



Scan to know paper details and
author's profile

Russia Vs Ukraine: What Next?

Givishvili G.

ABSTRACT

The reasons for the start of Russia's war against Ukraine are being discussed. It is shown that it was caused by Moscow's painful reaction to the collapse of the USSR empire. Due to the lack of complete consensus in the international community regarding the events taking place, the patterns of evolution of world civilization that led to the war are considered from the perspective of the Super-Strong Anthropogenic Principle (SSAP). In particular, it is shown that it was a consequence not only of the collapse of the USSR but also of many preceding events, such as its birth, as well as the birth and demise of Nazi Germany, the fire of World War II, the emergence of the Iron Curtain and the Cold War and the current confrontation between Russia and the West. All of these are interconnected through a single causal sequence. Its ultimate cause, to a decisive degree, in addition to other objective factors, was the ignorant and deeply flawed utopia of K. Marx, adopted by his Russian followers as an infallible religious doctrine. Nevertheless, in this case, it is not enough to understand the essence of what is happening and its origins. It is even more important to understand the conclusions-the strategy of Russia's future foreign policy. For it is confident that it is the suzerain among the surrounding vassals. Thinking this way was considered natural a hundred years ago. Today, when humans have reached space and invented nuclear weapons, remaining faithful to the prejudices of the past is unnatural.

Keywords: NA

Classification: LCC Code: DK510.766

Language: English



Great Britain
Journals Press

LJP Copyright ID: 573361

Print ISSN: 2515-5784

Online ISSN: 2515-5792

London Journal of Research in Humanities & Social Science

Volume 25 | Issue 17 | Compilation 1.0



© 2025, Givishvili G. This is a research/ review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), permitting all noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Russia Vs Ukraine: What Next?

Givishvili G.

ABSTRACT

The reasons for the start of Russia's war against Ukraine are being discussed. It is shown that it was caused by Moscow's painful reaction to the collapse of the USSR empire. Due to the lack of complete consensus in the international community regarding the events taking place, the patterns of evolution of world civilization that led to the war are considered from the perspective of the Super-Strong Anthropic Principle (SSAP). In particular, it is shown that it was a consequence not only of the collapse of the USSR but also of many preceding events, such as its birth, as well as the birth and demise of Nazi Germany, the fire of World War II, the emergence of the Iron Curtain and the Cold War, and the current confrontation between Russia and the West. All of these are interconnected through a single causal sequence. Its ultimate cause, to a decisive degree, in addition to other objective factors, was the ignorant and deeply flawed utopia of K. Marx, adopted by his Russian followers as an infallible religious doctrine. Nevertheless, in this case, it is not enough to understand the essence of what is happening and its origins. It is even more important to understand the conclusions-the strategy of Russia's future foreign policy. For it is confident that it is the suzerain among the surrounding vassals. Thinking this way was considered natural a hundred years ago. Today, when humans have reached space and invented nuclear weapons, remaining faithful to the prejudices of the past is unnatural. A misunderstanding of this fact makes Russia's strategy after the current war unpredictable. However, it is not only the global community but first and foremost the citizens of Russia who need to know what rules of interaction between sovereign countries, distant and nearby neighbors, it intends to follow in the future. The book shows that the choice is limited and that there is less and less time left to make it.

I. INTRODUCTION

The war, which was conceived by the Kremlin as a small victorious stroll through a subdued Ukraine, has been going on for almost 4 years now. Alas, the procession did not take place. On the contrary, an extremely alarming trend is emerging. The development of means of human destruction in our century has reached a limit that threatens the existence of all humanity. The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 could have set humanity back far into the caves of the Stone Age. Today, if the situation gets out of control, it could result in the complete annihilation of all higher forms of life on Earth. The number of nuclear bomb holders is no longer just two, but nine, while their total deadly arsenal has increased hundreds of times. If the pace of expansion of the nuclear club continues, soon almost half of the world will be part of it. And then nothing will be able to restrain particularly hot-headed individuals from the temptation to use this weapon to blackmail others. Thus, the Special Military Operation (SMO) represents a turning point and a critically dangerous moment in the existence of humanity. We have come too close to the edge of the abyss. If the momentum continues in the same direction, the next step will be the last one, this is obvious! And a surplus in a state of unstable balancing cannot last long.

Therefore, the question is relevant: what comes next? One thing is clear: the world must change radically. But how? I take the liberty to assert that there is no universally accepted answer. Primarily for the obvious reason that, to this day, the world has no clear understanding of why we all exist. It is true, religions pretend as if they know the answer. The simple Quran judges this with utmost frankness and cynicism: "I (Allah) created jinn and humans only so that they worship Me" (Surah Adh-Dhariyat, Ayah 56). However, sober-minded atheists remain silent on this matter. Without having firmly established facts that would allow

this topic and the speculation surrounding it to be closed, science and philosophy have, until today, preferred not to touch upon the question of human purpose at all. Everything changed in our century: finally, both facts and their explanations have emerged. But they turned out to be so unexpected that a certain number of scientists are still afraid to acknowledge them. Unfortunately, the inertia of thought is characteristic not only of believers but also of professional scientists.

Discoveries made by the Hubble and James Webb space telescopes, as well as space experiments conducted by three independent groups of scientists, have proven that the Universe is infinite in space and immeasurable in time. Therefore, Nature does not require any mystical supreme creator. The paradox is that, as it turns out, its infinite existence is impossible without Man—each of the billions of thinking atoms of the Universe, like us! Thus, the question of the purpose of Man, including *Homo sapiens*, has acquired a completely rational and real meaning! Namely: Man is called to sustain the existence of the Universe in a *perpetuum mobile* mode! For everything in this world is interconnected according to N. Bohr's principle of complementarity: "Opposites do not exclude each other, but complement each other." In particular, Man is a key link in the being of Nature in the process of its continuous self-renewal. This process represents a closed cycle: a) the transformation of elementary particles into "amoebas"; b) the development of the latter into beings endowed with intelligence; c) the activity of the intellect, which contributes to the constant generation change in the world of stars. And this endless cycle of transformations is conducted by evolution (phylogenesis)—the mechanism for generating new, increasingly complex and diverse forms of Nature's objects [1].

However, in order to meet the status of one of the demiurge-builders of the Cosmos, the mental, moral and technological development of each exoplanetary civilization in the Universe aspiring to this role must be at a level capable of handling the extremely complex task of the revival (or birth) of stars. Judging by what is happening on planet Earth today, the technological development

of our civilization has so far outpaced overall mental and moral development that it now threatens self-destruction. For Attila with a tie and a nuclear bomb in hand promises no future for our planet. Thus, the Special Military Operation (SMO), whether willingly or unwillingly, has turned out to be a test of humanity's ability to align with the goals of a cosmic mission. In the event of an inability to overcome the disagreements that led to the Special Military Operation (SMO), the Cosmos will simply eliminate us without noticing the "loss of a fighter," of which it has billions. And since everything that brought our world to its current state is the result of natural processes rooted in the distant past, it is necessary to understand why we found ourselves in a trap, whether there is a way out, and what it is. But since the SMO was initiated by Russia, it is first and foremost necessary to have a real and objective understanding of the arguments put forward in its defense by Russian society. The press covers its background and current events as follows.

PART I. THE WAR

I. REASONS FOR THE START OF THE SMO

In October 2022, Russian President V. Putin named two main reasons for the start of the special military operation. According to him, they were: first, the expansion of NATO, which meant an increase in the potential threat to Russia in Eastern Europe; second, the recognition of the independence of the Donbass republics, which imposed on Russia the obligation not to abandon them to their fate.

Relations with NATO.

Before the start of the special operation in Ukraine, Russia offered the United States and NATO member countries to conclude a treaty on security guarantees. The draft document contained requirements separately for the United States and for NATO countries.

Requirements for NATO.

1. The Alliance must push its borders in the east back to the positions of May 27, 1997. This means that NATO should not expand into new

territories-Moldova, Ukraine, and Georgia-and release (release to where?) Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

2. NATO member countries are obliged to cease any military activities on the territory of Ukraine and other Eastern European states.

Questions for readers

1. Russia consults with no one when making decisions regarding international alliances. Who gave it the right to demand that neighboring countries act in a certain way?
2. Why is NATO perceived as a threat in Russia? After all, this organization was established in 1949 with the "aim of protecting Europe from a possible threat of Soviet expansion." The first attempts to transfer the experience of Marxist revolutions to Europe were undertaken under the auspices of the Comintern as early as the 1920s. Their failure forced the Kremlin to temporarily scale back activity in this direction. However, after the victory in World War II, the Kremlin decided that the USSR had become strong enough to once again begin expanding its sphere of influence. It also refused to withdraw its tanks from the sovereign countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, which was naturally perceived as the occupation of Eastern Europe. Therefore, it is not surprising that the West responded by creating NATO as a defensive bulwark. By the way, the fact that this organization was created precisely in response-as a deterrent-is evidenced by the fact that it only becomes active in countering Russia after three years of passive condemnation of the special military operation (SMO) and that at the instigation of D. Trump.

Relations with Ukraine

The President explained that he made this decision regarding the SMO for the people of Donbas, who were subjected to '*genocide* by the Kyiv regime.' At the same time, the President emphasized that the country would not be afraid to respond to Ukraine's Western partners if they interfere with achieving the objectives of the SMO.

Our comment

According to UN General Assembly Resolution 260 (III) adopted on December 9, 1948, its Article II defines genocide as ...actions "committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such:

- a. Killing members of the group;
- b. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- c. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- d. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- e. The forcible transfer of children from one human group to another.

But... no indisputable evidence of genocide or terror by Ukraine against the residents of the DPR and LPR that would require Russia's armed intervention was presented. Therefore, the invasion of Ukraine was an act of aggression. This was confirmed by a UN resolution adopted on March 2, 2022: out of 193 member states, 141 voted for the resolution condemning the invasion. And only 5 countries voted in support of Russia: Belarus, North Korea, Eritrea, Syria, and Russia itself!

II. SPECIAL OPERATION

1. In February 2022 (at the time of the invasion), the ratio of military personnel was: Russia-900,000, Ukraine-196,000 (The Military Balance). In June 2022, The Independent, citing U.S. intelligence data, reported that Ukrainian forces were suffering significant losses, as they were outmatched by Russian forces 20 to 1 in artillery and 40 to 1 in ammunition.

Question to readers

It is striking that, despite the colossal superiority in manpower and equipment, Russia became bogged down in Ukraine. A swift takeover did not work. Does this embarrassment not closely resemble Russia's past wars? Especially considering that to get help in liberating the Kursk

region from the Ukrainian army, it had to turn to 30,000 assault troops from North Korea.

2. In April 2022, Russian Foreign Minister S. Lavrov stated on the Russia 24 television channel: "Our special military operation is intended to put an end to the reckless expansion and the reckless course toward complete domination by the United States and, under them, the rest of the Western countries on the international stage."

Question to the readers

It is becoming increasingly unclear what the Kremlin's special military operation is for and what it aims to achieve. Is it to save Russians from Ukrainian 'genocide'? To fight against U.S. domination?

3. In September 2022, according to The Washington Post, after the start of the special operation in Ukraine, Russia took control of mineral deposits totaling \$12.4 trillion: 63 Ukrainian coal deposits, 11% of oil reserves, a fifth of natural gas, 42% of metals, and a third of rare earth element deposits, including lithium, which is necessary for battery production, uranium, gold, and limestone. Amidst the noise of concern for the fate of Russians in Donbas, the dangers of Ukrainian biolabs, and the fight against U.S. hegemony, the Kremlin has already plundered Ukraine for a total of \$12.4 trillion.

