

# For Bolshevism



inside the communist and workers' movement

No 12 (93) 2010

FOR BOLSHEVISM-AUCPB website: <http://aucpbenglishwebsite.blogspot.com>

## STALIN AND THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION

The role of Vladimir Ilych Lenin as the organizer and leader of the Great October Socialist Revolution, is acknowledged even by anti-communists. However, various anti-Soviet and opportunists are trying to downplay the role in the preparation of the October Revolution and the triumphant accomplishments of another outstanding revolutionary - Joseph Stalin. Therefore, on the eve of the 93rd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, we must once again focus attention on the role of Stalin.

His role in the events of 1917 are huge: as the closest associate of Lenin, Stalin was directly involved in the leading of all the preparations for the uprising. Arriving in Petrograd on 12 March 1917 - when Lenin was still in exile, and arrived before Trotsky, Bukharin and Grigory Zinoviev, Stalin was actively involved in the work of the Party: by decision of the Bureau of the Central Committee he was elected to the editorial board of newspaper "Pravda", and later included in the presidium of the Bureau of the Central Committee, which included young Petrograd Bolsheviks underground activist Molotov and others. On March 18 the Bureau of the Party Central Committee decided to delegate J.V. Stalin to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers and Soldiers Deputies. During the three weeks before the arrival of Lenin, Stalin was the first person in the Bolshevik Party and in fact led the Central and Petrograd party Committees and the newspaper Pravda.

From March to December 1917, Stalin had written and published over 60 articles in the newspapers "Pravda", "Soldier's Truth", "Proletarian Cause," "Workers and soldiers, "The Proletariat", "Robochoy"and" Rabochoy Put"

At the April conference of RSDLP (b), J.V. Stalin spoke in support of the Leninist policy for the socialist revolution, as well as a speaker on the national question. Stalin had a clear line between principled recognition of the right of nations to self-determination up to secession and the formation of an independent state and the desirability of such a secession:

***"While recognizing the oppressed peoples right to secede, the right to decide their political destiny, we do not decide, thus the question of whether at this time some of the nations should separate from the Russian state. I can recognize the nation's right to secession" - said Stalin - but that does not mean that I order that nation to do it. People have the right to secede, but, depending on conditions, may not exercise this right. "***

Following the publication of the "April Theses" the authority of the Bolsheviks among the people grew rapidly, the crisis in the Provisional Government exacerbated, and to everyone, even in the bourgeois circles, it became clear that a dramatic denouement was inevitable and that the Bolsheviks would play a leading role.

In the days of the June crisis, when the Bolsheviks held back the willingness of the Petrograd workers to go on a demonstration with weapons, which would be a pretext for the Provisional Government to defeat the Bolshevik organization and the growing revolutionary movement, together with Sverdlov, Stalin led the Bolshevik faction of the Petrograd Soviet, spoke at various conferences and meetings of the Bolsheviks, gave in the press a clear description of the situation, and expressed the policy considerations for the future strategy and tactics of the party. In particular, he stressed: ***"The war and the related to this collapse, is exacerbating class antagonisms to the utmost. The policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie, the policy of maneuvering between revolution and counterrevolution is clearly untenable."*** In his characteristic laconic style, Stalin formulated the most pressing problem: ***"The first commandment is not to succumb to the provocations of the counter-revolutionaries, but to arm yourselves with self-control and composure, to preserve power for the coming struggle, to prevent any premature actions."***

After the failure on the front, in Petrograd, spontaneous demonstrations broke out. On the evening of July 3, some military units and workers who joined them from the Putilov and other factories of the capital, took to the streets. The demonstration was under the slogans: "Down with the Provisional Government", "All power to the Soviets of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies". The Bolsheviks led the movement to give it an organized character.

On July 4, 500 thousand workers, soldiers and sailors once again held a demonstration. This demonstration was shot at. The Provisional Government declared martial law in Petrograd. Arrests were made and the editorial and printing headquarters of Pravda, ransacked and vandalised. On July 6, an order was made for the arrest of Lenin. The Socialist Revolutionary SR-Menshevik Central Executive Committee (TsiK) of the Soviets recognized the "unlimited power and unlimited authority" behind the Provisional Government.

By decision of the Central Committee, V.I. Lenin went into hiding. Disguised, he was secretly transferred to Razliv station to the house of Bolshevik worker N. Emelyanov. J.V. Stalin maintained close contact with V.I. Lenin, and on his instructions directly led the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party.

His organizational work was now aimed at softening the blow of the counter-revolution, to prevent the defeat of the Bolshevik organizations. At an emergency conference of the Petrograd Bolshevik organization, J.V. Stalin made a report to the Central Committee of the July events. Here he gave an analysis of the new development stage of the revolution: **"As Marxists, we should approach the crisis of power not only from a formal point of view, but, above all, from a class standpoint. The crisis of power is a tense, open class struggle for power. " "The peaceful period of development of the revolution is over. A new period had arrived, a period of violent conflicts, skirmishes and clashes. Life will seethe, crises will alternate. Soldiers and workers will not be silent."**

Thanks to Stalin the party came out of the critical situation with few losses. But his particularly large role was in the preparation and the VI Party Congress (July 26 - August 3, 1917.) that took the historic decision to adopt the course towards seizing power through armed insurrection.

The VI Congress of the Party was led by Stalin and Y.M. Sverdlov. At the Congress, J.V. Stalin made a report to the Central Committee with concluding remarks, as well as a report on the political situation in the country. Guided by Lenin's instructions, he proved the need for a temporary rejection of the slogan "All Power to the Soviets", while stressing the need to work in the Soviets as organs for the revolutionary mobilization of the masses. Noting in the resolution that a peaceful transition to power of the Soviets was impossible, Congress temporarily dropped the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" and pointed out that "the right slogan at the present time can only be the total elimination of the dictatorship of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie."

The congress also noted, that since the April Conference, the number of primary Party organizations had increased from 78 to 162, while the number of the Bolsheviks had increased from 100 thousand to 240 thousand. The Resolution of the Congress stressed that a socialist revolution was the only way out of economic ruin, from the imperialist war, and a key to the preservation of national independence and autonomy of Russia. The congress justified the economic program of the party and determined the prerequisites for rebuilding the economic life of the country on a socialist basis.

In September 1917, J.V. Stalin wrote: "The counter-revolution has not yet been broken. It has only retreated, hiding behind the Kerensky government. The revolution should take this second line of trenches of the counter-revolution, if it wants to triumph." "The task of the proletariat is to close ranks and tirelessly prepare for the impending battles."

In the crucial weeks in October 1917, J.V. Stalin was at the centre of the main events. On October 10, a meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party was held. V.I. Lenin spoke with an analysis of the current situation: **"We now have the majority behind us. Politically, the situation is fully ripe for a taking power ... The political situation, therefore, is mature. We must speak of the technical aspect. That is the crux of the matter. Nevertheless we, like the defencists, are inclined to regard the systematic preparation of an uprising as something in the nature of a political sin."**

J.V. Stalin vigorously defended Lenin's position, outlined in his report in his own words: "It would be unworthy pedantry to demand that Russia "wait" with socialist transformations, until Europe "is ready".

