

Comment on the present situation, N10 (October 2002)

Calling things by their proper names

The most prominent event of October 2002 covered by mass media throughout the whole world seized strong attention of the “average” people who live only for the immediate needs and contemplate virtually nothing about the long-term political perspective. No doubt this event was the taking of hostages by the Chechen “rebels” at a musical performance called “Nord-Ost” (based on V.Kaverin’s story “Two captains”). It took place on October 23rd on the premises of the State ball-bearing factory’s former palace of culture, followed by their dramatic rescue on the night of October 25th. The interpretation of how this event interconnects with the current politics in Russia and abroad, expressing the opinion of the USSR’s Internal Predictor and the “Uniting” party was published on October 29 at www.pravda.ru in the “Politics” section under an excessively pretentious header “Russian conceptualists conduct a sensational analysis of Moscow events”. Therefore this comment deals with only those aspects of this event which exceed the narrow boundaries of “current politics”, though they continually manifest themselves within these politics.

1. What they urge to do in their appeals

From the very start of this drama and throughout the consequent week the ‘liberal’ newsmen both in Russia and abroad have been whinging and appealing. They insisted that the Russian authorities should negotiate and come to an agreement with the Chechen side – with the separatists’ leaders, field commanders, armed gangs – whenever they display peaks of activity. And though it is not worded directly, such homilies actually imply that the Russian authorities should conform to all demands of Chechen separatists, and that after it is done the war for control over the Chechen territory would cease by itself; peace would restore in Russia, and some time later, after Russia would apologise to “freedom-loving” Ichkeria and reimburse for all the damage inflicted in the course of war, Russia and Ichkeria would become good neighbours.

Well, only a committed enemy of Russia or a complete imbecile can agree with such position. Also, only a convinced enemy of Russia or a complete imbecile could go urging of the government to implement a policy of this sort.

That is why it appears necessary to clarify the sources and reasons of current political events, and look into where they lead to.

In every type of society there are people who are dissatisfied with their social life. Those dissatisfied get together and form a multifaceted opposition to the ruling regime. At a certain stage the opposition proceeds from thoughts to words, from words to actions, and depending on its' morals and the depth of their understanding, start effecting pressure upon the regime using available means. If their morals are bad and minds are feeble the opposition comes down to blackmailing the regime, one of the ways of which is terror against "just anyone from the crowd", i.e. the "average" people. The majority of the "average" people live only in and for the present day, they wouldn't and cannot think about the consequences of the actions of each one of them and what effect their actions could bring to the state policies. That is why in the times of terror outbursts, guided by their own fears they are ready to start recirculating pressure upon the government and sabotage its policy¹. Then – if the government turns ruthlessly on terrorism – they would support the government in its deterioration into a fascist dictatorship as the result of the ruthless if deliberate campaign of eliminating real and imaginary terrorists, their accomplices and sympathisers.

That is why if control over Chechnya were to be handed over to those who covet it now, then once they take it – provided that Chechen diaspora continues its' existence throughout the rest of Russia - such principal policies of the Russian government targeted at serving those who covet control over Chechnya and their associates would inevitably cause the Chechen yoke to fall upon Russia. Yet this is impossible, as in Russia there are other separatists who would try, seeing that the central government loses influence, to bite off a part of power, which they alledge their share. This is what happened when the USSR broke apart, consequently driving most people's lives for the worse, making them lose confidence in the nearest future. And there are also advocates of united and multinational Russia, who also are not sitting around twiddling their thumbs, waiting for a new "master" to hold up his bum for them to kiss it.

The option of Ichkeria's separation into an independent state, secured by the control of the international forces (similar to what was done in Kosovo at the time of

¹ The same happened in the incident of hostage-taking at the "Nord-Ost" performance – the hostages' relatives carelessly agreed to the demands of the terrorists without thinking about the future of Russia – their motherland – and went on a march carrying slogans and shouting demands that expressed the opinion of power-greedy Chechen clan bosses. Hence the government in declaring that all meetings and manifestations unapproved by appropriate authorities will be banned acted in a democratic way because it really was protecting the future of Russian people from even more horrible afflictions.

dividing Yugoslavia and Serbia) was also put forward in one of radio “Freedom”’s broadcasts on October 29, 2002. But this option would also be a step forward along the global policy of disintegrating Russia, which would bring affliction and suffering to the peoples of Russia.