Question to the readers

It creates the impression that the special military operation (SMO) is a kind of business project. Especially since contract soldiers receive "sign-on bonuses" ranging from 1 to 3 million rubles for participating in it. In a righteous war against Nazi Germany, raising the question of "sign-on bonuses" was unthinkable, even monstrous. So what is Russia fighting for today? To seize lands rich in natural resources?

III. RESULTS OF TWO YEARS OF THE SMO

In February 2024, Tsargrad Infographics published the results of the war with a brotherly (or hostile?) nation. The essence boils down to the admission: "Strike the West! Russia has challenged the world order established after the

USSR's defeat in the Cold War. The campaign in Ukraine became a slap in the face to the collective West-as Putin put it, a response to its 'cheating behavior'... And, one could say, our special operation has become the last nail in the coffin of American-style globalization. And no matter how events unfold further, it is already clear that a global government will not convene on Capitol Hill, and the United States, from being the planet's leading nation, is destined to degrade into a regional power."

Our comments

1. Judging by the tone of Tsargrad, it is most encouraged by the fact that since the start of the special military operation, Russia has begun the degradation of the USA and their transformation into a regional power.
2. According to data from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_invasion_of_Ukraine, in two years of war, Ukraine lost 70,000 killed and 100,000-120,000 wounded military personnel, with a total of 315,000 casualties. Russia: 123,400 killed and 214,000 wounded military personnel, with a total of 653,060 casualties. The secret of how many Russia lost in just 2025 (from January to August) was inadvertently revealed by Trump, who stated that 'Russia... lost 112,500 soldiers. Ukraine also suffered heavily. It lost about 8,000 soldiers... and this number does not include those missing in action.' If the figures are close to correct, it turns out that the ratio of casualties is 1/14 in favor of Ukraine! Could it be true that those who say Russia in the past won primarily by having a multiple advantage over the enemy are right, i.e., they won not by quality, but by quantity?
3. We will never know the exact figures of losses on both sides of the barricades, but judging by the rate of losses in Russia alone, their number today should be at least from half a million to a million of the 'cannon fodder' that Tsargrad talked about. It turns out that for the sake of the sovereignty of the Russian residents of Donbas under the wing of the Russian Federation, the Kremlin is ready to 'selflessly' sacrifice hundreds of thousands of Russians from Russia? Beat your own so that others would fear?

IV. THE POSITION OF PRESIDENT V. PUTIN

Since Russia has existed, its fate at certain moments of its existence has been decided by a single person (from Vasily III and Peter I to N. Khrushchev and M. Gorbachev). And the whole nation adjusted to his momentary opinion or whim. Today, this unquestioned autocrat is President Putin. To avoid being accused of misrepresenting his views on foreign policy without evidence, we will refer to his statements concerning: a) democracy, sovereignty and equality among states; b) relations with Ukraine and the West; c) the 'right' to use nuclear weapons.

1. Speaking at the Munich Security Conference on February 10, 2007, he asked: 'What is a unipolar world? No matter how this term is embellished, in practice it ultimately means only one thing: it is... a world with one master, one sovereign... And this has nothing to do, of course, with democracy. Because democracy, as is known, is the power of the majority, taking into account the interests and opinions of the minority... I believe that for the modern world the unipolar model is not only unacceptable, but in fact impossible... because it has no moral or ethical foundation of modern civilization, and cannot have any.' What democracy and a multipolar world are, in his opinion, he explained at a meeting with young Russian entrepreneurs on June 9, 2022. At this meeting, he stated: 'In order to claim any kind of leadership, not to mention global leadership... any country, any people, any ethnic group must ensure its sovereignty... *Either a country is sovereign, or it is a colony!*!!! He repeated this thought at a meeting with Russian teachers on October 5, 2022, stating: 'Russia was and will be sovereign; for this, it is necessary to eliminate any attempts to impose foreign values and distorted history on our children.'

Question to the readers

Does the president realize that one of his statements is fundamentally contradictory to another of his judgments? Since in his mind, every sovereign country must automatically be a

metropolis, that is, possess colonies. Otherwise, it itself becomes a colony. According to Putin, there is no third option. Consequently, equality, and therefore democracy, between sovereign countries cannot exist by his definition. You are either a sovereign, i.e., a hegemon, or a vassal, recognizing me as the hegemon. In other words, the multipolar world that the Kremlin is so energetically pursuing is nothing more than a facade for a unipolar world with a single suzerain. How, then, should we view Russia's current and future relations with China? Who among them is the suzerain, and who is the vassal? Or should what was said be understood to mean that as long as Russia does not remain the sole hegemon in a unipolar world, it will be at war with the whole world? And with China as well? For two bears cannot coexist in one den- according to the law of natural selection. Should Russians really be preparing for such a turn of events?

2. Putin called the invasion of Ukraine a *forced* special operation. He declared its necessity to be the rescue of the population of Donbas from 'suffering and genocide' while simultaneously ensuring his own security. In other words, according to him, the goals of the special military operation were 'clear and *noble*.' On March 16, he stated that 'we were forced to take countermeasures when all diplomatic opportunities were completely exhausted... We were simply left with no options to resolve the problems by peaceful means that arose *through no fault of our own!*?' And in this regard, we were simply forced to start a special military operation." Realizing that Russia's blitzkrieg had failed, Putin was forced to present Russia as a victim: "Everyone wants to bite us somewhere or take something away from us, but they must know, those who intend to do so, that we will knock out everyone's teeth so that they cannot bite... The same thing happens at all times. As soon as Russia becomes stronger, there are immediately reasons to limit its development," he stated.

Our comment

Since the times of the Roman Empire, any formal pretext for declaring war on neighbors is called *casus belli*. It exactly corresponds to the principles of social Darwinism.

- At the same Munich Security Conference, Putin stated: "Allow me to remind you that according to the UN Charter, sanctions from the UN Security Council are required for peacekeeping operations... But there is also an article in the UN Charter on the right to self-defense. And here, *no sanctions are necessary.*" In the film 'World Order-2018' (March 7, 2018), when asked about the use of nuclear weapons, Putin replied that it could not be ruled out in emergency situations. "Yes, for humanity, this would be a global catastrophe, for the world it would be a global catastrophe, but as a citizen of Russia, as the head of the Russian state, I want to ask the question: *what is the point of such a world if Russia does not exist?*" Putin added.

Question to the readers

Apparently, the meaning of the last statement is clear. It consists in demanding that the Kremlin be recognized as having full 'freedom of action' whenever it deems necessary. Otherwise, it is ready to take extreme measures! But can it be considered normal when someone, outraged that the world does not share their beliefs, is ready to wipe this world off the face of the earth, including their own country? And what should be done if not all of their compatriots are willing to sacrifice themselves?

Addition

D. Medvedev is the President of the Russian Federation from 2008 to 2012, Prime Minister from 2012 to 2020, today he is the Deputy Chairman of the Security Council of the Russian Federation, i.e. in fact, the second person of the state. Defending the right to "defend the country by all available means," he lashed out at the leaders of the Western world, who sharply condemned Moscow's actions. On 28.09.2022, he reminded the "hard of hearing, hearing only themselves": "*Russia has the right to use nuclear*

weapons in cases that lie at the heart of its state policy." At the same time, he hoped that "*even if Russia uses nuclear weapons, it will be 'swallowed'*", since "overseas and European demagogues are not going to die in a nuclear apocalypse." As a true "patriot", he vilifies Western politicians with confessions: "I hate them. They are *scums* and *degenerates*. They want us, Russia, dead. And as long as I live, I will do everything to make them disappear." "The number of leading *idiots* in NATO countries is growing. After all, these *weak-minded* are actively pushing us towards World War III." "The leaders of France, Germany and the United States are *freaks*," acting in relation to Russia "either because of childish infantilism, or because of mature *stupidity*, or because of outrageous impudence."

Our comment

Firstly, Medvedev should be entered into the Guinness Book of Records: he is unique. No European politician has ever stooped to the jargon of medieval urban underclasses, using street curses and blackmail as tools of dialogue. Does he really not understand that the slang of hooligans not only disgraces him personally—as a candidate of legal sciences—but also casts a shadow over the Russian government as a whole, since he is the second highest official in the state? Secondly, it is not impossible that our Galaxy is full of dead civilizations primarily because of exoplanetary Medvedevs. Therefore, if the global community does not wish to be buried alive, it must severely limit the ability of individuals like the deranged Medvedev to influence world order.

V. REACTION OF THE RUSSIAN ELITE

- The closest associate of the president in the past-businessman Y. Prigozhin-admitted (on September 26, 2022) that in 2014 he, like many other businessmen, visited training grounds where "Cossacks" gathered and "tried to *throw money around in order to recruit a group that would go and protect Russians in Donbas.* But he quickly realized that half of them were scammers." He then took the

matter into his own hands and found specialists who could help. "From that moment, May 1, 2014, a group of patriots was born, which later became known as the Wagner PMC," the late businessman reported.

Our comment

Oligarch Prigozhin, known as 'Putin's chef,' is his trusted associate, as well as a hero of Russia, the DPR, and the LPR. Whether intentionally or not, he revealed that the operation to intervene in the affairs of a neighboring state had been prepared long before February 2022. It included provocations by Russia on Ukrainian territories so that the opposite side would respond in kind. This was necessary for the Kremlin to accuse Kyiv of inciting hostility between Russians and Ukrainians. Thus, the group of mercenaries 'Wagner,' created by Prigozhin at the Kremlin's initiative, was one of the first and most active participants in escalating the conflict and increasing mutual accusations. Incidentally, 'Wagner' also participated in military conflicts in Africa, Syria, and other regions of the world. However, once the goal was achieved and the fire in Ukraine raged with the required intensity, the activity of the 'chef' began to discredit his boss. And then he was simply removed. (A servant should never overestimate the extent of his influence over his master).

2. To dispel any doubts regarding the Kremlin's foreign policy, Senator A. Pushkov explained (October 4, 2022) what it actually entails. On his Telegram channel, he emphasized that Moscow "does not have a coherent ideology similar to what Western countries promote. However, there is a set of its elements—from the principle of sovereignty to the defense of traditional values... And Russia must live with these ideas and strive to spread them within the international community."

Our comment

In the Middle Ages, the Kremlin imagined itself as the Third Rome. In the Modern Era, it prided itself on being the gendarme of Europe. After the Marxist coup, it dreamed of a worldwide proletarian revolution. After the victory in World War II, it boasted about the advance of

communism by 1980. Today, it dreams of the role of a sovereign-hegemon as the protector of traditional values and Orthodox doctrines around the world. And tomorrow – a sermon on domestic tyranny? How suddenly dreams have withered. In the Patriotic War of 1941-45, patriots considered it their duty to defend the Motherland. In the 2022 Special Military Operation, they are ready to kill for things they barely understand themselves. And yet, they demand monetary compensation. What is this if not a catastrophic degradation in the understanding of patriotism.

3. No less convincing confirmation of the ideological emptiness of the modern Kremlin is provided by the Russian Foreign Minister. In April 2022, S. Lavrov stated: "Our special military operation is designed to put an end to the reckless expansion and the reckless course toward complete dominance by the United States and, under them, the rest of the Western countries on the international stage." Washington and its allies impose a unipolar development model on the world, which serves the interests of the West, and try to "stop the flywheel of history." As a result, "the state of affairs in the field of international security is rapidly deteriorating" (24.09.2022).