Stalin stood firm on the positions of V. Lenin, resolutely and consistently defending them in the fierce debate with the Trotskyists, panicky afraid of an armed uprising of the revolutionary workers and soldiers. He tirelessly promoted the ideas of Lenin in the workers' environment, first of in Transcaucasia, subsequently - Petrograd and throughout Russia. Appreciating the value of V.I. Lenin's own destiny, Stalin said: **"There, in Russia, under Lenin's guidance, I became one of the masters of the revolution"** (Stalin. works, Vol.8, p.175).

On October 16, the Central Committee elected the Party Centre to direct the uprising headed by Stalin. The Party centre was the core of leadership of the Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet and led the uprising. In his speech to the Party Central Committee, rejecting the defeatist proposals of Zinoviev and Kamenev, who opposed the uprising, Stalin declared: "What Kamenev and Zinoviev are proposing objectively leads to the possibility for the counter-revolution to prepare and organize. We are forever going to retreat and lose the revolution. Why should we not secure the possibility of choosing the date of the uprising and the conditions not to allow to the counter-revolution to organize itself?" (Stalin. Works, Vol. 3, pp. 381).

Early in the morning of October 24, Kerensky ordered the closure of a central organ of the RSDLP (b) - the newspaper "Rabochy Put" - and sent armored vehicles to the editorial offices and printing plant of "Rabochy Put". But by 10 am on the orders of Stalin, the Red Guards and revolutionary soldiers drove off the armored cars and set up a heavy guard at the printer and publisher. By 11 o'clock, "Rabochy Put" was published with an front page editorial written by Stalin, "What do we need?", call on the people to overthrow the bourgeois Provisional Government. At the same time, as directed by the Party Centre, detachments of revolutionary soldiers and Red Guards were rushed to Smolny (the government building). The uprising began on October 24. On the evening of October 25 the II Congress of the Soviets was opened, having transferred all power to the Soviets.

After the death of Vladimir Lenin in 1924, J.V. Stalin publicly gave his solemn oath of honor to carry on the victorious banner of the Great October Revolution. And that oath he held fast to, that for many decades, caused fury of external and internal class enemies of the proletariat, who sought to destroy everything that was created by the Soviet people under his wise leadership.

The Great October Socialist Revolution radically changed the situation in the world. It divided the world into two systems, capitalist and socialist. In the USSR, socialism has suffered a temporary defeat, and now on Soviet soil triumphs bourgeois counter-revolution. But the advantages of the socialist system is still clearly shown by states remaining faithful to the ideals of socialism - the Republic of Cuba and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). These countries today are beacons for the oppressed peoples struggling against capitalist slavery.

The Bolsheviks in the former Soviet Union continue to struggle against the anti-Stalinist slanderous propaganda, being

instilled by the bourgeois government. So, the cause of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the cause of V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin, as the instigators and organizers of its victory, will continue.

**Yekaterina Fatyanova, AUCPB  
Krasnoyarsk**

---

## **GLOBAL JEWISH CAPITAL IN THE U.S. AND AROUND THE WORLD**

"These trends are clearly seen primarily in two major centres of business activity in the capitalist world - IN WESTERN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA, WHERE TO DATE ARE FOUND THE MOST POWERFUL FINANCIAL-INDUSTRIAL GROUPS OF THE JEWISH BOURGEOISIE. In Europe, this is the Rothschilds group, whose name is associated with the entire history of Zionism and in the U.S. – the relatively new Lazarov banking group: THESE ARE FIVE MAJOR INVESTMENT BANKING WALL STREET FIRMS ... forming the basis of two of the most significant Jewish monopoly groups" (the Limenov groups and Loeb - Bronfman – Beych groups)." ... In the hands of the above-mentioned five major Jewish investment banking firms on Wall Street are always up to 23% of the shares of large industrial companies in the U.S.. SOMETIMES THIS FIGURE REACHES 40%. Representatives from these firms cover about 15% of directorships in 1000 various corporations in the country.

The influence of major Jewish capital in the economies of the capitalist countries is maintained not just BY ITS FIRM POSITIONS, BUT IN INDIVIDUAL STATES AND BY ITS LEADING POSITIONS IN THE SPHERE OF CREDIT-FINANCE AND TRADE, WHICH REMAIN TO THIS DAY, THE PRINCIPAL AND TRADITIONAL BUSINESS OF THE JEWISH BOURGEOISIE. Over the past decade, the financial sphere of influence of the bourgeoisie of Jewish descent has gone far beyond these areas and has spread to many sectors of material production - mining, oil and chemical industries, transportation, publishing, advertising and the newspaper business, enterprise culture and the media outlets. In recent years, Jewish finance capital in corporations, firms and companies in the military-industrial complex has played a more prominent role.

"...THEIR WEALTH, ORGANIZATION AND LEADING POSITION PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR UNLIMITED INFLUENCE IN DETERMINING U.S. POLICY." (V.I. Kiselev. Zionism in the imperialist system // International Zionism: history and politics. M., 1977., P. 7-8,10).

"It is no exaggeration to say that the BRANCHING AROUND THE WHOLE WORLD and at the same time a strictly centralized system of organizations of International Zionism combined with a POWERFUL FINANCIAL-ECONOMIC BASIS in the face of a monopoly bourgeoisie of Jewish descent with a large, often DOMINANT INFLUENCE OVER THE MEDIA, CULTURE AND STATE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION APPARATUS of leading capitalist states, IS THE MAIN SOURCE OF STRENGTH AND EFFECTIVENESS OF ZIONIST INFLUENCE OVER POLICY of a number of leading capitalist states. To date, INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM by degree of the branching out of their organizations, their range of activities and international relations, the depth of penetration into the sphere of Jewish communities, as well as in different spheres of political, economic and social life in capitalist countries has no equal ... AMONG OTHER ORDERS OF WORLD REACTION " (ibid., p. 15).

"... " A Zionist organization... has the possibility and ability to achieve what is OUTSIDE THE AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION OF THE STATE, and in this lies the SUPREMACY OF A ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OVER THE STATE ... The state and the Zionist movement complement each other, need each other"... ZIONISTS HAVE DIRECTED THEIR STRENGTHS... ON A GLOBAL SCALE – TOWARDS THE CREATION OF A QUASI-INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS EDUCATION TO ENJOY THE RIGHTS OF SUPRANATIONAL (ABOVE-STATE) ORGANIZATIONS ... "(ibid., p. 73, 75).

"It becomes even more evident the unseemly role of those who encourage Israeli extremists - THE ROLE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM AND INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM AS AN INSTRUMENT OF THE AGGRESSIVE IMPERIALIST CIRCLES ... In many parts of the world, including Israel, the Zionist organizations and the Israeli government have become THE MAIN TOOLS OF POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE OF IMPERIALISM AGAINST SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM, AGAINST THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES AND ESPECIALLY AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION "(ibid.).

THE ROLE OF WORLD ZIONISM IS IN THE DESTRUCTION OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP.