Another possible option of how the Russian government could deal with Chechnya is as follows: if during a police raid a “zindan” (a ground hole - prison for slaves) is detected near the household of a Chechen family, each and every member of this family must be shot right at the spot without the right to trial in court or legal investigation. One person should be shot out of every neighbouring house on the charges of failure to notify the authorities that their neighbours are engaged in slave-owning. If the “zindan” was used by all villagers collectively, then all the people of the village are to be executed, with the exception of children under 3 years of age and those families whose members had notified the authorities about the existence of the “zindan” in the village. Further, if a Chechen national resides in Russia and travels around without the Department of Internal Affairs (MVD) registration, he is put into a concentration camp to stay there until the situation in the country quiets down.

The scenario of Russia breaking apart would satisfy many of the politicians and “average” people in both CIS states and the West, while the option of enforcing civil order based on the principle “you got a zindan – everyone is executed immediately; you live in Russia without registration and migration reports to the MVD – you stay in a concentration camp until the situation quiets down” would meet hypocritical condemnation abroad. And though there are organisational and military means to implement this option it would be detrimental for the whole of Russia, and not only for Chechens both for those living in Chechnya and those residing in the rest of Russia.

So if the government acts in the interests of the peoples of Russia it has no right to give in to the negotiations with the leaders of the mafia striving for control over Chechnya and to the affected citizens acting on their bidding by complying with all their demands. It equally has no right to limit its Chechen policy to a ruthless punitive operation that leaves a chance of survival only to grovellers and rascals who stay in their hide-outs until unfolding History gives them another opportunity to start a “liberating” war. Yet for the policies to be effective, and stay clear of the both unacceptable options, the Russian government and the people of Russia will have to understand the essence of the Russian-Chechen relationship problem.

2. The essence of the Russian-Chechen relationship problem

First of all one should not think that Chechnya came to be a part of the Russian Empire solely as a consequence of the Tsarist policy of conquest. The Russian tsarism simply turned out to be more capable of conquering the Caucasus than Turkey, Iran or Great Britain. At the time prior to “subduing the highland peoples of the Caucasus” those peoples and the Russian society were on different stages of social development:

- The highlanders lived within a tribal social system, which permitted slave-owning. It was maintained not only by enslaving paupers from among their own people but also through taking captives from the neighbouring territories including the territory of the Russian Empire. The idea of the kidnapping was getting a ransom or turning humans into slaves.
- Russia lived within a system of classes and castes, which also included slave-owning in the form of serfdom.

At the same time, the highlanders’ social system was quite steady while the system of classes and castes in the Empire was undergoing a deep crisis that Russia needed to overcome in order to move toward declaring all her people to be of equal dignity. But even after “subduing the Caucasus” the problem of highlanders systematic kidnapping for ransom or slavery remained unresolved. The captures continued, and though the imperial state system helped to restrict this customary practice, the police authorities were incapable of eliminating it completely and therefore often preferred to shut their eyes on such incidents.

Whether the “liberals” like it or not the establishing of the Soviet regime was aimed not at replacement of one form of human exploitation by another form but at eliminating such exploitation and those conditions that might help to restore the system when someone goes parasitic on the lives and labour of others.

Some highlanders supported this Idea of Civilizational Build-Up, some remained loyal to the customs of their ancestors. This slave-owning tradition was the source of their resistance to the Soviet government in the pre-WWII years which later developed into collaboration of some of the tribal leaders with Hitler’s troops while a large part of their people was indifferent or acquiescent, continuing to stick to the norms of tribal ethics that conflicted with the Soviet state policies.

In order to destroy the slavery-bound tribal structures, and not for other reasons a part of the highland peoples was removed from their historic homeland in 1944. Due to the new life conditions of the “special migrants” in their new homeland their customary tribal way of life was disrupted. But it was not a genocide of the whole people – as the

abstractionist “humanists” or representatives of “the repressed people” might be yelling: **for if it had been a genocide, there would have been no one to yell and lament half a century after it had taken place.**

In the new life conditions, in a different ethnic environment “special migrants” obtained cultural skills which had not been characteristic of them before. Basically, it was a renewal of an ancient Russian practice: captured steppe nomads were taken into the heart of the Russian territory, where they were given land and in a generation or two they turned into Russians, bringing into the multinational Russian culture something of their own, something viable in a community of people with different backgrounds united by common culture.