Our comment

The dominance of the West over the past century has brought the Third World dividends unprecedented in previous centuries and millennia. The standard of living is rising at an unprecedented pace for almost all peoples of the world, including Russian citizens. In every respect—social and intellectual, legal, technological and so on—world civilization is not degrading, but rapidly developing. And like any development, it does not occur without contradictions, sometimes acute, but resolvable. Yet there is one issue, reaching the point of irresolvable confrontation, which is associated with Lavrov's sharply increased desire to "put an end to the reckless expansion and reckless pursuit of complete domination" by the West.

4. 24.06.2022, the director of the Hermitage, M. Piotrovsky, stated: "The attitude towards military actions is not that simple. On one

hand, war is blood and killing, and on the other hand, it is the self-assertion of people, the self-assertion of a nation... We are all militarists and imperialists because we were raised in the imperial tradition."

Our comment

In his opinion, the empire's desire to unite peoples is tempting, but it is "one of the good temptations." Trying to assert oneself by trampling on the independence of neighbors, aiming to turn them into obedient vassals—is that a "good temptation"? Then why, in that case, did Muscovy – the future Russia – strive so hard to rid itself of the temptation to remain part of the Mongol Empire?

5. Surprised by the West's reaction to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, former well-known hockey player B. Mayorov stated that he is "completely astonished by the scale of Russophobia that has engulfed Europe and North America... I do not understand this hatred. Just look at history – Russia has never attacked Europe. All we ever do is fend off aggressors. Sometimes from the Poles, sometimes from the Swedes, from the French, the Germans... And this hatred extends across all fronts, including sports. Here we cut off, there we don't allow, somewhere we impose restrictions."

Our comment

Of course, it is pointless to expect an athlete to understand the nuances and intricacies of politics. But one cannot be so ignorant when it comes to basic knowledge of their own country's history and its relations with neighbors. As for the Poles, it was none other than Russia, Prussia and Austria that tore Poland apart three times: in 1772, 1793, and 1795. And until 1918 (for over a century), Poland was absent from the world map. Only a profoundly ignorant person could claim that the Great Northern War (1701-1721) was provoked by Sweden. It was Peter I who tried to 'cut a window to Europe' and was eager to reach the Baltic Sea. Napoleon invaded Russia in 1812 after several Russian campaigns in Europe. To counter him, the Russian army (led by Suvorov) made a push into Switzerland as early as 1799. The campaign

ended disastrously: the remnants of the army, having heroically crossed the Alps, barely managed to escape. In 1805, Russian troops fought Napoleon at Austerlitz and were resoundingly defeated. The next battle with Napoleon that Russia engaged in again took place in Europe (Preussisch-Eylau, 1807). In 1808-1809, Russia fought Sweden due to its refusal to join the continental blockade of England, declared by Napoleon. Ultimately, Napoleon could not tolerate the aggression of the eastern autocrat and decided to teach him a lesson. But he did not take into account that the technical capabilities at his disposal created insurmountable obstacles to the success of his campaign in the remote regions of Russia. Therefore, it is not surprising that her role in European politics from 1814 to 1854 is generally described by the expression 'the gendarme of Europe.'

As for the relations between Russia and Germany, during World War I Russia itself 'got entangled in history,' pursuing banal goals of expansion and dreaming of taking Constantinople. If we turn to World War II, is it really a secret to anyone that not only Nazi Germany thirsted for revenge, but Russian Marxists from the very first days of the Comintern were eager to fight? For what purpose? To establish the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' throughout the world, of course, led by Russia. Thus, it turns out that it was not so much the Poles, Swedes, French and Germans who wished to enslave Russia, but rather Russia itself that strove with all its might to extend its power over Europe and the world. Alas, the dreams remained dreams.

Therefore, only a series of unsuccessful attempts to turn Europe into its vassal, culminating in defeat in the Crimean War, forced Russia to change the direction of its expansion from the west to the south (the Caucasus), the southeast (Central Asia) and the Far East. Here, relying on European technologies and its experience in the conduct of wars, it relatively easily (not counting the Caucasus War, which lasted almost half a century) achieved its goals.

6. State Duma deputy and former boxer N. Valuev commented on the decision of the

International Boxing Association (IBA) to allow boxers from Russia and Belarus to participate in international competitions as follows: "Today, the hegemon manipulates world sports to serve its politics. As long as the hegemon-the USA-is at the helm, occurrences like what happened in boxing will be rare. Today, principles, adequacy and loyalty to sporting values are not valued among officials in world sports."

Our commentary

When an sportsman resorts to doping, it provokes condemnation from others. When a country engages in it, the entire international community becomes concerned. By putting domestic sports on doping, Russia turned sports into a tool of state propaganda. Does Valuev know about this deception of the entire sports world? Of course he does, just like everyone in the country! But which Russian athletes, sports officials, journalists and ordinary sports enthusiasts have admitted to this deception? They can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Mutual cover-up is passed off as patriotism. By the way, the USSR began cheating world sports at the Olympic Games in Helsinki in 1952. At that time, Soviet professional athletes were declared amateurs, and they competed with genuine amateurs without a hint of embarrassment... contrary to P. de Coubertin, who revived the Olympic Games. Who suffered as a result of Russia being barred from world sports-sports administrators? Alas, only the athletes. And who among them the most? K. Valieva-a brilliant child caught in the gears of the system.

Summary

Everything that begins eventually comes to an end. It is impossible to predict with 100% certainty how the SMO will conclude. But let's assume that the Kremlin announces that it has ultimately achieved its set goals. It is unclear, however, which of these goals will be disclosed. Nevertheless, the question arises: does the Kremlin have a meaningful long-term strategy for Russia's continued existence, and what is its essence? A brief analysis of the mindset of the Russian elite suggests that, in their understanding, Russia is and remains an empire, and at the same time, it is a beacon guiding the world

toward a happy future. But, firstly, all empires of the past, from the Assyrian, Persian, and Ottoman to the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, British, and Soviet, eventually collapsed either due to internal contradictions or because of external opposition. This is a historical regularity, a statement of fact. Therefore, there can be no talk of any happy future for Russia as an empire.

Secondly, there is no real evidence of its positive influence on the fate of the world in the past. He owes nothing to Russia, since everything progressive in him, in all spheres of human existence, originated outside of it. The only thing Russia has distinguished itself with in the past century is its decisive contribution to victory in World War II. However, in that war, Russia was primarily saving itself. And the events in Eastern Europe were a side effect. But... after liberating it from the Nazi occupier, the USSR itself became a Marxist occupier. Today, Russia, as the successor of the Soviet Union, tries, whenever possible, to revive the tools and the power over its neighbors that it once had in the recent past. Therefore, it is unclear what good it can offer the world in the future.

When launching the special military operation, the Russian elite expected the international community to turn a blind eye to it, seeing it as a 'just compensation' for the collapse of the USSR. The reality turned out to be unpredictable for the Kremlin. The world still does not recognize Russia's right to pursue expansion against Ukraine. By the end of 2025, condemnation of Russia has taken strict material, economic, and cultural forms. Its intellectual, cultural, and technological isolation continues to intensify. What conclusions does the Kremlin intend to draw from what is happening? It is important to know not only for the citizens of Russia but for the entire world community, as its military potential is capable of destroying humanity itself. Therefore, it is crucial for the world to have clarity regarding the rules under which the Kremlin intends to participate in global affairs going forward. The essence of Russia's foreign policy today is frantic attempts to take revenge for the defeat of the USSR. How long can Russia's 'butting heads' with the West and the world

continue and how might it end? Are they in the Kremlin aware that the outcome could be inglorious for humanity as a whole? But the most troubling thing is that its inhabitants do not understand the meaning of what is happening in the world. In their defense, it can be said that they are not alone in this.

The most fundamental problem of modern times is that the world community as a whole has little understanding of the driving forces that determine the dynamics and meaning of what is happening. This is because the key question of the purpose of human existence has never been posed by anyone, at any time. And there were neither circumstances nor reasons to pose it. The situation changed radically only in our century—see the Introduction. It suggested that the Special Military Operation (SMO) is, in fact, an exam that the global community is taking from evolution to determine the level of maturity of humanity's collective consciousness and its readiness for the role of the demigod of the Cosmos. And since the SMO may be the last chance to prove our intellectual and moral maturity, the tragedy can be avoided only by clarifying: 1) what reason led Russia to a harsh confrontation with the West; 2) whether it was a tragic accident or an evolutionary inevitability; 3) the ways that could prevent conflict and catastrophe. Their analysis is presented in the most concise form below.

PART II. THE PAST

I. SOCIALISM AS PRACTICE AND AS UTOPIA

Today in Russia, there is a popular thesis that the USSR was the pinnacle of human development, but the machinations of enemies destroyed this "temple shining at the top." Therefore, it is the duty of Russians to restore it to its former glory. However, the facts indicate otherwise: the collapse of the USSR occurred due to natural causes. There are several of them, but the three main ones are: 1) a false ideological foundation (Marxism) on which its political, economic, and social walls were built; 2) human psychology, encountering which turned dreams into ruins; 3) a planned (catch-up) economy that excluded private property.

As for ideology, its origin is associated with the Industrial Revolution in England and the emergence of two new classes: the 'upper'-capitalists and the 'lower' - the proletariat. The term 'socialism' was first used in P. Leroux's work 'Individualism and Socialism' as a kind of response to A. Smith's work 'An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.' According to Leroux, the individualist-capitalist, relying on private property, pursued only his own interests, without caring about the public good. (It should be noted that the concept of *private property* also arose during this revolution as ownership of the means of *mass or commodity production*). Socialism, on the other hand, was opposed to individualism (capitalism), demanding justice, i.e., equality, primarily in the distribution of material goods. In other words, Leroux contributed to the fact that, in the eyes of society, *socialism became synonymous with universal equality*.

Meanwhile, according to the science of ethology, the instinct of sociability is developed to some degree in all social animals without exception, including, of course, humans. The method by which they form into organized conglomerates is standard. This is a hierarchy that creates societies led by alpha males. Therefore, the meaning of real socialism as a mechanism for merging large communities of people into stable, viable structures-states-is also unified. Its key characteristic is *total INequality* among members of society. In other words, real socialism, which divides society into the 'top' (elites) and the 'bottom' (the people), is directly opposed to the notion of it as a symbol of equality, a notion conceived in the mind of a publicist. Moreover, during the construction of this pyramid of inequality, rivers of blood were shed. Since the pre-civilized man, free from any chains of inequality, fiercely resisted any attempts to limit his independence [2].

It should be noted that the era of 'twisting arms' for the free hunter-gatherer lasted no less than 4-6 thousand years of the Neolithic revolution. After all, it was only with the combined efforts of violence and deceit that it became possible to confine him within the cage of civilization. The

former was employed by secular leaders, the latter by religious alpha males. On this foundation, formed by natural selection (according to Darwin) and the profound ignorance of our ancestors, all civilizations of the world from antiquity to the present day were built without exception. Extremely rare deviations from this rule included only the Minoan civilization and a number of city-states of ancient Hellas, including democratic Athens. This is why it appears both logical and justified to classify all established hierarchical civilizations of the past and present under the term 'socialist.'

