

Notes on Ukraine

Proletarians of all countries, unite!
Notes on Ukraine

The head of Russian imperialism, Vladimir Putin, published on 12th of July via the Kremlin's webpage an article called "On the Historical Unity of Russians and Ukrainians". This article seems to frighten some, while it gives us the possibility to clarify some points.

The Yankees call Putins article via Peter Dickinson and the Atlantic Council¹, a „*declaration of war*“, reason enough to get into it. Furthermore they call the process of the development of contradictions between the three imperialists USA, Russia and Germany (covered as the European Union) and the Ukraine „*seven years of undeclared war between Russia and Ukraine*“. Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy responded to the article by stating that Putin obviously has a lot of free time on his hands. Stockholm Free World Forum senior fellow Anders Åslund branded the article “a masterclass in disinformation” and “one step short of a declaration of war.” Meanwhile, Russian newspaper Moskovsky Komsomolets claimed the essay was Putin's “final ultimatum to Ukraine.”

The Yankees accuse Putin to question the legitimacy of Ukraine's borders. Well, he does in a way:

„Therefore, modern Ukraine is entirely the product of the Soviet era. We know and remember well that it was shaped – for a significant part – on the lands of historical Russia. To make sure of that, it is enough to look at the boundaries of the lands reunited with the Russian state in the 17th century and the territory of the Ukrainian SSR when it left the Soviet Union.

The Bolsheviks treated the Russian people as inexhaustible material for their social experiments. They dreamt of a world revolution that would wipe out national states. That is why they were so generous in drawing borders and bestowing territorial gifts. It is no longer important what exactly the idea of the Bolshevik leaders who were chopping the country into pieces was. We can disagree about minor details, background and logics behind certain decisions. One fact is crystal clear: Russia was robbed, indeed.“

Tsarist dreams of Russian imperialism, slander against the glorious USSR, not naming the one really responsible – the rat Khrushchev, that bargained with the Ukraine in order to safeguard the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, transforming the people's rule into a fascist regime. Is there anyone in favour of this outside the ranks of (Russian) reaction?

Putin also states:

“Russia is open to dialogue with Ukraine and ready to discuss the most complex issues. But it is important for us to understand that our partner is defending its national interests but not serving someone else's, and is not a tool in someone else's hands to fight against us.

We respect the Ukrainian language and traditions. We respect Ukrainians' desire to see their country free, safe and prosperous.

I am confident that true sovereignty of Ukraine is possible only in partnership with Russia. Our spiritual, human and civilizational ties formed for centuries and have their origins in the same sources, they have been hardened by common trials, achievements and victories. Our kinship has been transmitted from generation to generation. It is in the hearts and the memory of people living in modern Russia and Ukraine, in the blood ties that unite millions of our families. Together we have always been and will be many times stronger and more successful. For we are one people.

Today, these words may be perceived by some people with hostility. They can be interpreted in many possible ways. Yet, many people will hear me. And I will say one thing – Russia has never been and will never be "anti-Ukraine". And what Ukraine will be – it is up to its citizens to decide."

Denouncing Putin as a warmonger, as the Yankees do quoting Oleksiy Goncharenko saying: "... the current conflict is not about control over Crimea or eastern Ukraine's Donbas region; it is a war for the whole of Ukraine.", his, among imperialists, seems a bit exaggerated, because what Russian imperialism did was to defend its zone of influence, of great strategic importance for the very defense of that imperialist State; in Putin's own words: the "association" of Ukraine with Russia, which he considers a State established in part of "historical Russia". With the displacement of Russia from being the main imperialism exercising semi-colonial domination over Ukraine another imperialism became the main oppressor through the indirect imperialist intervention that determined the regime change in Ukraine; thus, the status quo of the country was changed and, with this intervention of German imperialism with Euro-Maidan, Russian imperialism was attacked almost in the heart of its strategic defense. Russian imperialism headed by Putin had to react, in a defensive situation it acted with a limited offensive with moves that, rest assured, were made known before to the US and NATO. For Putin the thing now is to try to get things back to where they were in 2014. In that sense the quote from Oleksiy Goncharenko is right. Since at least in the medium term this is not given to him, the conditions are propitious for him; therefore, he at least seeks that the new status he achieved with his offensive action within his overall defensive situation, be recognized by the parties.

But the Atlantic Councils article gets the point in some aspects. Melinda Haring is quoted, saying: "Moscow cannot countenance letting Ukraine go." Danylo Lubkivsky said: "Putin understands that Ukrainian statehood and the Ukrainian national idea pose a threat to Russian imperialism. ... Many in his inner circle are known to advocate the use of force, but for now, the Russian leader has no solutions. ... Putin's essay is an expression of imperial agony." And Alexander Motyl: "... it doesn't read like something someone planning a full-scale invasion would write. ... why was it published now ..."