But Nikita Khrushchev put an end to this process before it had reached a point of no return. In the post-Stalin era the regime of the USSR became an antisocialist one, parasitic on the country’s peoples. Therefore it was forced to play the hypocrisy games, pretending to build a society of justice and freedom where there was no place for a man exploiting another man. In accord with the hypocritical policies by the central regime the leaders of the highlanders who had returned to their historic motherland gradually went back to their custom of taking Soviet citizens as prisoners in order to enslave them or get ransom while the ruling regime pretended that in a socialist society such things could not and did not happen. That is exactly why in the course of the current anti-terrorist operation we now and then hear news of slaves rescued in Chechnya and Ingushetia who had been taken prisoners as far back as the 80’s. Is there any accounting for those people who had been turned into slaves and were killed for resistance or died in slavery during the past 20 years?

On the other hand in the 1960-80s the Gosplan (State planning agency) of the USSR and the Gosplans of the Soviet republics were running the USSR’s economy and industry in such a way that many areas of the Caucasus and Middle Asia, which that later turned into “turmoil spots”, faced hidden unemployment. It contributed to the relatively high by Soviet standards local welfare, resulting from good natural resources and geographical status as well as from regional consumer basket price advantages and the governmental policy on taxes, subsidies and investments. Excessful vacant time along with low cultural level created favourable conditions for local people to get involved into criminal activities, especially for representatives of those peoples that kept intact the foundations of their tribal social structure. This tribalism serves today as an organisational basis for mafias all over the world.

If one forgets about this factor and is appalled at hearing many people, especially average people, say directly that **organized** crime in Russia has a clear ethnic slant, one is either a fool or is trying to deliberately obscure the essence of the problem: *these criminal statistics prove that ethnic criminal communities follow the tribal way of life*. This important factor brings about a significant conclusion for further discourse:

All actions taken by police authorities according to legislation of a European or American type - based on a belief that an individual acts independently and takes all responsibility for committed crime - will be always and by far ineffective against criminals who use the principles of clan-type organisation where many people are made companions in one crime². Legislation should be organised in such a way that if this fact is discovered, charges must be brought not only against the juniors of the clan hierarchy but also against the seniors. In European or American legal practices the seniors remain above suspicion or beyond the reach of police authorities due to absence of witnesses (intimidated or murdered by their order) or inconsistency between reality and the legal system. The charges against the seniors must be more serious.

It was a historical reality that supporters of the Idea of Civilizational Build-Up without anyone being parasitic on life and labour of others in the 1980s USSR were not a self-organising social force, unlike the opponents of socialism. These supporters believed to the betrayers of the Idea who emerged as leaders of the Communist Party and the country after the years known as “ottepel” (political thaw) and “zastoï” (stagnation). That is why after the traitors deserted and abandoned their posts, state structures in all regions of the USSR were seized by political forces that were *self-organised on this or that cultural basis*. The variety in *such cultural bases of self-organisation* among the opponents to society without human exploitation defined the final pattern of the USSR’s splitting up into a multitude of “souvenir” states.

Accordingly, when one correlates the problem of Russian-Chechen relationship with the Idea of Civilizational Build-Up without anyone being parasitic on life and labour of others, particularly without parasitism openly or covertly proclaimed as the foundation of the country’s life, one can clearly see that the Russian-Chechen conflict is a conflict between the two “elites” on the disputed “best” methods of slavery.

The Kremlin’s side. The “democratisers” of Russia who have seized the Kremlin, advocate a “highly civilised” global kind of slavery, exercised by means of a

² The difference between multinational mafias and criminal communities that are ethnically homogeneous lies only in that multinational mafias (when treated in terms of tribal laws) act in the principle of “adoption” while ethnically homogeneous mafias act in the principle of blood relation or spiritual kindred among the fellow tribesmen.

monopoly on usury held by Jewish clans in all countries. Loan interest exceeds the growth rate of social labour productivity, generates an increase of prices that outrun production growth, devalues assets and savings, creates a debt that nobody has a chance to pay. Managing the volume, distribution and clearing off of those debts by means of stock exchange quotations system, bank-rates and insurance rates the clans that control the global financial system hold everyone else captive. This very concept of slavery was the reason for murdering Ceausescu in Romania (Romania had no debts by the time when Ceausescu's regime was overthrown) and assigning a 200% per year interest rate in Russia, which was done in the times of Gaidar, Livshits and Chernomyrdin and had a devastating effect on Russia's science and industry.

