitalist society of fascist bourgeois dictatorship; a new tsar who is full of Great Russian chauvinism and a contemporary version of fascist Nazism.



<https://cpaml.org/>
ozml@protonmail.com

February 2025