"... UP TO 80% OF AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL WESTERN MEDIA OUTLETS ARE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST CENTRES. In many countries, the bourgeois Zionist organizations have placed their own "cadres" and "sympathetic" into the central elements of the press, editorial radio, in television, film, science, art and literature. USING THESE POWERFUL LEVERS, THE ZIONISTS INFLUENCE PUBLIC OPINION, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY PREACHING THEIR IDEAS, REMAIN SILENT OR DISTORT EVERYTHING THAT IS EVEN THE SLIGHTEST DEGREE AGAINST THEIR IDEOLOGY" (Ideology and practice of international Zionism., 1978, p. 97, 98).

"A SIGNIFICANT role for ZIONISM lies in the strategy of imperialism to create within the individual socialist countries - through the Zionist-minded elements, with the help of all sorts of revisionist and nationalistic concepts - ENCLAVES OF OPPOSITION to the people's system with the aim of eliminating it through a "SILENT COUNTER-REVOLUTION"... Unfolding the FRONT OF IDEOLOGICAL SABOTAGE with the aim of undermining the socialist society, BREAKING IT UP FROM WITHIN, Zionist organizations attracted ZIONIST intellectuals FOR THIS,

COVERED BY A MASK OF "LIBERALS" AND "FIGHTERS FOR DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS" (ibid., p. 105).

"To strengthen political subversion against the socialist countries, international Zionism brought their own strong points closer to their borders. Such SUBVERSIVE CENTRES AND ORGANIZATIONS OF ZIONISM, with close ties to the intelligence services of the imperialist states, settled in West Berlin, Brussels, Paris, London and Vienna. All of them, coordinating with each other activities against the socialist countries, COLLECT AND HANDLE MATERIAL ... , ENGAGE IN IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL SABOTAGE, etc ... According to the London Sunday Telegraph, "TEL AVIV HAS BECOME KNOWN IN WORLD INTELLIGENCE AS A KIND OF INTERNATIONAL MARKETPLACE FOR INTELLIGENCE DATA", supplied by the Zionists who infiltrated the socialist countries" (ibid., p. 106).

"Evidence suggests that a typical example of the unity of racism and chauvinism is specifically Zionism, which CURRENTLY IS ASSIGNED THE ROLE OF THE GUNS OF WORLD REACTION ... Many people increasingly find clear the TRUE scale of the danger posed by the IDEOLOGY AND ACTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM FOR ALL PEACE-LOVING, DEMOCRATIC FORCES OF THE PLANET AND ITS FUTURE ... Its SPECIAL DANGER lies in the variety of forms and methods of struggle, and the ability to change them depending on the situation, in the POSSIBILITY OF CONCENTRATING ENORMOUS FORCES AND MEANS TO FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALISM" (ibid., p. 265).

---

## MARXISM IS NOT A DOGMA, BUT A GUIDE TO ACTION

In recent years the process of convergence of Bolshevism with the labour movement has begun to unfold. This is due to both the systematic and consistent work of the AUCPB (All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks) in the labour movement and activities of the VSR (All-Ukrainian Workers' Union), the organization, the closest to the masses of working people, to labouring, worker collectives.

We have previously mentioned in the pages of our newspaper that the activists of the VSR (which is, for the most part, members of the Communist Party of Ukraine (KPU)) have begun to be expelled in scores out of the KPU for criticizing the opportunist line of the KPU, its leadership and its support for small and medium businesses, and flirting with religion and the Orthodox Church, for its actual rejection of revolutionary forms and methods of struggle, the rejection of the preparation of the working class in Ukraine for a socialist revolution aimed at overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie and the restoration of Soviet power (the dictatorship of the proletariat). The leader of the VSR, editor of "Working Class" Comrade A.V. Bondarchuk has also been expelled from the KPU.

Of course, we Bolsheviks are wholly in support with the VSR, which, as well as our Party, stated the need to break with opportunism in the communist and workers' movement and work in the working class and toiling masses of Ukraine on the preparation and implementation of a socialist revolution. Our support we have previously mentioned in the pages of the Workers' and Peasants' Truth", in July at a meeting of the Ukraine Bureau of the Central Committee of the AUCPB adopted a statement on the support of the editorial board of the newspaper of VSR "Working Class" ("RKP" № 8 (149)), published articles in support of Comrade Bondarchuk and other leaders of the labour movement. For its part, the editors of the "Working Class" have also carried out reprints of our articles from the AUCPB newspaper in Ukraine "Raboche-Krestyanskaya Pravda", while in number 44 (483) my article "The Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat" was published, written specifically for this newspaper.

But during the presidential election campaign, in the Ukraine Bureau of the AUCPB Central Committee and the Soviet of VSR began to appear different approaches to tactics in these elections.

We, developing tactics, said that all candidates for the highest office in the state are the representatives of the bourgeoisie, and that whoever was the victor, the power will still remain in the hands of major oligarchic capital. Moreover, all 18 years of so-called independence indicates that the power of the bourgeoisie in Ukraine has strengthened, that the bourgeoisie is now the true master of the situation in the country. Hence our conclusion: we Bolsheviks have nothing to do in these elections. **The main task we have seen and see now, is to explain to the working people of working in Ukraine the futility of the election campaign, to expose the parliamentary illusions and raise the working people to lead the working class in the struggle to overthrow the power of capital.**

The VSR though, decided to support Yanukovich in these elections. When for this decision, we subjected comrade Bondarchuk to friendly criticism, he is in his article "You are my friend, but the truth – is dearer" ("WC" № 3 (490), January 2010), began to teach us Marxism-Leninism and the ability to apply the methodology in making tactical decisions.

Here is what he wrote: "So ... secretary of the CC AUCPB of Ukraine Anatoly Mayevsky, analyzing the current pre-election situation, turns his attention not on the search for an approach of Communist agitators to our real present workers with their current level of consciousness, but immediately leaned towards advice - for who or against to vote (see article by A. Mayevsky "Mopping up the territory" in newspaper Raboche-Krestyanskaya Pravda (Workers' and Peasants' Truth") № 1, 2010). ....with this approach, the whole election "tactic" is to correctly mark ballots: in 2004, the AUCPB decided to put a tick in front of the name of Yanukovich, then in 2010 - in the box "against all"." And further, Comrade Bondarchuk says that 99% of the workers of the industrial Eastern Ukraine are today for Yanukovich, so let A. Mayevsky try "today to go to the workers of Donbas or Kharkov with his tactic "to vote against all candidates"." But if you act in accordance with the Resolution of the VSR prepared on the recommendations of Lenin, then everything will turn out: the workers of Donbas and Kharkiv will listen to me, and I (further quoting Lenin) "I can explain in popular fashion not only why Soviets are better than Parliament ..." (PSS, v.41, p.73)."

"That's why we must support voting for Yanukovich" - teaches us comrade Bondarchuk.

And there is a lot of what the leader of the VSR is trying to teach us. It turns out that "we have no tradition of in-depth study of scientific communism and the adoption of practical solutions based on precisely the methodology of Marxism. Instead, a passion for slogans, cabinet closed doorishness and an inexplicable attraction to the same elections.

