

WHAT DID WE GOT FROM THE RUSSIAN ELECTIONS?

The Russian elections are over, and we have interesting results from them. CPRF ended up being empowered, and United Russia ended up losing some of its power. These elections show how the inter-class situation of the anti-imperialist de facto alliance is structured and the mood of the masses of the Russian Federation.

First things first, the following parties compose the state дума as per the elections:

- 1) United Russia, national bourgeoisie, "centre" faction, 50%
- 2) Communist Party of the Russian Federation, proletariat, 19%
- 3) A just Russia-for truth, national bourgeoisie, "left" faction, 8%
- 4) Liberal Democratic party of Russia, national bourgeoisie, "right" faction, 8%
- 5) New people, small and petty bourgeoisie, 6%
- 6) Rodina, national bourgeoisie, "centre-left" faction, 1%
- 7) Party of growth, semi-compradorist petty bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie party, 0.50%
- 8) Civic Platform, national bourgeoisie, 0.20%

The important parties, representing the two main classes of the country, are four. 3 bourgeoisie ones, and 1 proletariat. Both three bourgeoisie ones represent the *three different flanks* of the bourgeoisie.

- 1) United Russia represents the *unified will* of the national bourgeoisie of Russia, and the non-communist proletariat and masses who see themselves betting with

national bourgeoisie social-democracy than with communism which they probably deem impossible to happen again. They form the government of Russia, and they were the ones who broke compradorship away from the ruling power. They represent the "*centre*" of the national bourgeoisie; they are neither for too much marketization neither for too much nationalization. This is why they are in power, and why they are able to keep Russia going as it goes for the last two decades. This party presents the stability of the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat by its very program. By putting its main internal focus on re-creating industry (first and second sector) they create the basis of both capitalist development, of real development, not the GDP figures of imperialist nations where service "industry" is regarded as development, and the current stability of Russia by the alliance of the many classes in the country. Their role is of course, *temporary*; at one point, this party will either be transformed to an imperialist party, which is *impossible* for Russia, or start fighting off the Communists who will naturally rise in the conditions of higher in quantity industrial capitalism, thus breaking this alliance and making the party obsolete.

2) The CPRF represents the proletariat who don't bet anymore with national-bourgeoisie social democracy but with Communism once again. CPRF and UR are in some short of de-facto anti-imperialist alliance, but this seems to be "breaking" lately. Probably the CPRF will ask more concessions and more power within the alliance, something which UR will be forced to allow if they want to stay afloat. The CPRF represents the *future* of Russia, and the more stronger they become the more the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat will see their alliance status *fluctuating* and at some point, *break*. CPRF will necessarily either adopt the correct lines in the future, knowing when to launch an offensive against UR and when to not, and thus, be in power in the incoming

years, or their role, like UR's, are also temporary, and the party will become like the CP of France, of US e.t.c, in short, they will *become social-fascists supporting the future imperialist transformation of Russia* (which will fail), and thus *another* party will do its job. The other alternative will be for them to launch an attack against UR too soon, which will break Havoc to Russia thus making the proletariat drop communism as impossible and stick to whatever social-democratic party the bourgeoisie present to them.

The position of CPRF is the most precarious one; all other bourgeoisie parties are destined to fall, but CPRF *can't afford these mistakes* because it presents the future. If their decisions lead to a worse immediate future than what the bourgeoisie present, they will fall for many years to come.

3) The Just Russia represents the the "*left*" faction of the national bourgeoisie, backed with some proletarians who think that while Communism is impossible, it is possible to negotiate for a better welfare bourgeoisie state. This party, while no communist, and therefore, not against the Market all together, supports bigger state control over the economy and more benefits from the proletariat, such as more spending on healthcare, free (or cheaper) state services, and of better quality, more pensions e.t.c. They, like all bourgeoisie parties present a temporary existence for our epoch; they are there to essentially try to "catch" the proletariat which backs UR whenever UR turns to more marketization and starts making measures benefiting the bourgeoisie in a more obvious manner. In short, they are there to try to keep the proletariat in capitalism instead of having them move to communism. If Russia ever manages to become an imperialist nation, for sure they will serve the regular, Social-democratic "Left" (i.e the Leftist Aristocracy) either directly, by direct continuation of their party, or by a merging with the other "left" factions of the bourgeoisie (like Rodina) and

making a "new" party.

4) The LDPR represents the "*right*" wing of the Russian bourgeoisie who are not compradors. Quite the opposite, LDPR presents the future ruling party *of a future Russian imperialist nation*. Their will to absorb the financial bourgeoisie of Russia into the state, prohibit help to other countries and writing off debts, kick US out of Europe only to put Russia in its place, perhaps putting Russia in an alliance with the imperialist nations of Europe like Germany, Britain and France, the project of further inter-Colonizing Russia with the "Back to the village" policy to provide Russia with what is necessary for a future elevation to imperialism + the lines about what is essentially a Russification of the non-Russian nations, to prohibit imperialist enterprises in Russia if Russia is not allowed to partake in the plunder in the imperialized and peripheral nations of Europe, focus on developing the Service "economy" (which of course, can only become a reality either by industrializing Russia too fast *or send the industry abroad, i.e advance to imperialism*), to make small rural bourgeoisie and small bourgeoisie in general to obtain dept in an easier way, and of course, to elevate multiple times the Russian wage (of course, since they don't mention cuts from the capitalists, this only makes the precedent for de-industrializing Russia and pushing for elevation to imperialism) are nothing more *than the will of the potential Russian imperialist*. They are national and anti-imperialist as far as immediate imperialist threat comes at play, but they are in essence a the prologue of Russian Fascism-Imperialism if such imperialism ever becomes the status quo. Their program is carefully thought as to create all necessary precedents to try and advance Russia to the imperialist stage with a piece of mind. Thus, they present the "right" wing of the Russian bourgeoisie, and the worst enemy within the Parliament of Russia right now, for both the Russian proletariat and the masses of the world. Their program