Chechnya's side. "Freedom-loving" Chechen elders who used general Djohar Dudajev and company as a cover-up were not freedom-loving in reality. When they sensed the government's weakness (as far back as the Soviet times) robbing transit trains became almost a nation-wide business employing a fairly large part of the autonomy's population. Covert unemployment created by the USSR's Gosplan some time before helped this business to get started and flourish. Taking captives for enslaving them or getting ransom started to happen more often as the government composed of the "perestroika"-era traitors remained passive. But when the Chechen leaders faced a demand from the Kremlin "democratisers" to pay their debts on equal terms with other Russian citizens, Chechnya started along the separatist line.

To make a long story short, the Kremlin followed the concept of "civilised cultured slavery" exercised by means of financial and usurious yoke. And the Chechen "pahanat" (leaders with criminal background) followed the primitive concept of slavery exercised by means of brutal force (zindans, iron collars and manacles, intimidation, mutilation and killing slaves). And both sides of the conflict are unjust in their devotion to slavery.

A conclusion follows: Chechnya is right in putting up resistance to the regime of financial and usurious slavery that the Kremlin is seeking to establish; the Kremlin is right in putting down an attempt to establish a primitive society with slave-owning system and to form a separate slavery state equipped with modern technical means on the territory of Russia.

It also follows that lord Judd, the European parliament and other foreign "supporters" of Chechen separatists are either scoundrels and hypocrites or idiots. The same goes to those inside Russia who are bent on protecting the "human rights" of Chechens presumably violated by federal troops, advocate withdrawing federal troops

and granting “independence” to “Ichkeria”. But it is fair that the politicians and common people of Russia who are sure that the Russian government is the only just party who has proved its case in this conflict and that its’ local representatives thus enjoy the “privilege” for unlawful actions and bear no responsibility for abuse of state power and armed force, - in the face of people and God - are no less hypocrites.

If both sides keep their current vision and ambitions to exercise the “pseudo-right” of slavery in the conflict for control over Chechnya between the Kremlin and the Chechen tribal “elite” will find the task insoluble. Being controlled from outside Russia the conflict can evolve to the detriment of both sides as long as the “world backstage” needs or until it, unless it is cut off from controlling this process.

3. Jihad

Michael Leontjev (one of “Odnako” program’s hosts on ORT channel) concluded his comment on hostage-taking at the “Nord-Ost” performance and extermination of terrorists with a folly: “For every Jihad there is Russian spetsnaz”.

“Jihad” means “holy war” when translated from the Arabic. Essentially it means that the followers of God’s kingdom upon Earth are forced to defend themselves, their families and allies because murder is a sin. But murder is a smaller sin than impiety brought in openly or indirectly by the enemies of those who forcedly resorted to Jihad.³

But what is going on in Chechnya is not Jihad. It is a pseudo-Jihad.

If one turns to the history of how one of the world’s regional civilisations developed its culture on the basis of Koran’s revelation one notices that before the prophet Muhammad started a Jihad he spent ten years preaching peacefully. During that time:

- On the one hand, all opponents of Muhammad and his first followers had every chance of getting to know the revelation of Koran, delving into its meaning and thinking about their personal attitude to the Revelation and their personal relationship to God (this is what *religion* actually is). As a result some of them adopted Islam according to their personal understanding of good and evil, benefits to the community.

³ On the problem of Islam’s attitude to the world see the Koran, sura 2:212.

- On the other hand, first Muslims themselves were firm in enduring everything their opponents used against them – conspiracy and violence amounting to murders including attempts to assassinate Muhammad himself, hunger and economic genocide caused by a trade boycott organised by the clan leaders of Islam’s opponents.

And only after that did they start the Jihad which resulted in the complete defeat of their enemy. Taking precedent into consideration had Chechnya started a true Jihad then Chechen leaders themselves would have put an end to the train-robbing “business”. The same goes to the issue of taking hostages for ransom or slavery.