All spontaneously emerging new things are accompanied by upheavals. Therefore, the initial steps of the Industrial Revolution, among other things, could not help but be accompanied by various disasters affecting the majority of the people. Sympathizing with those suffering from the changes, people like C. Saint-Simon, C. Fourier and R. Owen proposed all kinds of plans to remedy the evils. But what was common in their ideas was the recognition of property as the main "apple of discord." Therefore, in their view, justice could only be achieved on the basis of: a) communal ownership; b) obligatory labor for everyone; c) equal distribution of goods. Naive as they were, they sincerely believed, like their predecessor-the utopian T. More-that private property was the most pernicious enemy of humanity, hindering its happiness. From this arose all their fantastic plans to save society from poverty and exploitation, which required total equality in the possession of property, and these came to be called socialist utopias. Louder than others in the field of utopian criticism of capitalism prophesied K. Marx. Obsessed with a mania for grandeur, the journalist, who had externally defended a dissertation in philosophy, dreamed from youth of taking the place of Christ. Meeting F. Engels suggested to him how to achieve this: since a new 'salt of the earth'-the proletariat-had appeared, he, Marx, would become a new god for them. However, the proletariat itself interested him only as 'cannon fodder,' worthy of contempt, as he admitted in correspondence with Engels [3].

Without bothering with complicated searches and proofs, Marx started with the simplest. He challenged the philosophy of G. Hegel. Without introducing anything entirely new into his framework, he, like a circus magician, with a single gesture, simply turned it from its idealistic feet to a materialistic head. This was not difficult, as at that time no one had irrefutable facts to confirm the correctness of one view over another. Any idea, no matter how speculative, had the right to exist, as long as it was loudly proclaimed. One only needed to summon the courage (or audacity) to perform this trick. Marx calculated correctly: the PR campaign effect impressed his immediate circle. Furthermore-being a complete amateur in the field of historical science, he also made a mark here by presenting the world his version of human evolution, full of falsifications and deceit. This was also easy due to the obvious immaturity of historiography at that time.

But the main trump card, or rather, not even a trump card but a joker that Marx pulled out of his sleeve like a card sharp, was called communism. Firstly, his "brainchild" promised the proletariat the advent of paradise, but... not in heaven, rather on earth. Moreover, it guaranteed the fulfillment of the slogan: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs"-as much as is required. In this way, Marx seemingly cut off any hints of a connection between his teaching and religion. Secondly, he asserted that this paradise would come only *after* the proletariat destroyed: - a) private property;-b) all class enemies;-c) established its dictatorship throughout the world ("The Communist Manifesto"). He believed that the frivolous proletariat would bite at such a tempting bait and clear a place for him on the divine throne, ousting Christ-the god of the agrarians. By calling for lynching of everyone who, due to circumstances, found themselves above the proletariat in the social hierarchy, he placed in their hands an ideological sword for dealing with the adherents of all old idols.

However, neither Marx nor his utopian predecessors realized that the notion of property as an 'unclean force' threatening universal equality had already emerged in the primitive era. Subconsciously aware that property could divide

people, Stone Age hunters and gatherers regarded individual poverty as a public good—a guarantee of universal justice. In the 19th century, ethnography (anthropology) was only just becoming a science. And few could have imagined that for the majority of the past, *Homo sapiens*—for at least 40-50 thousand years—were governed by the structure of social relations which modern communists call... communism (from Latin: *commūnis*—"common"). This historically first, real communism was the embodiment of absolute universal equality, including equality in the possession of material goods. For such goods simply did not yet physically exist. No one produced anything beyond their own modest needs.

Accordingly, the primitive communist in the modern sense was not an ascetic, but literally destitute to the point of nudity. Yet... in no way a beggar. On the contrary, he was happy. Life in universal equality had such allure that the 'last of the Mohicans' of communism—modern hunter-gatherers from South Africa, Australia, and Brazil—still resist the encroachment of civilization's comforts. And it is not surprising that, from the perspective of utopian science fiction writers of the civilization era, the Upper Paleolithic was truly the 'Golden Age' of humanity. But this involuntary widespread misconception turned out to be an advantage for Marx. The malicious yet maniacally vain misanthrope concocted a bluff in which the word 'communism' became bait for the gullible. His 'Manifesto'—a document that brings shame to humankind—effectively provoked the proletariat to the vilest and basest impulses that could arise in a human mind: to ignite the fire of a world revolution—a civil war across the entire globe.

It is not surprising that the overwhelming majority of thoughtful Europeans considered such utopian schemes to be cannibalistic, criminal, and simply insane. Even the proletarian masses were frightened by his calls: a) to destroy private property, the individual—the owner of this property—and trade, as well as the family as such; b) to abolish the fatherland and nationality; c) to eliminate bourgeois ideas of freedom of conscience and religion; d) to anathematize universal human moral, philosophical, political,

and legal ideas. Thus, his passionate calls for a global massacre remained the voice of one crying in the wilderness. And only after his death did their poison penetrate the consciousness of his followers, both the ideological heirs—Marxists—and his opponents, the Nazis. The hatred of the proletariat toward the bourgeoisie, which Marx tried to instill in his flock, had the opposite effect—it generated hatred for his preaching among his most fanatical opponents. But one way or another, both chicks—the Marxist, his rightful heir and the Nazi, the bastard who dreamt of patricide—flew out of the same nest. (Action generates reaction—a law of nature discovered by I. Newton in experiments with basic physics).

As expected, thirsting for glory and divine privileges, he felt insulted. In response, cursing all the "obstinate" people, he decided to take revenge on all of humanity in the style of Herostratus, dedicating the rest of his life to writing "Capital"—a pompous diatribe against economics as a science. It did not address a single problem whose analysis would contribute to the progressive development of the economy and the relations between labor and capital. In other words, anything that could ease and improve the state of society as a whole and the proletariat in particular. It contained nothing except a) "exposing" the history of social relations in England during the infancy of the Industrial Revolution; b) banal truths of management known since antiquity; c) amateurish attacks on professional economists; d) calls to anathematize private property [4].

Evolution constantly tests the sanity of humanity with the most fantastic ideas, myths, and unthinkable speculations, similar to the delusions about a complete and/or flat Earth. Against this backdrop, Marx's doctrine of socialism—communism appeared the height of respectability to some particularly uncritical and gullible individuals. Especially since he established, as he believed, a clear boundary separating his 'strictly scientific doctrine' from the utopias of his predecessors. This is what enticed his Russian followers—the most radically left-wing in Europe. Marx proved to be a revelation for them for two reasons. On the one hand, he seemed to them a serious authority who dared to dispute with

luminaries such as Hegel and Adam Smith, as well as to reject religion. On the other hand, in his name as a 'brilliant scientist,' any crimes against humanity could be committed. He granted indulgences for any villainy in the name of the victory of the proletariat. Entranced by his tale, they burned with impatience to carry out a grand upheaval first in Russia, and then throughout the world.

Their fanaticism and determination were partly understandable. Nowhere, at any time, not even in the East, had people been subjected to such sophisticated mockery, disgraceful humiliation, and monstrous violence by *their own elites* as in Russia. And it was there that resistance to the "rulers" sought any justification for the necessity of radical change and for mass bloodletting. Meanwhile, the colossal internal pressure of mass protest, brewing for centuries, was preparing a social explosion of unprecedented force. And when the spring of popular anger was ready to release and erupt in the form of a rebellion, as always—"senseless and ruthless"—the Marxist-Bolsheviks immediately seized it to make it "meaningful"—directed towards seizing their own power. This was the prelude to Russia's confrontation with the West, initiated, on one hand, by the insane pretensions of the 19th-century Herostratus and on the other, by the tragic history of the Russian people in the Romanov Empire. Subjective and objective causes coincided to set the stage for another civilizational experiment.

II. THE ERA OF THE USSR

All radical changes in power structures, as a rule, are accompanied by abundant bloodshed. The coup d'état carried out by the Bolsheviks, which was followed by the Civil War, was no exception in this sense. It was expected, because the people were eager to pay off their tyrannical oppressors for centuries of suffering. But the price of revenge was an unthinkable 12 million victims! The Bolsheviks, who initiated the massacre, declared that their conscience was clear—they carried out the will of the people. But they were disingenuous: the punishment of the old elites in the name of the good of the people was the surface part of the

iceberg. Its underwater part was the desire of the Bolsheviks to become a new elite. At the same time, they did not promise the people either freedom, or equality or fraternity. In this respect they were honest: they did not give him the first, nor the second, nor the third. But by proclaiming slogans such as "Power to the Soviets! Factories to the workers! Land to the peasants!", the Marxists hoped to bribe, that is, deceive the people. And they were not mistaken. Deceiving the profoundly ignorant masses, whose submissiveness had almost reached the level of reflexes, turned out to be quite simple. And if before seizing power they were in their own way sincere in the intention of actually giving something to the people, once they took power, they quickly forgot about them. For behind the false slogan of proletarian hegemony lay the true goal—the hegemony of a new elite, the Marxist elite. Power corrupts everyone, and absolute power, as is known, corrupts absolutely. Those who did not understand this or did not bow their heads, faced bloody terror, inspired in the Bolsheviks by their leader -V. Lenin.

Selfless concern for the needs of the people was one of many fairy tales invented by the Bolsheviks—disciples of the liar Marx. This was proven by the incredible ferocity of their actions against opponents, driven by... fear for their own lives. By provoking a world revolution, they hoped its flame would distract the external enemies of Marxism from interfering in Russia's affairs. That is why, as early as 1919, the 1st Congress of the Comintern was held in Moscow. At that congress, the words were spoken: 'The hands of the proletarians reach for swords. Not a year will pass before all of Europe is Soviet... In 1920, a great International Soviet Republic will be born.' Thus, the theory of the proletariat's war against all other humanity began to be put into practice by the efforts of Marx's disciples immediately after the October coup. By the way, the second-in-command organizer of this coup—L. Trotsky—shortened his own life by continuing to obsess over the dream of world revolution (and his role in it) up until the beginning of World War II.

But the most convincing proof of serving their own selfish, rather than the people's, interests, the Bolsheviks demonstrated during the tragedy

known as the "Volga Famine of 1921-1923," in which about 6 million people perished. Unable to cope with the problem on their own, the Kremlin turned to the international community for help, which did not hesitate to respond to the request. In particular, the American Relief Administration (ARA), led by Herbert Hoover, helped save at least 9 million people from starving to death! In addition, citing the need to purchase food for the starving, the Kremlin confiscated church property worth *2.5 billion gold rubles*. Thus, from these two sources-external and internal-the Relief Fund for the Starving received a total of up to *4.6 billion rubles*. But, attention reader: only 1 (*one!*) *million rubles* were allocated for the purchase of food for them! That is, their share amounted to *less than one-thousandth of the total sum collected for their rescue!!!* Meanwhile, *5.5 million rubles* were allocated to the Comintern to finance the activities of 'brotherly Communist parties.' And to this day, it remains a mystery what operations the remaining more than *4 billion rubles* were spent on. In world history, it is hard to find another example of such monstrous hypocrisy. This is how the self-destruction of Russia began.