"For us the Communists, it's time to finally understand a few simple things. Without a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory there can be no question of socialism - this is firstly. But theory alone is not enough: we must still connect it with the living labour movement – this

is secondly" – this bit is all true so far. But then this gem: "Thus, almost everything is ready: the theory has been developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and, the labour movement is conditioned by capitalist production. We still have one thing left to do – and that is to combine the first with the second, Marxist theory with the workers' movement", - concludes comrade. A. Bondarchuk.

And he ends his critical article with the slogans: "Support V. Yanukovich! Long live the revolutionary working class!"

A brilliant connection of Yanukovych - the authorized representative of major oligarchic capital, the main enemy of the working class, with the revolutionary working class. This is something new in Marxist-Leninist theory, worthy of such a "profound theoretician" and "expert" of Marxism-Leninism as comrade Bondarchuk.

I am compelled to respond to the criticism from the respected leader of the VSR.

**About cabinet closed doorishness.** This is a completely false allegation. The ruling bourgeois regime is in a constant struggle with the Bolsheviks, persecutes and even destroys our activists. In 1996, member of the Central Committee of the AUCPB, Hero of the Soviet Union, Comrade S.P. Subbotin (Cherkasy) was killed on his way back home from his dacha. In October 1997, Party organiser of the CC AUCPB in Kharkov region Comrade A.L. Bondarenko, a man closely associated with the labour movement of Kharkov, who had great authority in the Working (Trudovaya) Kharkov, and in the communist and leftist movement of the city and region was killed in a deliberately set-up car crash. And after this, the security services began vigorously to break up the Kharkov Party organization, by the infiltration into them of provocateurs. Of course, we found them them, and expelled from the party, but they did a lot of dirty deeds, but were unsuccessful in destroying the organization. On May 1, 2005 a gangster style attack was carried out on member of the Central Committee of the AUCPB Comrade V.G. Koshevogo (Donetsk), one of the leaders of the Donetsk city organization of the Union of the workers. Comrade Toshevoy then spent nearly two months with the most severe concussion, lost his health, his activity decreased sharply, and in December 2008 he died prematurely. The same bandit attacks on our activists with their destruction take place in Russia. Special services are not averse to any kind of provocation, attacks on the Bolsheviks from behind the corner, trying to compromise, etc. etc. Straight away I say that we, Bolsheviks, can not be intimidated by anyone. And in the place of our fallen comrades others will certainly come and others have come. No sooner had our newspaper "Workers' and Peasants' Truth" (January 1997) had time to see the light, when the editor immediately began to face prosecution "for anti-state activities and calls on the people" with attempts by the authorities to close the newspaper. For about three years the court case continued, but the editors managed to defend its right to carry the word of truth to the working people and win the case. Some time later, the editor had spend two years suing the Pension Fund of Ukraine (Mukachevskij department) having attempted to strangle the newspaper financially. And we won these court cases. The newspaper continues to go now for the 14-th year, and continues to spread the Bolshevik word to the masses of working people. This is with regard to "cabinet closed doorishness".

#### **About the "inexplicable pull to those same elections".**

Comrade Bondarchuk suggests elections. The AUCPB has never had a pull towards elections.

"AUCPB - as noted in our party program - its main task specifies: the conquest of the working class political power, establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat, the abolition of private ownership of means of production, elimination of exploitation of man by man, the restoration of a socialist society, the revival of the USSR, the development of socialism and the construction of communism." There, in the Program of the AUCPB it says: "To establish the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible only through a socialist revolution, as the bourgeoisie one will never peacefully give up power. And one more position of our Party Program I would like to give: "The main activity of the AUCPB in the communist movement – is its Bolshevization, meaning the return of the communist movement to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism with the demands of the modern era. Bolshevization - is first of all, a policy of the revolutionary change in the current bourgeois socio-economic system. Bolshevization - is the relentless and uncompromising struggle against opportunism and revisionism. Without the ideological defeat of the bourgeois parties operating in the ranks of the working class, pushing backward sections of the working class into the arms of the bourgeoisie and destroying the unity of the working class - victory of the proletarian revolution will be impossible. "With reformists and Mensheviks in their ranks, it is *impossible* to victor in the proletarian revolution and *impossible* to defend it" (V.I. Lenin)".

Where did you, dear comrade Bondarchuk, see here "a pull towards to parliamentarism?" And Ukraine Buro of the CC AUCPB in its practical political activities and making tactical decisions is constantly guided by our party program. Even at the II Congress of the AUCPB (February 1996), General Secretary of the AUCPB comrade Nina Alexandrovna Andreeva in her report stressed: "**Is the parliamentary way of transition to socialism possible today?** In our opinion, practically impossible. Today, after the temporary defeat of the world socialism, the imperialist bourgeoisie makes it clear that it will not give power to working people without a severe and intense struggle. According to mafia Chief "voucherizer" Chubais, a return to socialism can only be achieved through a civil war. At the slightest threat to their rule in Russia and to international imperialism, they will not stop short of the armed suppression of the will of the people, or the organization of foreign military intervention. In the era of the modern stage of imperialism, parliament is practically deprived of the opportunity not only for the socialist reform of society, but in general, the ability to radically influence the policy of state-monopoly capital. Parliaments, Senates, City Councils and Dumas are today, a screen for the financial oligarchy and safety valves for the timely letting off of steam of popular discontent ... In the parliaments and senates of many western countries, the Communist opposition is well blended into a legitimate niche of imperialist regimes. Its leaders are aging and dying in parliamentary seats. Those who have gone, are replaced with new leader-Communists, who also find it convenient and a privilege to be members of Parliament or the Senate. Communist parties often become appendages of their parliamentary factions that have become hotbeds of opportunism and compromise. Euro-communism grew out of parliamentary departments. The crisis of the idea of a parliamentary road of transition to socialism means that **for the working class and its allies, parliamentary games by the rules of modern imperialism are completely hopeless ... It is not parliamentary reforms, but revolution which is the only real way of transition to socialism.**"

Here, comrade Bondarchuk, is the attitude of our party to parliamentarism and the parliamentary struggle. "**It is not parliamentary reforms, but revolution which is the only real way of transition to socialism.**" In this direction our party does its work. You yourself, as until recently a member of the Central Committee of Communist Party of Ukraine, several times elected to Parliament and was a member of the communist faction. And all your activists of the VSR were deeply involved in numerous campaigns. Thus, you until very recently were infected with the "pull towards elections".