In this case Chechnya would not be striving for “independent statehood” and at the same time commit a great many crimes. Chechen deputies in the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation (or in the Duma if this historic scenario would include the fall of the Supreme Soviet as well) would build their speeches on ethic and philosophical principles of the Koran and would try to point out a way to solve the problems of multinational Russia in concord with God’ will. Our knowledge of the Koran’s texts even in Russian translations, our understanding of the present events, our experience of exchanging views with people of different social strata suggest that if this were the case the reformers and democratisers would quickly lose their air of intellectuals and freedom-lovers in many people’s opinion, because it would then come to light that by their idle talk they hush up an international fascist dictatorship of usurers coming into being and their legislative activity is aimed at it.

Islam as a teaching of human freedom inside God’s will. It condemns slavery no matter what means are used to exercise it⁴ and especially does not tolerate the power of usurers over economy and social life. Despite this we did not witness events, when Chechen representatives in Duma would fight against this kind of enslavement.

It was the course of history that the Koran was revealed to people in the times when slavery was in the order of things and the mighty of this world preferred to misuse Koranic texts in their interpretation of life, justifying slavery by pettyfogging reference to the Koran. Acting contrary to the slave-owning custom of the Islam that existed in the *historically real Islam* one of the founders of the Muslim civilisation, Muhammad’s relative and fellow-fighter - Ali, bought slaves as was customary in those times, taught them the Koran getting them to know Islam and in a year freed them and gave them enough money to live independently in a Muslim society and return to their homeland

as free people. Many of those released slaves upon returning to their home started teaching Islam to their peoples.

Certainly the Chechen leaders in the 11 years that passed since the break-up of the Soviet Union (this is a longer period than the one preceding the Jihad started by Muhammad) managed to get many people bowing to a prayer rug five times a day. Muhammad said, “The prayer gives to the servant of God⁵ only what he has understood from it”.

One must admit that getting someone to nonsensically bow to a prayer rug as a part of an obscure ritual is one thing, and teaching a man to live a religious life in the course of God’s will and in peace with other people and the Universe is somewhat different.

And every Russian citizen when recollecting those thousands people reported missing who were actually turned into slavery and those of their countrymen who died in acts of terror, would hardly recollect a single person whom the Chechens did convert in true Islam, so that this person by all his life would act as a credible example of a righteous man of God. Although there are several examples of people converted into the *historically real type of Islam*, the type of thoughtless worshipping - and supporters of usurious slavery immediately grabbed the opportunity, turning that fact to their advantage in the movie “Musulmanin” (“The Muslim”).

The Chechen leaders had succeeded in getting people to thoughtlessly bow to a rug and used that as a basis to create robot-like kamikazes to exercise power against the will of God but in His name. This message could be read in the face of Movsar Barayev when he was interviewed for the last time in the bearing factory’s palace of culture: a listless stare shunning the camera; a dependant look befitting a zombie who is not speaking on his own, who is acting on orders transmitted over the telephone and who is not aware of what he is doing, because even his masters had not been trusted the secret

⁴ If someone thinks it is not so one is simply prejudiced or ignorant. And even if one thinks so having read the Koran it means that he has managed to bring one’s own prejudices into interpreting the Koran’s text.

⁵ The servant of God does not mean a “slave of God”. The Russian word “rab” lost the meaning of “rabotnik” (“abourer”) and acquired the meaning of “slave”, “property”, “thing” in the mob-“elitist” culture.

One can understand that Muhammad’s words should be interpreted in the meaning of man’s labour in concord with God’s will and not in the meaning of slavery brought upon people under the guise of religion from the Koran. Sura 26 contains a reproach from Above sent to earthly rulers which indicates a difference between God’s guidance of the man who is free to choose and the power of the mighty of this world: “130. When you rule, you rule tyrants”.

of the global psycho-Trotskyist scenario in which all of them are being used without knowing it. All this and the implementation of God's will is incompatible.

That is why those who think that the "spetsnaz" had put a bottle of cognac into Barayev's dead hand before video-taping his body in order to defile the true warriors of Jihad in the opinion of Muslims - are wrong. First, the body lay exactly where Barayev met his death, which is proved by the pool of blood which the body lay in. And a theatre bar is not a key defence position and not the best place for arranging headquarters and commanding the battle, so even if he were *a stray Muslim warrior* he had nothing to do in that bar. Second, those led by God usually achieve more than they have expected and the "guerrillas" got into a mess and failed, discrediting all Muslims as potential terrorists and their accomplices in the opinion of others.