The emergence of the USSR completely mirrored the Eastern tradition of violence and deceit in the process of elite change. But the classical civilizations of the East existed and/or continue to exist for many centuries, even millennia. The USSR did not make it to 70 years! After the brilliant victory in the 1941-1945 war, which elevated it to shining heights, it suddenly and thunderously collapsed. What or who tripped it up? Today in Russia, the blame for the collapse of the Soviet Union is placed on M. Gorbachev & Co. There is a grain of truth in this, but only a tiny one. The overwhelming part of the burden of guilt lies with Marx! He was the main architect-ideologist who designed the foundation, as well as the political, economic, and social walls of the country. And the first, most visible sin of the project was that its path to a bright future, cleared of opponents of the proletariat, ran through the Himalayas of corpses. However, neither Judaism, nor Christianity, nor Islam, which also diligently cleared their space under the sun of opponents, stopped at such a 'trivial' obstacle. Therefore, the second, implicit yet fatal flaw of Marxism was that

it promised paradise *on earth 'here and now'*! But such a promise has an unpleasant trait – it can be tested. 'Practice is the criterion of truth,' Marx carelessly remarked, not realizing that experience would disprove the truth of his teachings. In fact, he turned out to be far less farsighted than his predecessors. For they promised paradise in the heavens, which cannot be tested.

The builders of the USSR naively thought they were doing something exceptional, unprecedented in history. In reality, all their 'innovations' were a trivial repetition of banal palace coups in the Eastern style, seasoned with the European art of fooling the masses. Nevertheless, for a utopia to prove its driving force, the overthrow had to be led by a leader for whom the value of human life was zero, and the concept of morality was merely a tool of politics. Such a person was found in V. Lenin. According to his view: "Morality is that which serves the destruction of the old exploitative society and the unification of all workers around the proletariat, which is creating a new society of communists." This new Robespierre demonstrated that he was capable of stopping at nothing, no matter how shameful the lie, and was ready to drown in blood as many people as his victory demanded [5]. And it demanded, at a minimum, $6+12 = 18$ million people. Who gave 'good grandfather' Lenin a blank check for cannibalism? Marx – the author of a pseudo-scientific voodoo! Was this crime something exceptional in history? Alas, the weight of crimes committed by the 'brilliant' practitioner of Marxism was in no way less than the severity of the 'exploits' of Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, and similar heroes of agricultural socialism.

But the seizure of power is only the overture in the force majeure drama of history. The usurper still needs to prove his viability by holding this power in his hands while thousands of other hands try to tear it away. The civil war left the country in ruins. To revive it among the builders, there had to be a leader capable of: 1) stopping the attempts of the old Leninist 'guard' to continue a suicidal game of world revolution; 2) raising the economy practically from scratch in order to urgently prepare the rear for war; 3) dealing with the 'fifth

column' regardless of the number of victims (only very naive people could think that those who lost the Civil War would forget about revenge); 4) overcoming and organizing the chaos that reigned in all departments of the state apparatus; 5) preventing deadly disagreements in the army, as well as properly arming it; 6) creating an atmosphere of an unbreakable union among the peoples of the multinational country, forging them into a single image of the 'Soviet person'. Without solving at least one of the listed points, it would have been impossible to save the USSR.

But there remained one more puzzling problem: relations with Europe. The country needed to be prepared for the inevitable war with Nazi Germany, maneuvering between it on the one hand and England and France on the other. Since the victory of Marxism in Russia had triggered a reaction in the form of the victory of Nazism—a reflection of it in a distorted mirror. Without the existence of the USSR, A. Hitler would categorically have had no chance of winning the 1932 elections. (Just as Marxism won in Russia due to two reasons: a) the objective—the peculiarities of its history and b) the subjective—Marx's teachings, similarly Nazism triumphed in Germany due to: a) the specifics of its historical past; b) Hitler's propaganda). Thus, Europe had to choose the lesser of two evils. And for the USSR, it was extremely important to demonstrate that Marxism was the lesser evil compared to Nazism.

Only a leader possessing almost supernatural qualities could resolve the unimaginably contradictory spectrum of arising problems in the shortest possible time. Such a leader was found—I. Stalin. Unlike most of the Marxist elite, he, astonishingly, was not deceitful. A cruel dictator, responsible for the blood of not only many active opponents of his policies but also of the innocent, he did not pretend, but sincerely desired a better future for the people. In this way, he became an anomaly—an exception to the rule for the overwhelming majority of those hungry for power. Having seized it, and with an indulgence from Marx and Lenin for any bloody crimes, the despot *put the interests of the people above personal*

ones! This choice of priorities was unprecedented for any tyrant.

But in doing so, Stalin committed the unthinkable. First, he materialized a utopia, which turned out to be a phenomenon unique in world history. In this way, he breathed life into Marx's paper mythology. Second, he saved the country from collapse, the Russians and many other peoples from slavery and the Jews of the Old World from complete extermination. Under any other national leader, the country would have fallen in 1941 or earlier. Third, he spared the world an uncertain outcome of the slaughter between Anglo-Saxon and German civilizations in the event of the USSR's defeat, since Germany was just one step away from creating its own atomic bomb. Fourth, he essentially determined the status of modern China as a contender against the West. Fifth, without fully realizing it, he partly initiated the global tectonic shifts that today implicitly accelerate the world's movement away from socialism and liberalism toward direct democracy. And this is far from all that is connected with his legacy. That is why Stalin remains the most controversial figure in world history, at least of the Modern era.

However, being a devout follower of Marx, he did not realize that his titanic efforts were ultimately doomed to fail. For they were like Don Quixote's attempts to fight a windmill—the power of elites of any kind, including the Marxist ones. The result: being a "black sheep" in the world of authoritarian tyrants of classical socialism, he found himself alien even among his own—the Marxist elite. And the elite took revenge on him. They had grown tired of enduring years of sole rule by a dictator that infringed on their interests and rights to what they believed was absolute power, won with blood. That is why they hastened to consign to oblivion the legacy of the last true fanatic of the Marxist utopia.

The parallel between the socialism of the USSR and primitive communism is not immediately obvious. Nevertheless, it is impossible to ignore the sense of satisfaction with one's existence that prevailed among the Soviet people during Stalin's rule (and, by inertia, under Brezhnev). It was

close to that feeling of fullness of life that characterized the pre-civilized era of universal equality-primitive communism. The feelings experienced by an ordinary Soviet person were caused, on the one hand, by a huge relief from the terrifying oppression that weighed on their ancestors from generation to generation. On the other hand, by the real benefits provided by the new regime, including the illusion of the free nature of many goods that became accessible to the majority of the population. It was created because no worker knew the real cost of the products they produced or what portion of it the monopolist state generously left for the worker, and what it allocated to the elite. The latter consisted not only of the party apparatus but also of many other dependents of the state treasury. The state manipulated these shares so skillfully, redistributing income and expenses, that people got the impression that they had, in a sense, actually stepped into the promised communism. Therefore, it is not surprising that, according to most contemporary Russians (according to polls from 2024-no less than 70%), the era of Stalinism was a kind of "golden age" of Russian statehood. A time of the real embodiment of the dream of a peaceful life, equality, justice, and a cloudless future.

However, neither Stalin nor his successors understood that a planned economy, according to Marx, is categorically incapable of competing with a market economy for any significant length of time for a simple reason. It is only capable of quantitative, but in no way qualitative, development. It can only be 'catching up,' or for a short time 'leading' in some already known industry (particularly in rocket engineering and the nuclear industry-unfortunately, the list ends there). But it is categorically incapable of independently generating new ideas, technologies, and industries that introduce something revolutionary or unprecedented into practice. It is a perfect stamping machine, Henry Ford's assembly line. It does not have access to phylogenesis. And the market economy does. Since private initiative, backed by private property, creates the 'founder effect,' well known in biology and culture, including in economics.

The only exceptions to this rule were the force majeure circumstances of the pre-war and post-war periods, which Stalin managed successfully.

His inept successors played around with manipulations to such an extent that they drove the last nail into the coffin of their own state. Therefore, what people in Russia today take for the USSR was in a way a mirage, allowed to become a reality for a short time. That is why nostalgia for the USSR and dreams of its revival today are akin to visions of Eden. They are absurd for another reason as well: a hundred years ago, the standard of living of peoples, both in the USSR and in the West, was quite comparable, i.e., to some extent, people were equally impoverished 'here' and 'there.' Today, the peoples not only of Europe but of the vast majority of countries in the world live in ways that their grandparents could not have dreamed of even in their wildest dreams. Countries in Asia and Africa, in particular, show a stark contrast with the past. How did this happen? Through the introduction of private property into their economies, which helped them taste life and understand the difference between poverty and prosperity. Therefore, the revival of the USSR and the renunciation of private property would mean a return to... equality in poverty. It is unlikely that not only the younger generation of Russians, but even the generation that remembers its heyday, would agree to this.

Summary

However, the haste of the elites in the process of burying Stalinism was explained not so much by the bruised psychology of ambitious individuals as by the disappointment in evolution. It became evident that socialism, whether agrarian or industrial, does not promote progress for the same reason as primitive communism. Neither the first, nor the second, nor the third are capable of stimulating the kind of dynamic cultural and technological development of humanity that the Cosmos requires. But if communism and agrarian socialism were natural stages in the "maturation" of *Homo sapiens*, then the Marxist utopia represents an anomaly in its development doomed to sterility. This raises the question: why did evolution experiment with the peoples of the USSR so ruthlessly and inhumanely? As has

already been said, it is both blind and perceptive at the same time. Satisfying its curiosity, it tests in practice any speculations that occur to collective humanity. However, the mystifications of Marxism turned out to be too catastrophic for it. According to our calculations, from 1917 to 1989, up to 111 million people worldwide fell victim to provocateur No. 1. According to other estimates, "...in the 20th century, by the direct order of convinced Marxists acting in the name of their idol, more than 150 million people were killed" [6]. But the harvest of victims did not end there. It continued within the borders of Russia itself.

PART III. THE PRESENT

I. RUSSIA AND LIBERALISM

Claiming the role of a new, industrial god, Marx completely distorted the evolution of humanity not only by presenting the distant, impoverished yet happy communist past as a near future shining with unimaginable wealth. But that is not enough, and he also falsified the era of civilization by presenting socialism as the future 'anteroom' of communism. In reality, all authoritarian civilizations, from the times of ancient Egypt and Sumer to the USSR and modern Russia, belong to the same circle-the socialist one. They are all united by one fundamental characteristic-*inequality*. Depending on space and time, it played a fundamental role either in one or another aspect of state organization-power, law, economy, etc. And thus it gave rise to various forms of socialism: agrarian (Eastern countries), oligarchic (Republican Rome, post-feudal Europe, including modern China), dictatorial (Imperial Rome), feudal (Medieval Europe), Marxist (with an elite from the party bureaucracy). Accordingly, empires were called those civilizations within this sphere that, for one reason or another, managed for a time to turn nearby or distant peoples into their colonies.

Moreover, Marx had an extremely superficial understanding, in particular, of such a key phenomenon for world civilization as ancient democracy. Which took the first step toward becoming a civilization in which complete *equality* in political, social and economic rights of

all citizens of the polis was established. In this regard, the question is appropriate: what suddenly gave rise to this phenomenon? How was the emergence of such an obvious anomaly possible against the standard socialist background? In biology, the phenomenon of preadaptation is well known. It produces, in one species or another, vital but currently useless mechanisms or organs, which turn out to be advantageous... in the future. It was precisely preadaptation that played a decisive role in the world of culture as well, giving rise to ancient democracy-a sharp contrast to the world of socialism. However, in those times and in that environment, it had no chance to develop into a full-fledged direct democracy as understood today. Nevertheless, it proved to be a great preadaptor, passing some of its cultural heritage to Rome.