Another thing. The fact that I am **immediately inclined to advise - for whom or against whom to vote**" (Comrade Bondarchuk refers to my article "Purging the territory" "RKP" № 1, 2010). And that our Bolshevik voting "tactics" are "reduced to the proper filling out of ballot papers: in 2004, the AUCPB decided to place a tick next to Yanukovych, and in 2010 - in the box "against all candidates". It would be interesting for me to know where in the article "Purging the territory" comrade Bondarchuk saw the advice "to put a tick against all candidates"? One should also be able to know how to read so as to attribute to his opponent what he did not say. In the article "Purging the territory" there is no word about how to vote. All my article "Purging the territory" is devoted to one subject. Namely. For nearly 19 years on the territory of, "liberated" and "free" Ukraine it has been ruled by capitalism. Over these 19 years, Ukraine's population of 52 million people has decreased to 39 (approximately a 6.5 million people population decline, and about the same amount go abroad in search of work and opportunities to earn a piece of bread, i.e., a decrease of at least 13 million people).. All the clans of the bourgeoisie - and Yushchenko and Tymoshenko, and Yanukovich, and others, are caring only about one thing, about maximizing profits and surplus profits thanks to ruthless exploitation and plunder of the working people. And all of their presidential election battle boils down to one thing – to take the highest office in the State to ensure that, having in their hands the levers of power, much of the profits fall into the pockets and bank accounts of the group of capital, whose representative has become president. **And the main task** facing the Bolsheviks, in the face of all the political forces that are not in words but in deeds, fighting for the abolition of bourgeois power, is to **"raise the working class to fight for their rights, for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and firmly discredit the remnants of electoral illusions."** That is the difference, comrade Bondarchuk.: to strongly debunk the remnants of electoral illusions, and not "vote against all." Comrade Bondarchuk simply misinformed readers of newspaper "Working Class" of the position of the AUCPB in this presidential election campaign. Revolutionaries-Communists, the leaders of the labour movement may not agree with each other in some things, including in matters of tactics. But they, in arguing, should truthfully express the position of their opponent, and not distort it. The controversy between comrades in the struggle must be conducted honestly, dear comrade Bondarchuk.

Likewise, comrade Bondarchuk distorts our position on the 2004 elections. At that time a representative of the neo-fascist Banderite group of capital, Yushchenko was eager to get into power. Behind him stood American, western capital. At the meeting of the Ukraine Buro of the Central Committee of the AUCPB, held in August 2004, we discussed the situation and concluded that the main task of the moment was to Stop fascism (that was the name of my report at the meeting of the Ukraine Buro CC AUCPB) in the face of Yushchenko surging to power. Keenly aware that the chances of reaching the second round were held only by Yanukovych and Yushchenko, we called on the voters of Ukraine in the second round vote to against Yushchenko. This meant that we were forced to vote for Yanukovich - the representative of a major oligarchic bourgeoisie and the exploiters and oppressors of the working people. But there is no other way to stop the fascist presidential candidate at present"- stated in the Decree of the Ukraine Buro of the CC AUCPB (see "RKP" № 9 (90), 2004; here I want to note that the printing of that issue of the newspaper was delayed by almost 3 weeks since the printers, where our newspapers are published, were simply afraid to release it, so the newspaper had been produced in another printing plant, and immediately censored, the editors spending two weeks trying to find a way to publish the newspaper) . No, because at that time there was no revolutionary situation, or other opportunities, we had no other option but to vote in the second round against the President, to stop this puppet of U.S. imperialism and the heir to Bandera and the Nazis,. At the same time, we explained to the workers that "the working class, the working people of Ukraine through presidential-parliamentary election campaigns would not come to power" and that "whoever wins the presidential election, ... the power will still remain in the hands of capital in the hands of one or another faction of the bourgeoisie", and we urged the working class, working people up to fight for the overthrow of the power of capital. That is our position in that period. In reaching this decision, we also realized that, behind Yanukovych are powerful financial-industrial groups of the Eastern regions of Ukraine closely connected with Russia's capital, that in the case of Yanukovych coming to power, perhaps will be a strengthening on a bourgeois basis naturally, the Ukrainian-Russian relations (political, economic, financial, etc.) that will allow to strengthen the economic potential of both Ukraine and the entire CES (Common Economic Expanse), which at that time was beginning to take shape in the 4-republics: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. And this, in turn, will lead to the restoration and strengthening of relations between workers of the four Soviet republics, and would facilitate them to lead a joint struggle to overthrow the power of capital. Unfortunately, the Central Committee of Communist Party of Ukraine, after the Symonenko did not come out in the second round of presidential elections, spoke about not supporting any of the candidates in the second, and then the third round, as both are members of competing clans of the bourgeoisie. I recall that then, esteemed Comrade Bondarchuk was a member of the Central Committee of Communist Party of Ukraine. The result of this shortsighted position was that 1.4 million votes cast for Simonenko in the first round, were dispersed, and yet, at the correct position taken by then, most of these voters could have voted against President Yushchenko. The unfolded after the second round, of the so-called "Orange Revolution", carried out by hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars, brought to power Yushchenko. This pseudo-revolution clearly demonstrated that Yushchenko was necessary to U.S. imperialism as the puppet as president of Ukraine, was needed in order to wrest Ukraine from Russia, to oppose the two fraternal peoples against each other and turn Ukraine into a vassal state, completely dependent on the U.S. and the West and a possible military base, a springboard for US-NATO forces in the struggle of U.S. imperialism for global domination, with the subsequent enslavement of Russia and the seizure of untold natural resources and raw materials, primarily oil and gas. Coming to power, Yushchenko immediately liquidated the participation of Ukraine in the CES, and began to actively pursue the glorification of Bandera, the OUN-UPA, exercised a decisive turn back of Ukraine against Russia and a turn towards the U.S.. That is, with regard to where and when "to place the bird" in the elections, in the words of Comrade Bondarchuk.

#### **But over the past five years of orange-rule in Ukraine, the situation in the country has changed.**

Immediately after Yushchenko came to power, the competing among themselves for the election clans of the bourgeoisie, began to build bridges and establish contacts. The result was the signing in September 2005 of the "Declaration of Unity and cooperation for the future of Ukraine", signed by both Yushchenko and Yanukovych's Party of Regions. Yanukovych did not fulfilled his promises of Russian as a second language state, did not actively oppose the process of bringing Ukraine closer to NATO. For many months during 2008-2009, the negotiations were held between representatives of the Party of Regions (Yanukovych) and the BYT (Tymoshenko) to establish a joint coalition in parliament. But such a coalition, ultimately failed. Obviously, they were not able to share the portfolios of power and spheres of influence. So in these five years there began the process of rapprochement between competing clans of the bourgeoisie. And one of them - Yanukovych or Tymoshenko is now more pro-Moscow politician? It is difficult to say. At least, the gas

contracts signed by Tymoshenko's government at the beginning of last year. set the price of gas for Ukraine is approaching to \$ 400 per thousand m3. at a time when Prime Minister was Viktor Yanukovich (still under Kuchma) the price for a thousand m3 of gas was 49 USD. Putin and Medvedev are also known as the political representatives of big business in Russia, primarily of the oil and gas oligarchs. It is clearly, what price is more favorable to the oil and gas tycoons in Russia and those of the Ukrainian top politicians, in this regard, who they are more than satisfied with. Both Yanukovich and Tymoshenko sought support from the West, the EU and the United States and Russia. And forcing them to do so, first of all, are the the major capitalist groups that stand behind them. According to KIA (Committee of Voters of Ukraine), in the first round of elections both Yanukovich and Tymoshenko spent approximately \$ 200 million on the election campaign (exactly half of the total cost of all presidential candidates). Both are supported by the richest people of Ukraine, the billionaires and multimillionaires, who seized the metallurgical, machine building, chemical and petrochemical plants and refineries, mines, mining and dressing enterprises, privatized the whole food and light industry, etc., etc. having formed their own banks and on the basis of the connection of industrial and financial capital, formed financial-industrial groups (FIGs). In particular, Yanukovich's support came from: Akhmetov (3.7 billion dollars according to the version of the magazine "Focus" at the beginning of 2009), A. and S. Klyuev (356.8 million dollars), V. Khmelniysky (246.8 million) and other oligarchs. Tymoshenko, in turn had the support of I. Kolomoysky (2.3 billion), V. Haiduk (704.3 million), S. Taruta (673.8 million), etc.