What is the correct stance? The formation of the Ukrainian nation was fulfilled within the Russian Revolution, the formation of the USSR, because the Great Socialist October

Revolution completed the pending tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution, among these the final formation of the nations. All the bigmouth historian hens cackling about the origins of Ukraine as the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, or the Russian tsarist conquest – remember the definition of Tsarist Russia as a “prison of peoples” (Lenin). In the same way, Austrian Chancellor Kurz could argue that Budapest or Belgrade belong to Austria. We reject, condemn and crush that filthy imperialist banner of “limited sovereignty”, we reject the division of countries and new partition, we stand for what Chairman Mao stated: The peoples fight for revolution, the nations for their liberation and the countries for their sovereignty.

The Ukrainian nation belonged to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and was granted autonomy convergent with the right of self-determination. Ukrainians became part of the Soviet people and Ukraine part of the Soviet homeland, in whose defense in World War II they offered millions of lives in the great Patriotic War led by the great Comrade Stalin.

After the death of comrade Stalin Khrushchev took over. With the restoration of capitalism in the USSR Russian social-imperialism emerged and subjugated the other nations of the union as their semi-colonies. Ukraine played an important role within this process, as mentioned. With the collapse of revisionism and the end of the social-imperialist Soviet Union, Ukraine gained formal independence, but remained a semi-colony of mainly Russian imperialism.

German imperialism in the same period annexed the GDR and expanded eastwards, taking over Poland, the Baltic states and others. At the beginning of the second decade of the present century German imperialism lured at Ukraine, what culminated in the Euro-Maidan. But German imperialism was weaker than itself thought so the Yankees took over. They covered their hostilities with the mask of democracy and their efforts were strongly supported by German imperialism via the EU, proceeding their sinister plans.

The Yankees in collusion and struggle with German imperialism succeeded and forced Russian imperialism to react. This led to the invasion of Crimea and the construction of the Russian forces formed, supplied and directed from the Donbass (direct intervention in the first case and indirect in the second), which established a kind of sovereignty apart from the U.S. puppet central government. Therefore, we have to consider that Ukraine is today a semi-colony of mainly Yankee imperialism in some parts and a colony (without any formal independence) of Russian imperialism in Crimea and semi-colony mainly of Russian imperialism in the Donbas.

With the bankruptcy of revisionism and the dissolution of the USSR the zones of influence of the latter enter into imperialist dispute. Ukraine is one of them. In the conflict there, two types of contradictions and three different forces converge. These two types of contradictions are: first, the inter-imperialist contradictions, that is, those existing between the USA and Russia and between the USA and Germany and, secondly, the contradictions between the imperialist

powers and the Ukraine as an oppressed nation. The three forces at play, the first are the USA, the sole hegemonic imperialist superpower; the second, Russia as an atomic superpower and Germany, second order imperialist countries, and the third, the oppressed nation. Remember that the first world is being redefined since the collapse of the former USSR due to the bankruptcy of revisionism.

Recognition of Ukraine, yes, but only in “partnership with Russia”, says Putin. This is the reedition of the “limited sovereignty” of which Khrushchev and later Bresnev spoke, which in Putin’s words has been expressed in a previous quote as follows: “the true sovereignty of Ukraine is possible only in partnership with Russia”.

The status quo in Ukraine is not very comfortable for Russian imperialism because it is threatened by NATO forces on the borders of its core territory or, even more so, on what it considers its interior lines. That is the reason for Putin’s efforts. The answer to Alexander Motyl’s question: “Why now?” are the changes due to the renewed presidency in , USA, one can say after the meeting with Biden, from which he was battered by being treated as a minor counterpart, he had to show firmness on this vital issue and the recent agreement on NordStream2, which shows that Ukraine is not of vital interest to US and German imperialism, as the central Ukrainian government has just received some crumbs and promises. In addition, we must take into account the current meeting in Geneva between the U.S. and Russian imperialists to renew the “arms deal”, so both sides are trying to move the chips forward.

The only true solution for the Ukrainian people is to reconstitute its Communist Party, as a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist militarized party, independent and self-reliant, to swipe away all foreign forces and the country-selling traitors with a broom of steel in a new democratic revolution. Based on the glorious heritage of socialism and the experience of the people their future is brilliant. It is just up to the communists and revolutionaries to fulfil their duties.

[i](#) Putin’s new Ukraine essay reveals imperial ambitions”, by Peter Dickinson, Atlantic Council, July 13, 2021

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
MARXIST-LENINIST-MAOIST ONLINE NEWSPAPER

PROLETARIANS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