The latter sought to emulate the tradition of Athens. But its elite (the patricians) resisted losing their privileges and property restrictions. In doing so, the patricians contributed to the birth of the first oligarchic republic-a civilization with elected power but preserving *inequality* in social and legal relations, as well as full freedom of any kind of property. This 'recognition' of property rights was readily embraced by Early Modern Europe-the cultural heir of Greece and Rome. All the more so because both its secular and spiritual authorities became full participants in monetary transactions. Moreover, they became so active in this regard that the attitude toward property became the primary reason for the split of Christianity into Catholicism and Protestantism. Subsequently, the desire for the free circulation of property fueled bourgeois revolutions in the Netherlands, England, and France. As a result, monarchies were either abolished in most European countries or transformed into constitutional monarchies. Thus, a third pillar of the vertical power structure-the market-type economy-was added to the two pillars of its civilizations.

Today, Marxists mistakenly call regimes that rely on these three pillars capitalism. However, the latter only pertains to a type of economic management and has nothing to do with political,

ideological or other institutions. A term that encompasses the full functioning of the state is more logically defined as 'liberalism.' At the same time, strictly speaking, liberalism represents an intermediate state between democracy and socialism. It differs from classical socialism in one, but crucial, aspect: its reliance on private property and on representatives of its elite, its alpha-male. The latter (entrepreneur-businessman) not only fully merged into the old guard of the agrarian civilization elite but also gradually pushes it out of power. And it is precisely this circumstance that allows *liberalism to be considered a subtype of classical socialism*. For it lives by the laws of social Darwinism in the same way, that is, guided by the principles of natural selection and intraspecific competition. However, in a noticeably softened form. This is because a businessman's power is limited by the market. And for the latter, production without sales is pure nonsense. It is vital for a businessman that what he produces is actively consumed. Therefore, the more buyers there are and the wealthier they are, the more bonuses the businessman earns. In this way, whether willingly or unwillingly, he contributes to improving the lives of the masses of buyers, who represent the people.

With the collapse of the USSR, Russia also entered an era of liberalism, though not so much civilized as barbaric. And Marxism is also to blame for this. The reason being that Russian liberalism is just as artificial a construct as Marxist socialism. Russian business has no own roots or history. It was born, once again in the spirit of the "Communist Manifesto": take from society what was created by the whole society and divide it among those who are bolder than others. And its "parents" were some from the Komsomol, others from the criminal gangs. It is unfamiliar with concepts and principles that have been developed in the West over centuries and are recognized as effective, even though some entrepreneurs try to bypass them. In Russia, there are no standards of entrepreneurial behavior at all. Young wolves of the Russian market live by the laws of the jungle: "*homo homini lupus est*" (man is a wolf to man). Hence the colossal gap in

income that suddenly emerged between the business elite and the people, replacing the previous approximate material equality between the party elite and the masses. The latter, of course, perceive the abruptly arising chasm as blatant injustice, made all the more outrageous by the fact that the business elite itself has nothing whatsoever to do with the creation of the property it has successfully "carved up" for its own benefit.

It is largely because of this injustice that most Russians live with blinders on, seeing only the grim aspects of liberalism. And few people realize that 99.9% of everything that surrounds them day by day is owed to liberalism. All the benefits of modern material existence for a Russian have come to him from the West. Patriots, who are the loudest when talking about Russia as the future of the world, should look around and think about what their country would become if everything introduced from abroad suddenly disappeared. But they do not do this, albeit subconsciously. Their intuition tells them that in such a case, Russia would turn into a bear's den in the literal sense of the word: a world of village huts and bast shoes with rags. After all, not only high technology, the internet, and other achievements of the modern world, but also all areas of classical culture, from writing and literature to the arts and sciences, are borrowings from the West.

It is impossible to point to a single idea that was born and 'stood on its own feet' in Russia and later became the property of all humanity. Of course, Russia has shown that in practically all of its cultural borrowings, it reached the same level of development as the originals. And sometimes even surpassed them, as can especially be seen in the example of weaponry, which has always been advanced since the Soviet era. Nevertheless, historically it has always been second in time. But... not because the Russian people are incapable of creativity, but because their social and governmental institutions in the past and even today, have not allowed their talents to manifest. These talents, by the way, are equally inherent in all peoples without exception. Unfortunately for patriots who place their nation and country above all others, this is an unacceptable reality for them. One they

categorically refuse to accept. Therefore, the only thing that was indisputably unique in the USSR was the people's enthusiasm. But even that lasted only a few decades.

However, Russia is not alone in its role as a copier of Western technologies based on private property. In fact, all the colossal technological progress achieved by the world as a whole (including Japan, South Korea and China) owes its existence to the creative and economic initiatives of Western liberalism. Now, having suffered defeat in its bet on a planned economy, Russia is making strenuous efforts to ignore its absolute dependence on it as a raw materials appendage. And it is desperately butting heads with the West, trying to prove to itself and others that the future belongs to it. What remains unclear, however, is in what form: modern or Soviet? But what, in reality, has happened in Russia since the collapse of the USSR, apart from the chasm of income that suddenly opened up between the new elite and the people? A lot-both visibly and behind a facade.

Among the obvious ones: national patriotism has completely replaced proletarian internationalism. Marx's 'atheistic' doctrine has been replaced by Orthodoxy. The status of the second world power has become almost that of a global outcast. Among the less obvious ones: calls for world revolution have turned into threats to 'bury' the West if it does not agree to recognize the Special Military Operation as legitimate. Furthermore, in order to maintain its influence over the former 'brothers' of the USSR, the Kremlin created the CIS, the EAEU and the CSTO. However, the number of participants has decreased from 16 to 5-8 members. The dreams of the former Comintern for a global proletarian revolution materialized in the creation of the SCO, which, unfortunately, is fraught with many contradictions. By the way, the sharpest are between Russia and China. The latter views the organization as an economic union and a promising market for the sale of its products. Russia, on the other hand, insists on the military component of the SCO, which is supposedly intended to prevent terrorism, extremism, and separatism. Thus, formally, Russia seems to have

broken with its imperial past, but in reality, it has not, and clings tightly to it. Moreover, its citizens have developed a panic fear, first, of the onset of chaos due to possible powerlessness of the Kremlin and second, due to the imagined threat of losing the country's 'sovereignty.' And this fear paralyzes them.

However, some Russian patriots rejoice in what they believe to be Russia's role in transforming the world from unipolar to multipolar. They are flattering themselves. The world is becoming multipolar as a result of the natural course of evolution. On the one hand, over the past century or two, humanity, as if having fallen into a lethargic sleep for 4–5 millennia, has suddenly 'awakened' and come into motion comparable to the tectonics of the Earth's plates. And the driving force behind its activation was precisely those bourgeois revolutions that freed private property from the heavy chains of Prometheus. The USSR also contributed to turning the world from unipolar to multipolar. But its influence on this process is incomparable to the role of the West. On the other hand, the USSR collapsed because none of the 'younger brothers' of the hegemon nation liked being vassals of the Kremlin. Nowadays, this chaotic process of democratizing relations is happening among all the peoples and states of the world.. Nowadays, this chaotic process of democratizing relations is taking place among all the peoples and states of the world. Especially since the indisputable world leader-the USA-does not particularly abuse its authority. They also have growing internal problems. In particular, with the rise to power of the eccentric D. Trump, chaos has sharply increased not only in the domestic but also in the foreign policy of the United States. (It seems that a state suffers when not only a cook, but also a hardened oligarch ends up at its head).

Summary

So, now we have almost all the data needed to understand how classical (agrarian) socialism differs from Marxist (industrial) and liberal (monetary) socialism. Classical socialism emerged as the offspring of two 'forces'-power and cunning. Power was embodied by the despotism of secular authority, while cunning was embodied

by the tyranny of spiritual authority. Understanding that property was the object of desire for the vast majority of people, both branches of authority, fearing the loss of their absolute dominance over society, suppressed the activities of individuals who embodied the power of money by all available means. This blockade was only broken by the bourgeois revolutions in Europe, thanks to the Greco-Roman legacy-the recognition of private property as one of the most effective drivers of material progress. Thus, the businessman became the third pillar of the pyramid of inequality-liberal socialism. Marxism, pretending to call humanity to take the next step forward-to level the pyramid with the ground and eliminate inequality as such-in reality took a huge step backward. Russian Marxists did not understand this. But the idea of: a) combining secular and spiritual dictatorship in one person; b) establishing their hegemony over the entire world, seemed extremely attractive to them. To realize their dream, they, first of all, carried out a counter-revolutionary (October 1917) coup, which blocked the path of the February Revolution of the same year. Secondly, they declared jihad against private property as allegedly the enemy of the proletariat and progress.

Unfortunately and at the same time, fortunately (history can be exceptionally paradoxical), among the "fighters for the people's cause" there was a unique individual who truly believed in Marxism. Instilling his faith and enthusiasm in a people suddenly freed from Romanov serfdom, he accomplished the impossible. But the Marxist elite, disagreeing with the diminishment of their power, immediately reclaimed it with the leader's departure. And instantly, everything fell back into place-the USSR collapsed. Yet, in doing so, Russia not so much lost an entire century as was pushed even further and deeper into the past. Of course, not in terms of technology, which it still actively uses, borrowing from the West. It delves into the archaism of the Middle Ages in terms of national mentality. And perhaps Uvarov's 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality' will soon return to the country as the dominant force in the collective consciousness of the nation. In any case, the trend toward such a development of events is more than evident. The colossal potential of the people once

again becomes a prisoner of the remnants of the past. The world is moving forward, Russia is moving backward. This is the result of the experiment conducted by the Marxists on their own country. Which, incidentally, serves as yet another proof of the principle according to which it is not so much being that determines consciousness as, on the contrary, *consciousness that determines being*.

From this, it follows that in the last century, no natural disaster or external enemy has caused more harm to Russia and the world than the teachings of Marx.

The problem, however, is that liberalism, which initiated a gigantic intellectual and technological surge for humanity, does not solve the problem silently posed to it by Nature. Not only because no one is aware of it, including Elon Musk, who does not grasp the deeper meaning of space colonization. But, above all, because liberalism not only preserved but also multiplied the pillars of inequality, adding a third pillar-the financial - to the two existing ones, secular and ideological verticals of power, i.e., the unlimited freedom of private property. And as history shows, any unlimited power tends to degenerate. Liberalism has taken a serious step towards moving away from classical socialism, but it is clearly insufficient. At the same time, the ongoing confrontation between Russia and the West represents a particular expression of a more general and broad front of disagreements that shake global civilization and hinder the dynamics of its development. These disagreements are primarily caused by two factors: *conservative collective consciousness* and *traditions of inequality*, adhered to by the 'founding fathers' of both classical and liberal socialism. They could play the role of gravediggers of global civilization if humanity does not find a worthy alternative to them.