It is therefore quite an untrue statement by the VSR Resolution by the Soviet "About the tasks of the VSR in connection with presidential elections in 2010" ("RC» № 43 (482), November 2009) that Yanukovich would "dig in his heels - to create favorable conditions for domestic enterprises, ... create the material conditions for the existence of the working class - the main revolutionary force in capitalist society ... will raise the gravedigger of capitalism - what he does not "support" in this important matter for the Revolution! ". To this I wish to note one thing. Both factions of capital, and challenges for Yanukovich, and Tymoshenko will act in the same way: in the period of recovery, they will increase production, increase the size of the working class, in a recession (depression) - expel "unnecessary" people onto the street. Capitalism, dear members of the VSR, is raising its gravedigger - the proletariat, objectively, regardless of colour shades, political and ideological preferences. In this regard, both Yanukovich, and Tymoshenko are identical.

Nor is the allegation by Bondarchuk that 99% of the workers of the industrial east of Ukraine are today for Yanukovich. In order to more or less reliably know the mood of the workers, it is necessary that the newspaper published daily circulation of at least 0.5 million - one million copies. Then will be established a stable relationship with labour collectives, which will allow editors to monitor the mood of the working class. And since this figure is taken by comrade. Bondarchuk from the ceiling, to artificially justify the wrong, in our view, position of the VSR, especially in the first round of elections. There can not be 99% of workers supporting Yanukovich, supporting all these Akhmetovs Kolomoyskys, Tarutas, Zvyagilskys and similar bourgeoisie, which during the years of the "orange revolution" robbed the workers and seized for a pittance into their own hands the factories and mines, and hundreds of thousands, millions of people who are thrown out onto the streets, make unemployed, homeless, leaving their families and without a livelihood. (Currently, these bourgeoisie, as a result of intense competition, have dispersed to different political camps, but in the 1990-s, during the formative years of their financial and industrial empires, they robbed the workers all along, of course, each into their own pocket). As a result of this lawlessness, many Donbass mining towns have turned into ghost towns and villages and die out, because the mines, or even the only one mine, which provided residents work and livelihood are all closed. And comrade Bondarchuk believes that these miners and hundreds of thousands, and millions of unemployed people support their robbers? The respected leader of VSR is too disrespectful in relation to our working class.

But suppose that comrade Bondarchuk is right and the vast majority of workers of the eastern regions of Ukraine actually support Yanukovich, because of their backwardness and oppression. Surely this implies that in this case the party of the working class, labour leaders, communists, revolutionaries, i.e. Bolsheviks, should tail behind the workers and preserve their backward attitudes and views. No, of course not. This behaviour by a party is called tailism and it is not unique to a revolutionary party of the proletariat as "the highest form of class organization of the proletarians" (VI Lenin, Left-Wing "Communism", an infantile disorder" MSS, v.41, p.33), but an opportunist party, trailing in the wake of the backward attitudes of the masses. In the same "Infantile Disorder ..." referred to by Comrade Bondarchuk, but he did not even bother to read, let alone to ponder over its contents, the essence of Lenin's conclusions, recommendations and advice, says: "The whole task of the communists is to be able to *convince* the backward elements, to work *among* them, and not *isolate themselves* from them with invented and childish "leftist" slogans" (ibid., p. 38). But comrade Bondarchuk, to justify his position of support for Yanukovich and win the support of the masses, said that Yanukovich is "our son of a bitch". The slogan is beautiful, which catches the eye, but it is not a Marxist one. "This is a son of a bitch, but it's our son of a bitch" - according to the American authors, memoirists, a review of the Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza (senior) of the 32 th U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt. (Collegiate Dictionary winged words and expressions ", author-compiler Vadim Serov). So the expression "our son of a bitch" bears no relation to Marxism. This expression comrade Bondarchuk, is trying to win the favor of the proletariat of Eastern Ukraine, indulging his backward classes and the mood and weaving into their tail. But V.I. Lenin from the very beginning of his revolutionary activities pointed out that "social democracy everywhere and always has been and cannot but be the representative of the conscious worker and not the non-conscious workers, that nothing could be more dangerous and criminal than demagogic flirting with the unconscious workers" (PSS, 4, P.315). And then he continues: "The task of social democracy is to develop the political consciousness of the masses, and not drag in the tail of the disfranchised masses" (ibid, P.315-316).

In our case this means the following. If a certain part of the workers, and working people of the eastern regions of Ukraine are for Yanukovich, due to their backward and downtrodden by poverty and hopelessness of life, then we Bolsheviks have to explain to them that Yanukovich is OUR CLASS ENEMY, the same as Tymoshenko, (and in western and central regions of Ukraine where some definite, disoriented and deceived workers supported Tymoshenko, we must explain to them that Tymoshenko is OUR CLASS ENEMY, the same as Yanukovich), that with elections we can not change anything, because whoever comes to power, in any case, the power will remain with the bourgeoisie, or clan of Yanukovich or Tymoshenko's clan, that the working class has only one way to secure for themselves, their children and grandchildren a decent life and that it is to rise up to the struggle for the overthrow of bourgeois power and restore the power of the proletariat. Of course, we have told the workers that we are not talking about a revolution overnight, but that the fight must begin in the most elementary basic demands: ending wage arrears, payments of salaries, the provision of increase of salaries, pensions, stipends and other payments at a level no lower than the living wage; lower prices and tariffs for the most needed products,

transportation and housing and communal services, etc., etc. And in the course of this struggle is to be forged the unity of the working class, class solidarity. And when the struggle spreads throughout the country when the fight is switched to workers in all occupations, as well as working intellectuals and peasants, this struggle will have to acquire a universal character, from the economic struggle it will grow into a political one. From here it would not be long before the general political strike, and then the socialist revolution would not be far off.

Namely based on this analysis, we Bolsheviks approached the campaign, saying that elections are a mechanism for strengthening the power of capital (this, incidentally, is shown by the entire short history of "independent" Ukraine), and that inside the parliament, workers have already long gone for good (this was in Lenin's time, during the Tsarist period, determined, though a disproportionately small part of the workers could get into the tsarist Duma on workers curiae, but now, when Parliament is elected from party lists, these lists of workers and working people are absent with none to be found in parliament, besides the Com. Party of Ukraine, several members of the working people of Ukraine attached obviously to no-go places) that the Ukrainian president could be a very rich person (ie, bourgeois) or a politician, serving the interests of a clan of the bourgeoisie, since workers need 2,5 million UAH only to ensure the nomination of a candidate (not to mention the need for tens of millions of dollars to conduct the election campaign) simply can not be found. Hence, we concluded that workers have nothing to do in these elections (by the way, 1/3 of voters in the first round did not take part, knowing that the presidential candidates absolutely do not care about the fate of working people and that someone who is elected president, the next day after his victory will forget and completely abandon his or her campaign pledges), and the Bolsheviks should use this campaign to expose the illusions of the election, to introduce revolutionary proletarian class consciousness into the ranks of the working people.