will turn Russia to destroy itself and create a huge rift in the anti-imperialist alliance. While of temporary existence as any other bourgeoisie party, they present the proto-fascistic elements of Russia who are part of the compradorist elements. The difference with the Navalnists is that the Navalnists see that autonomous Russian imperialism is impossible to succeed and thus a position within the camp as a service-boy of the imperialists (similar to Turkey) in return to perhaps be able to fatten the pockets of a bunch of potential parasites and immigrants among the intelligentsia to imperialist Europe, while LDPR sees things on a different manner. Not to become the dogs of US imperialism, *but to take their place*. Knowing that indeed, the current Russian situation makes this impossible, they desire to create the precedent for that by the policies they plan to adopt if in government.

Thus, we have the main factions of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Now to see the class dynamics.

The Proletariat is more empowered in this new parliament than the previous one, CPRF having 57 out of 450 seats instead of 42 they had the week before. Thus, purely from a revolutionary perspective, the election results are positive. The "centre" of the Russian bourgeoisie are losing support; the fact that real wage growth is lower at any point since 2018 for three years straight, means that the livelihood of the Russian proletariat gets harder and harder. From the Numbers, it does not seem that UR lost anything much to CPRF. What seems to have happened is that the proletariat who was passively supporting the government by not voting for anyone, said "that's enough" and voted for the communists. This is of course, a political lose for UR and the bourgeoisie in general. While UR did not lost much from its faithful supporters, it did lose about 3 million Russians from its passive supporters, and did not "lost"

them to another bourgeoisie faction, but to the class which its both its livelihood and its grim reaper, the proletariat. It would be far better for UR to lose these 3 million to Rodina or Just Russia than the CPRF. Thus, while UR did lose seats from the Duma, they did not lose in absolute numbers. 28 million open supporters they had, 28 million they have again. This shows to us that the strength of the Communists is not only to contest the nationalistic minded masses who are openly allied into UR, but to contest the *passive elements* who are not exercising their vote and have no trust in the Parliamentary system.

What about the other bourgeoisie factions? The "left" wing of it got stronger for about one million voters, which is an indication for the future if UR does not do something to alleviate the livelihood of the proletariat to a higher level soon.

These elections were a big defeat of the "right" faction, where they lost almost 3 out of their 7 million votes, or in short, almost half of their support.

All in all, we can say that these elections have a positive result overall compared to the previous ones. The "right" wing of the bourgeoisie became much smaller, the "left" wing of it stronger, the "centre" of it relatively weaker but on absolute terms stable, and the proletariat much stronger. The compradorist elements present no threat within the parliament in Russia, and thus we can be sure that the Navalnists failed to do anything regarding the hearts of the nation.

Now one thing remains to be said; will CPRF act in a correct manner? To rush is to die; to not rush, is again, to die. Either CPRF will find a *balance* in its own forces, to reconcile the two factions within it to adopt a coherent, correct stance, or they deem themselves to be a party of *temporary existence*, a bunch of Mensheviks.

What we mean by this? There are the reformists within the CPRF, who are afraid of Revolution. They instead opt to not be rash and to stick with a general anti-imperialist alliance with the national anti-imperialist bourgeoisie. This will lead to their irrelevance when the bourgeoisie either want to run to imperialism like they wanted during the early 20th century, or they will become compradors (in Russia this is unlikely). There are the revolutionaries within CPRF, who are afraid of the anti-imperialist alliance, afraid that the proletariat will deem them as the "paws of Kremlin", and thus, they want to rush for the revolution. This rush will lead them again, to die off and become irrelevant like countless other Communist Parties which did the same back in the past and no one speaks of them now.

Who is correct and who is wrong? Both factions, are both correct and wrong.

The correct part of the first faction is that they don't rush, their willingness to see the big picture and be willing to work with the national bourgeoisie to oppose imperialism. In this manner, they are like the old wise man, who does not rush and is very careful on what they do, planned and in coherence to avoid grave mistakes.

The incorrect part of the first faction is that they aren't willing to simultaneously build for the revolution, by creating military organizations and the like. In short, they are *afraid* of the revolution. Thus, when the time comes, they will just left there staring being unable to do a thing. Unarmed and untrained the party is nothing when the situation demands a revolution. Here again, like old men, they are too afraid to walk enough in fears their cane will break up or they will fall from the stairs. They just wait to die the most painless death.

The correct part of the second factions is that they are willing to risk, to build the forces of the Revolution, to fight off the national bourgeoisie for proletarian supremacy. In this manner, they are like the young man full of vitality; he rushes and is determined and confident for victory, he can climb mountains with his legs and hands alone. Not afraid to be tired and of hardship. The incorrect part of the second faction is that they are too rush. They dont pay the biggest attention towards the anti-imperialist alliance, to the anti-imperialist struggle before the national struggle. Here again, like a naive young man, they are too confident in their own ability to climb mountains with their hands and legs alone, and the result is that the slight mistake will lead to them falling to the pit.

What needs to take place in CPRF is a reconciliation within these two factions. To remove the incorrect and unite the correct elements. In short, to build the the forces of the revolution while also being allied to the anti-imperialist forces in the country, even if these forces are officially in the "opposition" in the parliament. This is the only way the Communists can return to power in Russia, even more stable than the previous communist government of 1917-1991.

F. U. Kuqe