PART IV. THE MENTALITY OF SOCIALISM

I. BELIEFS

The intellectual potential of a person in the era of primitive communism was by no means inferior

to that of a modern human and in some respects, it may have even surpassed it. However, the absolute ignorance of that era made them extremely naive in everything that went beyond routine existence. And when individuals with the psyche of an alpha male and heightened vanity appeared within their community, they easily found an audience for displaying their inflated ego (similar to modern actors or politicians). But since they also did not excel in education, unlike their peers, they could attract the attention of their fellow tribesmen only by appealing to their imagination and by instilling in them their exceptional ability to communicate with spirits. And to cement the authority they gained in this cunning way, they began to call themselves magicians, shamans, sorcerers, and so on. Thus, the first tiny step was taken toward violating universal equality. For a long time, the claims of the ambitious remained fruitless, and their power over others was weak. For every hunter-gatherer was skilled in their trade, relatively independent of the weather, and not reliant on anyone's services. But ultimately, wizards were partly helped by the fact that over the millennia, *Homo sapiens* had developed long-term memory and collective consciousness.

Everything changed when the wandering hunter turned into a farmer, tied to his (communal) plot of land-his new provider. That was when humans felt the heavy hand of the whims of weather. Which the wizards immediately took advantage of: they invented that there is a hierarchy among spirits and that the higher spirits are called gods, who, in fact, command the forces of nature. It goes without saying that if people did not want to die of hunger due to the fury of natural disasters, they had to unquestioningly obey their commanders-the gods. And the magicians, supposedly on close terms with the spirits, now took on the role of intermediaries between their surroundings and the gods. On the condition that from now on they would be considered not ordinary tribesmen, but powerful priests, heralds of the will of the gods. Their childishly naive surroundings had no choice but to accept the new rules of the game. Thus, the farmer, remaining deeply ignorant, found himself completely

dependent on the self-serving inventions of equally ignorant but extremely ambitious aspirants. This was further facilitated by the development of yet another crucial factor-the social instinct, in addition to long-term memory and collective consciousness.

Previously weakly expressed in small populations that included a certain number of family groups, it intensified as the number of these groups grew. Upon reaching a certain critical size, the classic social instinct reached a level of extraordinary strength (*eusocial*-from Greek: εὖ - fully, well + sociality). It is extremely rare in nature, as it is necessary to maintain cohesion in abnormally large, multi-thousand communities. Therefore, prior to the emergence of humans, it was observed only in a few insect species-ants, termites, and bees. However, with the appearance of humans, eusociality also began to acquire decisive importance in human communities as agricultural collectives expanded to many thousands of members.

At the same time, if a single instinct was enough for insects to maintain the cohesion of their families, in the human environment it became effective through the mediation of cultural tools. One of the first such tools were fairy tales, born, on the one hand, from children's curiosity (what, how, and why?), and on the other-from the answers to the questions they posed to their ignorant parents. What could these answers have been? Obviously, too often-extremely fantastic, even absurd, from the point of view of a modern person. In turn, some explanatory fairy tales, passed down from generation to generation thanks to the developed long-term memory, became myths. Losing connection with the names of their ancestral authors, they gained the authority of virtual reality. By selecting myths useful to themselves from this ersatz reality, and creating new tales-now for adults-the cunning priests radically transformed the collective consciousness of the farmer, which had been dwelling in darkness.

It did not become more enlightened; it merely replaced one collection of delusions with another. But in the end, humans finally recognized the

power over themselves of certain mystical celestial forces-gods-and their earthly representatives-the priests (who had invented these gods). To make their authority over society indisputable and enduring, these priests staked out a kind of gold-bearing territory: among other things, they invented the institution of religion. Thus, they began to fight for their privileges not individually, but collectively, that is, more successfully. And evolution readily assisted them in their endeavors. For there were no other, more effective ways to engage in existence within communities of thousands yet. By placing themselves above their surroundings, the *priests altered the collective consciousness of humanity-giving rise to the chimera of religion, along with inequality in human society.*

To strengthen control over the consciousness of their fellow tribesmen, they made a third invention: they devised the concept of sacredness as something lofty, close to the gods and endowed with 'holiness.' By instilling in the childishly naive farmer the idea of his supposed chosenness from above, they zombified his mind. But ideological power alone was not enough for those who had tasted its material aspect. Therefore, the priests concerned themselves with turning spiritual power into material power, laying the first stone in the foundation of the *global bureaucracy-the pyramid of hierarchy.* Over time, the burden of this pyramid, resting on the shoulders of the common person, grew so great that life began to seem like hell. Yet now, the only support left for them was God (gods), who remained their hope for justice and their protection in the face of hardships born of inequality. On earth, there was no place for hope, and they had no choice but to turn their gaze to the heavens. Moreover, even a small acknowledgment of the reality of God made life somewhat easier: the "creator," it seemed, provided a simple and easy explanation for everything. But the louder and more grandly preachers spoke of the greatness of their gods and the sanctity of their beliefs, the more examples and evidence of their deceit accumulated.

The mountains of utter stupidity, unrestrained by any boundaries of logic and rationality, that have accumulated to this day, are immense. Yet, as a

tacit acknowledgment that God (or gods) is not omnipotent after all, the concept of morality simultaneously took shape. It did not arise as criticism or protest, but as drops of common sense among the few who thought not only of themselves and believed that the duty of a conscientious person consists in showing care for their fellow beings. Nevertheless, their rare voices, crying out in the wilderness, were drowned out by the trumpeting voice from the heavens, depriving humans of the opportunity to manage their own affairs. Therefore, religious faith remains a self-deception, concealing the truth about one's own weakness, born of ignorance. This weakness manifests in: 1-immorality, 2-ignorance, 3-rigidity, 4-ossification.

- The opinion that the Bible is a beacon of morality is nothing more than propaganda. It serves as a vivid illustration of all imaginable and unimaginable vices that humanity displayed during the era of building the first civilizations. Almost all the initial chapters of the book-Genesis and Exodus-are filled with examples of the low starting point from which our journey toward morality began. This path was marked by deceit and betrayal, duplicity and treachery of its numerous characters – the descendants of Abraham. But such were the morals of virtually all humanity at a time when it was just beginning to adapt to the harsh rules of civilization, based on the principles of natural selection. Ethics almost took a central place in the sermons of Christ, which received support from Greek philosophy. But his later followers did everything possible to distort his teachings, turning it into a religious dogma. This was made easier by the fact that Christ remained a firm adherent of the principle of inequality: 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's,' which assigned humans the role of humble petitioners for various blessings from above.

The concepts of 'morality' and 'Islam' are in such strange relations that it is sometimes difficult to understand how much they are compatible. If Islam acknowledges that a woman is a secondary

being, having neither her own rights nor her personal space, then what morality can there be in principle? Especially since, concerning men, Islam represents a military code for all aspects of life, and the world appears to it as a large barracks into which all humanity must be driven. Buddhism for a long time remained a teaching truly devoted to the individual. But the eusocial instinct, over centuries reshaping the consciousness of its followers, has turned their beliefs into a kind of hypocrisy. On one hand, Buddhism acquired a church, rituals and other attributes of a classical religion. On the other hand, each Buddhist is focused on their own self, ignoring the external world and taking no interest in its development. This cannot be called immoral, but it is difficult to deem acceptable. The immorality of Marxism was discussed above. And only the limited scope of this article prevents complementing the enormous register of its moral transgressions.

- The concept of reason in the Bible is associated with wisdom and Solomon is recognized as the ideal wise man. However, as a result of his inept rule, the previously unified kingdom of Israel split into Israel and Judah. The Church, a bureaucratic institution of Christianity, made every effort to ensure that believers would only believe blindly, without thinking independently. Such a "crime" was considered heresy and was severely punished. Since the Quran is, in fact, a military code in a civil guise, believers are not officially prohibited from thinking. They are simply not given room for reflection or doubt. All religions in the world, including Marxism, exhibit the same extremely cautious, and sometimes hostile, attitude towards "free thought." It is caused by a common reason-fear of free thought, fear of exposing the instability and falsehood, whether conscious or due to ignorance, of all religions. I. Kant-one of the very few believers-had the courage to admit that: "...on the *fear* of God's existence and the afterlife... on these two symbols of faith," all religion rests. Moreover, he agreed that this extremely primitive understanding of it can "be reached even by ordinary reason, without calling philosophers to help!" [7].
- Examples of cruelty toward all "those who are not like us" abound in Deuteronomy and the Book of Joshua. But were they some kind of exception in biblical times? Not at all. Against the backdrop of the ferocity of Assyrian kings and Aztec priests, they seemed like routine reprisals sanctioned by the gods. For a millennium and a half of the existence of the Christian Church, it has not only tarnished its name with the behavior of many of its leaders, but has also managed to drench the blood of heretics and pagans, non-believers and coreligionists of all continents of the world. Moreover, Christians, without false modesty, call their god the savior of mankind?! From what sin, in the name of what and whom exactly did he save in reality? In response, as a rule, there are waterfalls of words to try to chatter, or wash away this blood of shame. Islam prides itself on its peacefulness. Muslims tell these tales either to those who do not know well the bloody history of the conquests of Islam or do not follow the modern actions of its active fanatics. But Marxism has outstripped everyone in this respect. In a single century, he managed to reap a harvest of sacrifices that was at least not inferior, and probably even surpassed, to the harvests of Christianity and Islam for all the centuries of their labors in this field. All this is thanks to the fact that he supplemented the unconscious natural selection of religions with a conscious natural selection supported by his "theoretical" justification.
- Ideologies are an evolutionary project designed to strengthen the unity of large and very large human groups by brainwashing the collective consciousness of their members through the eusocial instinct. But nothing more than that. For some time, religions indeed played the role of catalysts in uniting large human communities. Sometimes they even served as symbols of preserving the national identity of particular peoples. But now these functions are successfully carried out by culture and traditions, cleansed of religious dogmas. In our time, the latter have turned into walls that hinder the mental unity

of humanity as a whole. Since their ideal is inequality-their greatest common vice. It manifests with varying intensity, in different forms, in various spheres of social existence, but inevitably. Firstly, because any ideal, including the ideal of inequality, contains within it the greatest slyness. As soon as it is achieved, even the slightest movement automatically ceases and all stimulus for further development disappears. It follows that achieving an ideal in the realm of ideology is a mirage, or a utopia. Secondly, any ideology inevitably develops its antithesis, because inequality itself generates an irresolvable contradiction between its "upper" and "lower" levels. Thirdly, conflicts between ideologies are inevitable, driven by the animalistic principle of natural selection, which leads to a global division of humanity at the level of worldview.

II. PATRIOTISM

The concept of 'patriotism' seems like the most natural feeling that unites people not only genetically (as an instinctive drive) but also culturally (through language, customs, and mentality). Yet it is also highly speculative. One example: during World War II, both Germans and Russians felt themselves to be patriots fighting for a just cause. The question arises: what is the criterion that indicates whose patriotism in this case was genuine and whose was false? Apparently, the answer must be sought in the fact that it consists of two parts. Its instinctive component has roots in the *protective* reaction of any social animal toward its habitat. Here, the positive emphasis is undoubtedly on defense as an act of justice, as opposed to aggression-the seizure of what does not belong to you. As for the cultural aspect of patriotism, the situation becomes more complicated. When humans transitioned from hunting and gathering to agriculture and animal husbandry, owning a certain territory became not so much a purpose as a synonym for life. Therefore, natural selection for them turned into a struggle for territory. But... in this struggle, the question of defense or attack arose again. A common farmer, having a certain plot, was interested in expanding it only under force

majeure circumstances. Manual cultivation of land requires significant effort, limiting the owner's ambitions.