And yet another argument of the VSR and comrade Bondarchuk is in the need to support Yanukovich in the elections, to support him like a "rope supports a hanged man", referring to the "Left-wing communism – an infantile disorder", by V.I. Lenin (PSS, 41, p.73). And Comrade Bondarchuk, proudly declares that the resolution of the VSR is based "strictly on the Leninist methodology outlined in "Infantile disorder"...", and that "these tips by Lenin are almost 100% suited to our current situation! "

Dear Comrade Bondarchuk thinks that if he pulled out of context a quotation of Lenin's work, not thinking about its content and not bothering to read all this work of Lenin, or even go beyond page 73, then such thoughtless citation is called "Leninist methodology"? A few pages earlier, Lenin shows that the Hendersons and Snowdens are petty-bourgeois leaders, analogs of the Russian Mensheviks (p. 70, 71). In general the whole ninth chapter of the "Infantile disorder..." is devoted to "Left-wing" communism in Britain, the alignment of political forces in this country by the beginning of 1920 ("Infantile disorder..." was written in April-May 1920). Lenin showed that representatives of big capital in Britain of that period were Lloyd George and Churchill (as we, in Ukraine today, such representatives of big business, the winners of the first round of elections were Mr. Yanukovich and Yulia Tymoshenko). But Henderson and Snowden were the representatives of bourgeois parties (Henderson was one of the leaders of the Labour Party and the trade union movement; Snowden was a representative of the Independent Labour Party, the leader of its right wing). Lenin also said that in Britain of that period there were several small Communist groups and organizations, and he urged them to unite their efforts to unite and act together against the common enemy - the bourgeoisie. Representatives of these groups called for the advancement to socialism and the victory of the proletariat in a straightforward way, without compromise, flexibility and maneuvering. Lenin, however, refutes this straight-line tactics of the "Left" and says that once a significant part of the British working class follow their British Mensheviks, behind the Hendersons and Snowdens, then the Communists in order to win the masses over to their side, should support the electing of the British Mensheviks to help them come to power, to support "Henderson with their ballot just as the rope supports the hanged man". Why is such "help" to the Mensheviks from the Communists needed? The Communists, Lenin shows, should help the representative of the British Menshevism to come to power to ensure that the majority of the working class on its own experience could be convinced of the correctness of the British Communists, "i.e. in the utter uselessness of the Hendersons and Snowdens, in their petty and treacherous nature, and the inevitability of their bankruptcy." This in turn, will hasten the moment, "when on the soil of frustration by the Hendersons, the majority of workers can be a serious chance of success and quickly overthrow the Government of the Hendersons" (p.71). That's who should have been supported at that time in England when there was no revolutionary situation, by the British Communists, and supported from a single view that British workers would have seen the betrayal of the Mensheviks, their subservience to the bourgeoisie and, on receipt of such practical experience, which turned be from the Mensheviks and would go to the British Communists. An analogue of the Mensheviks, an analog of Henderson in Ukraine (not absolute but relative, of course) is P. Simonenko (Leader of the Communist party of Ukraine). Based on the guidance of Lenin, then it would be the time to vote for Symonenko, with the same aim, of course. This, by the way, is what we Bolsheviks proposed to workers in Ukraine elections in 1999, when into the second round came Kuchma and Simonenko (this was the highest achievement Simonenko and the CPU, and then the CPU rating because of its conciliatory position began to steadily decline). And we to the working people openly stated that no matter who at that time may come to power, the power will still remain with the bourgeoisie, as Kuchma, a representative of big business, and Simonenko - representative of the petty bourgeoisie, which, by their very nature, is politically, rather, serves, a particular clan of big capital. But given the fact that a large part of the masses of working people saw in Simonenko a true communist, and not a compromiser and petty-bourgeois figure, we then proposed to workers to vote for Symonenko, that they in the future, if Symonenko came to power and became president of Ukraine would be able to see for themselves on their experiences, his petty-bourgeois nature, his loyal service to the bourgeoisie, and not the working class, working people. (Incidentally, this version of arrival to power took place in Moldova, where the PCR (Party of Communists of the Republic of Moldova) leader Vladimir Voronin was president of Moldova for 8 years and completely in the eyes of workers exposed himself, as bourgeois, and not communist in character, and demonstrated in practice the petty bourgeois nature of the PCR). Simonenko was afraid to fight for the presidency, and between the first and second round of elections, the CPU practically turned its back on its own propaganda activities, that is, without a struggle gave the post to President Kuchma (just as Zyuganov, leader of the CPRF- Communist Party of the Russia Federation did in 1996 when, in fact he won the second round of elections, but handed back power to Yeltsin). Now to vote for Symonenko makes no sense at all, because the CPU's popularity among the masses each year invariably falls and it was clear that Simonenko under no circumstances would make the second round, as was shown in the first round, where Simonenko took 6 th place.

Lenin, however, did not propose voting for representatives of big capital, since British workers were aware that they were their exploiters and oppressors. Comrade Bondarchuk has absolutely given no thought about what Lenin wrote, has perverted Lenin's advice and called it a "Leninist methodology".

This, my dear comrade Bondarchuk, is not Leninist methodology, but a perversion of Marxism-Leninism as a result of your superficial



approach, your unwillingness to read this outstanding work of Lenin and understand its content. Leninist methodology, which is based on the dialectical materialist method, involves a comprehensive, concrete-historical class approach to the evaluation of phenomena, events in one country or another, accurate accounting of the placement of all classes, groups, strata, political parties operating in the country, consideration of the effect of external forces (i.e., an account of the international situation), to arrive at the correct tactics of Communists in a particular situation, at a particular historical period, and in a particular country. That is what, in particular, Lenin said in the same "Infantile disorder...": the task is "to be able to lay the general and fundamental principles of communism to the *specific* relations between classes and parties, to the *specific* features in the objective development towards communism, which are different in each country and which we must be able to explore, find, guess" (p.74). Or even one sentence of Lenin: "**One must have one's own head on their shoulders, so in each case one is able to work it out!**" (p.52).

**Your own thoughtless citation led to the development of improper tactics in the first round of the elections.** But this would not have been so terrible, if you had a tenacity worthy of a better use, in not defending your own incorrect tactics, pointing at the same time to the very superficial nature of your approach to Lenin's ideological and theoretical heritage. With this "knowledge" and "understanding" of Marxism-Leninism you simply cannot lead the workers' movement in Ukraine in a Bolshevik, revolutionary way, and will always be stray in broad daylight.

However in the same work, Lenin said, that in the second round and in the second ballot the Bolsheviks never rejected "support to the bourgeoisie against the tsarist regime" (p.56). Why, I hope this is understandable, because Capitalism is a higher stage of socio-economic development than feudalism, the political expression of which was the tsarist government.