A completely different attitude towards land ownership began to emerge with the growth of agricultural settlements and the onset of competition for territories. War became a permanent backdrop of human existence. The most fortunate alpha males with the warrior psychotype, either defenders of their tribesmen's lands or conquerors of neighboring lands, became the new elite, in addition to the priestly elite. Over time, they developed a particular taste for aggression, since their success on the battlefield not only strengthened their power over their tribesmen but also gave them authority over other peoples and their lands. Thus, although the priests were the first to begin building the hierarchy pyramid called socialism, the key role in this process was played by alpha males with the warrior psychotype. But the priests were also interested in the success of the latter, as it brought them dividends too, expanding the influence of their gods on neighboring peoples. So, the two types of elites-the warrior and the priestly-merged to become the 'upper class,' leaving their tribesmen with the status of the 'lower class' or common people.

Although wars quite effectively stimulated the creation of a strong vertical power structure, the eusocial instinct also contributed to the process of the masses recognizing the construction of their states as a common good. The concept of patriotism served as an intermediary in cultivating this feeling in them. It is impossible to define patriotism without clarifying the concepts of "nation" and "people." The literature dedicated to their interpretation is vast, but it fails to identify the main difference between the terms under discussion. Meanwhile, the difference is evident. Formally, if the people represent, so to speak, the "lower strata," then the nation is a synthesis of the "lower strata" with the elite-the "upper strata." Substantively, the goals of the people and the elite not only often differed, but were sometimes radically opposed. First and foremost, this difference manifested in their

approach to land. As a result of the predatory wars initiated by the elites, their peasant populations received only "the holes in the bagel." Moreover, it was they who served as cannon fodder in the adventures of their elites. Thus, historically, it turned out that if the people are a symbol of peace and tradition, the elite represents aggression and dynamism. But to mask this obvious conflict of interest, the elites invented the concept of "patriotism," supposedly equally close to both the people and the elite. And the instinct of eusociality greatly contributed to the development of this ambiguous feeling among the people. The specifics of the difference between the people and the elite are particularly evident in the example of Russia.

Up until the War of 1812, its elite was completely uninterested in the interests or feelings of the people, who remained for them 'working cattle,' cannon fodder and merchandise. Only Napoleon's invasion forced the elite to remember their provider in order to deal with the aggressor. The situation changed somewhat with the October Revolution, when the Marxist elite was forced to rely on the people and hear their voice in order to seize power from the old elite. And since the number of new contenders for power significantly decreased during the Civil War, the new elite had to embrace ambitious individuals from the people. However, these individuals very soon forgot their past and quickly adopted the customs of their former masters. Patriotism thus took on new colors, but in the old palette-with a clear dominance of the color of violence and blood.

To inspire the Soviet people to build a new future, it was necessary to instill in them pride in their past. And that past was bleak and humiliating for their fathers and grandfathers. Therefore, Stalin-a Marxist monarch on the Kremlin throne-set about rewriting history in the spirit of M. Lomonosov's propaganda. 'The First Russian University' claimed, in particular, that statehood was brought to Rus not by the Scandinavian Rurik with his retinue. For 'the progenitor of the Slavic people' was Noah's grandson Mosoch. That the Slavs appeared 'many centuries before the destruction of Troy,' were given writing by Alexander the Great and later fought with the Roman Empire.

Why did Lomonosov dispute the obvious? By his own admission, he wanted to demonstrate 'the greatness and antiquity of the Russian people, in NO WAY inferior to Greek and Roman heroes.' Why did Stalin decide to repeat his experiment? For the same best intentions, as he believed. But one state-sanctioned propaganda provokes the birth of many other historical myths. These began to multiply in the USSR at an extraordinary speed. It is not surprising, in this regard, that M. Thatcher, commenting on the repeated rewriting of her country's history by Russian specialists, wondered: "Which past is now fashionable in Russia?" Today, as we see, it is being adjusted to the needs of the special military operation.

This propaganda would not have had such disastrous consequences if Stalin had not singled out the Russian people among all the peoples of the USSR. Before the War, the concept of the "Soviet person" was not divided; it was holistic, meaning all the peoples of the Soviet country were considered equal. This, incidentally, also helped the country to withstand hardships. After the War, the Russian people developed a sense of their own exceptionalism. They began to see themselves as the main victors, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, as pioneers into a bright future. A former serf suddenly imagined himself as the 'older brother,' standing above the 'brothers' from allied, autonomous, and other republics. And he became intoxicated with success-a sense of patriotism based on exaggerating his own merits at the expense of belittling the merits of other peoples. For the first time, this affected not only the elite but the entire people, the entire nation. Patriotism 'swelled' to the status of nationalism. But there is nothing new in this either: many nations have been infected by the disease of such hypertrophied self-esteem. Whereas, in reality, all peoples and nations without exception possess intellectual and creative abilities equally.

Two examples that support what has been said. The first one-the ancient Greeks discovered the most important key for the development of humanity, giving rise to almost all 'high' domains of cultural creativity: philosophy and science, art, sports, etc. Without the Hellenes, the modern

world would not exist. In terms of global cultural leadership, no modern nation compares to them. But how do their direct descendants-modern Greeks-stand out on the global stage? Not in any remarkable way. Has their genetics changed? Not at all, it has remained the same. The circumstances have changed. The second example is related to the Jewish nation, whose diaspora covers almost the entire human oikumene. But nowhere and at no time have they stood out from their surroundings by demonstrating their creative potential. The only exception for them has been the West and even then only in the last 2-3 centuries. Thanks to what? Thanks to the specific intellectual and economic atmosphere inherent in the West.

Therefore, when today someone tries to prove that their race or nation, their faith or culture is superior to all others, they are either engaging in destructive self-deception (like the Germans hypnotized by A. Hitler) or making a fool of themselves. L. Tolstoy understood this well, asserting that patriotic pride is dangerous because its aggression divides nations [8]. The reality of this warning was confirmed in practice during the existence of the USSR. There, following the rise of narrow-minded patriotism among the Russian people, the awareness of the need to preserve their own identity also arose among their "younger brothers." This inevitably clashed with the requirement to remain vassals of the Kremlin. As a result, centrifugal forces emerged and rapidly grew, beginning to destroy the walls of the Union's unity from within. And, as we can see, they succeeded, confirming the writer's fears.

Summary

The concepts of "faith" and "patriotism" are not only extraordinarily multifaceted. They are also very defeated by evolution. In particular, in the past, at the stage of the formation of civilizations, they were a *blessing*. They contributed to the strengthening of internal consolidation in the growing human collectives. But they were also unable to take the next step - to merge humanity into a single family. From unifiers of individuals in limited communities, they have become dissociators of the world community as a whole. Meanwhile, the separation of the world, beliefs

and patriotism strengthen intraspecific natural selection and mental disagreements in it. And this not only does not contribute to our further development, but threatens our very existence. Therefore, in fact, they have exhausted themselves and... have become *evil*. Faith and patriotism have outgrown the age of youth, dressed in short pants of the herd instinct of eusociality. Now they will become a matter of reason and conscience of every independently thinking citizen of our planet.

Since evolution expects from us maturation-both mental and moral. This means that humanity should not only rely on bare instincts of self-preservation, but combine them with reason. For one does not exclude the other; they complement each other. However, returning to the past of traditions of ideological confrontation and primitive patriotism should in no way be forced. Let us repeat: violence, even when applied with the best intentions, only generates more violence. And this process of one violence transitioning into another is endless... unless it is stopped. Foolishness can only be ended with the help of reason, given to humanity for survival through development, not for self-destruction. But socialism either does not use reason at all or uses it wrongly, even to its own detriment.

III. CONCLUSION

The reader may reproach the author for attempting to create a new utopia-a future without ideologies, without patriotism indistinguishable from nationalism, without the state and private property, etc. Such a reproach is unfounded, as it is obvious that, on the one hand, the state and private property are the cornerstones of any highly developed civilization. On the other hand, evolution never rests on its achievements. And we-humanity-are the product of its tireless activity. At present, Homo sapiens is the pinnacle of the phylogenetic pyramid of Earth's organic life. Physiologically and intellectually, he has reached the limits of his natural development. But evolution does not consider its task complete and rest. Its ultimate goal regarding us is to prepare us for the active role of creator-demigod of the Cosmos.

But once it has fulfilled its function in the world of organic life, it moves on to the stage of cultural evolution. From now on, phylogeny must 'grow' the tree of evolution consisting of objects and phenomena generated no longer by organic life, but by human reason and hands. In other words, the time has come to switch from *natural* evolution to *cultural* evolution, and from natural selection to cultural selection. However, concepts such as justice, morality, dignity, etc., do not directly pertain to its creative sphere, since each of us is no more than one among the great multitude of thinking atoms of Nature. Therefore, it leaves this concern about us... to ourselves, endowing us with reason and thus intervening in our affairs only indirectly! Hoping that we will manage this gift wisely: relying on no mystical forces and solving the problems of mutual coexistence of all the people on our planet for the common good. When modern elites speculate with phantoms of inequality of any kind, concocted out of their unscrupulous fingers, the result is what we have today. And, more importantly, what has no future. The chance of its emergence can appear only on the condition of recognizing the principle of universal equality as basic or fundamental in the human community. The process of its breakdown took several millennia. Its restoration on a fundamentally new level cannot take that long. Nowadays, Nature may grant us only a few years to make serious decisions.

However, taking into account that over the course of many generations humanity has not only become accustomed to inequality but also recognized it as fundamental to world civilization, the question arises: is this unusual state of global equality achievable in principle? The answer: it is achievable... provided that the principles of ancient democracy are revived and further developed, taking into account the experience of past centuries and based on the high technologies of the modern age. For only democracy (and not its false imitations) possesses decisive superiority compared to all other forms of civilization. It guarantees continuous development (phylogenesis) by stimulating constant internal contradictions, resolving them fundamentally

without bloodshed, using only peaceful means. Thus, only *democracy* as a political and economic system and *humanism* as a worldview are capable of translating the conflicts of animal natural selection into the framework of civilized sporting competition.

We are aware that reversing a trend that has been forming over centuries and millennia is incredibly difficult. There will be desperate resistance to this not only from interested individuals, groups and classes, but even from entire states. Yet there is no other path toward the future except to transform *Homo sapiens* (the potentially rational human) into *Homo cogitans* (the actively thinking human). More precisely, there is an alternative, but it is a choice between becoming *Formica hominis* (the ant-like human) or turning into the ashes of the Great Crematorium. A mind incapable of understanding its purpose is not worthy of respect and does not deserve the right to exist.

REFERENCES

1. Givishvili G.V. "General Theory of Evolution. The Super-Strong Anthropic Principle as the Basis of the Universe's Existence. Why Does Man Need Reason?" Moscow, 2024. (In Rus.)
2. J. J. Frazer. "The Golden Bough."
3. A. Ryman. "Ordinary Marxism, or How Mordechai Helped Aman Destroy Jews in the 20th Century." <http://www.cirota.ru/forum/view.php?order=asc&subj=22065>. (In Rus.)
4. Givishvili G.V. "Psychology of Property. Theory of Market Evolution." Moscow, 2011. (In Rus.)
5. A.G. Latyshev. "Declassified Lenin." Moscow, 1996. (In Rus.)
6. S.S. Montefiore. "A Monster Named Marx." Daily Mail, United Kingdom, 16.07.2005.
7. I. Kant. "Critique of Pure Reason."
8. L. Tolstoy. "Patriotism or Peace?" 1986, 2011. (In Rus.)