Before us, the Bolsheviks, the question arose, for whom to vote **in the second round**, or, as in the first round, not to participate in the elections. Of course, while we could not follow the above example of Lenin, since Yanukovich and Tymoshenko are both representatives of large financial-oligarchic capital, but from its different groups and different political hues. But on the eve of the first round of elections in the media reported that 8 of the national-democratic parties, such as the Ruh and others like them "democrats", i.e., neo-banderovites, decided to support Tymoshenko. The very same Tymoshenko made in response to the unambiguous political gesture by appointing to a higher pension to the son of Roman Shukhevych - Hitler's servant and executioner, commander of the UPA - Yuri Shukhevych. That is, the Nationalist neo-banderovites decided to change their leader, and, instead of the completely bankrupt Yushchenko, made a bid for Tymoshenko, thereby seeking to extend their political existence. Of course, this can not happen. So we decided in the second round to vote against Tymoshenko, and hence we were forced to support Yanukovich, a representative of big business, because we do not currently have others ways to stop the march of nationalism in Ukraine. Being forced to vote for Yanukovich, while continuing to publicly expose the exploitative nature of bourgeois anti-national group of big business, whose interests he is politically – that was our tactics in the second round. To expose the bourgeoisie, to explain to the working class, working people of Ukraine the falsity of the promises of the representatives from both factions battling for power, to help the working people and dispel any illusions, calling on the workers to rise up to fight for their rights, as the only way to secure a decent life - these are tasks that we decided on in these presidential elections and not to turn away from them, pleading not with flashy and completely devoid of content phrases like "our son of a bitch", but carrying out consistent daily work of the Bolsheviks on propaganda and agitation among the masses of working people.

Especially revealing is the statement by A. Bondarchuk that "almost everything is ready: the theory is already developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, well, and the labour movement conditioned by capitalist production. We still have one thing - to combine with the latter, the Marxist theory with the workers' movement.

How easily and simply. Bondarchuk had forgotten while Lenin instructed that "Our theory is not a dogma but a guide to action - Marx and Engels said ..." (the same "Infantile disorder...", p. 55). If Lenin and the Bolsheviks proceeded from the fact that Marx and Engels had it all developed, there would never have been the Great October Revolution. Marx and Engels in their time, in the second half of the 19 st. argued that the socialist revolution will occur more or less simultaneously in all or in the main capitalist countries. Lenin, however, investigating the development of capitalism in its imperialist stage, the highest, showed that due to the uneven development, socialist revolution will occur in several or even one country, which by then will form the objective conditions of revolution and will be a proletarian revolutionary party type, as a subjective factor in this revolution. (See "The Slogan of the United States of Europe" and "militant program of the proletarian revolution"). The Mensheviks, led by Plekhanov, an outstanding Marxist, but with an approach to Marxism that was not dialectical but metaphysical (in particular, in this issue), subjected Lenin for this conclusion to the most severe criticism. But the course of historical events confirmed the correctness of Lenin, who approached Marxism not dogmatically, and even less, not so simplistic as A. Bondarchuk. The Great October Socialist Revolution under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin, led to the victory of the proletarian masses of Russia, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat from the wreckage of the destroyed during the revolution bourgeois state.

Moreover, his assertion that the theory has been developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, A. Bondarchuk did not mention Stalin. And that means that he does not consider Stalin an outstanding theoretician of Marxism-Leninism, which is also fundamentally wrong. Such work by comrade Stalin as "Marxism and the National Question," "Dialectical and Historical Materialism", "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics", "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" and others, as well as "A Brief History of the CPSU (b)" entered the treasury of Marxism-Leninism, and to discard the theoretical contribution Stalin in the further development of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, which means wilfully or unwillingly descending to the petty bourgeois pro-Khrushchev camp (i.e. Trotskyist) point of view.

\*\*\*

What caused these errors of A. Bondarchuk?

Of course, not only his superficial knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and the lack of a dialectical approach to analyzing the current situation in Ukraine, which is replaced by mindless and uncritical citations.

The point lies elsewhere. Until recently, Comrade Bondarchuk, as a member of the Central Committee of Communist Party of Ukraine, was under the ideological control of the party. He was expelled from its ranks (in which, incidentally, is no tragedy, and we already wrote about this and fully supported the thrust of VSR activity in the working class), Comrade. Bondarchuk was free, in ideological and organizational aspects. The VSR Soviet was supported not only by us Bolsheviks, but also by a number of other leftist

parties and organizations. Bondarchuk's head went dizzy. Here on the pages of "Working Class" appeared "well-wishers, who began to push Bondarchuk and the VSR Soviet towards creating a "party of the working class". Hence, aplomb, and the ambitions of Alexander Bondarchuk. I note that in the former Soviet Union now operate some 50 communist and leftist parties and organizations (this was said by Nina Andreeva, whilst reading a report at the 4 th Congress of the AUCPB in April 2005). Naturally, such a fragmentation of the communist movement plays into the hands of the bourgeoisie. And if comrade. Bondarchuk will create another party of the working class, it will only play into the hands of the bourgeoisie in Ukraine, because it once again splits the communist movement in the Ukraine, complicates (but does not stop it) the merging of Bolshevism with the workers and protest movement.

We want to remind A. Bondarchuk of the fate of Moiseenko, the talented leader of the left-wing of the Communist Party. He was also pushed by the security services, just playing on his ambitions to create a renewed Communist Party – the Communist Party of Workers and Peasants (CPRS). Where is the CPRS and its leader Vladimir Moiseenko? – They went into political oblivion. The same fate awaits the "party of the working class" which they are pushing comrade Bondarchuk into to creating. Pushed, we just have to say, by the Secret Service of Ukraine, to prevent the merging of Bolshevism with the workers and protest movement. Of course, nothing can stop this process, because it is objective. But simply additional obstacles occur on this path.

Our task, our obligation is to work together, join the protest movement of the working class, working people of Ukraine with Bolshevism, to build class consciousness in the ranks of the fighters, armed with the working class understanding of its historical mission, the gravedigger of capitalism and the builder of a classless communist society.

#### **A. MAYEVSKY, secretary of the AUCPB**

PS: The article was written towards the second round of presidential elections in Ukraine

---

Supporters of the **AUCPB** (All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks) can visit the **FOR BOLSHEVISM-AUCPB** website at <http://aucpbenglishwebsite.blogspot.com>

Join the online supporters group / discussion forum **For BolshevismAUCPB** by e-mail at <http://uk.groups.yahoo.com/group/ForBolshevismAUCPB>

or email: [zabolsh@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:zabolsh@yahoo.co.uk)

**Russian AUCPB website address: vkpb.ru**

**FIGHTING FUND** – Comrades and Supporters of the AUCPB and Subscribers to "**FOR BOLSHEVISM INSIDE THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' MOVEMENT**" and other material of the AUCPB, please make a donation towards the further publication of AUCPB material translated into English from Russian by sending donations to our fighting fund account "**FOR SOLIDARITY WITH WORKERS OF THE EX-USSR**" sort code **30-93-60, Account Number: 02312361 (Lloyds TSB).**

**Many thanks to all our comrades and supporters for their material support!**

---

**DEFEND THE DPRK!**

**JOIN THE KOREAN FRIENDSHIP ASSOCIATION**

**WWW.KOREA-DPR.COM**

**EMAIL KOREA@KOREA-DPR.COM OR UK@KOREA-DPR.COM**

---