And the main thing: the above-mentioned incident exposed to every man capable of thinking in concord with his consciousness, that the Chechen attempt to build a society with independent statehood in which slavery is legalised has degenerated into gangsterism and is contrary to the spirit of Islam; and that true Jihad was fought by the spetsnaz who put an end to the gangsterism of pseudo-Muslims brought up by the Chechen leaders during the last decade.⁶ The use of special means in the course of the operation, which brought about casualties among the hostages can not be put at fault to those in-charge of the operation. It was successful in not giving the kamikaze-terrorists the chance to blow everything up, for everyone would have died in this case. And this is God's gift to Russia, given in advance for her future, in order that she could quietly get rid of all types of slavery and thereby solve the Russian-Chechen relationship problem.

Attempting to solve the Russian-Chechen relationship problem along with building the so-called "civil society" based on the Western concept of "human rights" in Russia is hopeless, as it is a continuation of the conflict between the two systems of slavery:

- **The primitive tribal system based on brutal force which is exercised by the Chechen "pahanat" and**
- **The "highly civilised" one based on the Jewish supragovernment corporate/mafia monopoly on usury, stock exchange quotations, copyright which controls the Western world.**

Hakamada, Nemtsov, Yavlinski and other politicians of the liberal front may not understand it, but they cannot help sensing it. That is why the actual state of things

pushes their interests towards concluding a “voluntary” agreement with the Chechen “pahanat” (which would be fatal for the future of people in Chechnya and the rest of Russia) on isolating “Ichkerya” into a separate state, because it leaves them a chance to keep the control over Russia in the hands of their “backstage” masters.

Accordingly, the society needs an alternative – a level of morals and awareness alternative to the multi-faceted slavery of mob “elitism”.

4. Every people has a government slightly better than it could have been

This statement reflected itself in the way the Russian government reacted to the taking of hostages: under a worse government everything could have been blasted; under a much worse government all demands of terrorists would have been satisfied and Russia would start falling apart, and in Chechnya those Chechens who support unity and progress of multinational Russia would be subject to oppression. We have no right to betray the Chechens once more, like Yeltsin kept doing since 1991. He paved road for the “popular front” to power in Chechnya in revenge for the Chechen government having supported the GKChP (State Emergency Committee) (i.e. having stood up to save of the Soviet Union, while brainless “average” Muscovites led to power the anti-national clique represented by Boris Yeltsin). We must defend these Chechens even if this group of people does not constitute a majority in today’s Chechnya.

But the Russian government could be better: then the terrorists would have been intercepted at an early stage of preparation, and in this course of events the common people would have learned about an attempt to conduct an act of terror in some twenty years after when the records of the security services would have been unclassified.

Therefore the following question is a crucial one:

What is it necessary to do now, so that to have a better government tomorrow?

The “average” man is sure that he is a “small person” and that “nothing really depends on him”. In fact without even knowing it he asks of the government to have the omnipotence of God and of God to be the “Allmighty cop”. The “average” man is afraid if life conditions deteriorate, which comes in with the government’s inability to act, proceeds from inadequate training of the officials, their ignorance, mistakes, corruption.

⁶ In other words if Gorbachev and his clique had not betrayed the Idea these and other Chechen pseudo-shahids both dead and alive could have become rather decent citizens of the USSR, realising themselves in another quality: workers, farmers, scientists, cultural worker etc.

But he does not want to admit that every official was once a child, a teenager, a young person, who was taught at home, in a kindergarten, at school, university and at his place of work and that officials are mostly “small persons” just like himself. Exceptions from this rule both among officials and among teachers and mentors are rare in both the past (e.g. the tsar’s family) and the present.

In other words the government is inseparable from the society, it is the flesh of the society’s flesh. And hence it cannot be better than the society itself. But a society is represented by a wide range of “statistics” of the mentalities, therefore in every epoch the government is slightly better than the society deserves by its’ worst performers. But the government could also be somewhat better than it de facto is if the multitude of “average” people would stop waiting and asking of the existing government something it just cannot fulfil and would start brining up the future governments so that they could fulfil their hopes for a better future. But it is only one side of the matter.

The other side of the matter is that the government (not the whole of it but its *unselfish well-wishing part*) can implement only what appears to be backed up by resources of the society under control: physical resources and “nonmaterial” ones – morals and ethics, people’s knowledge and skills, their creative potential.

What kind of fight against corruption can there be if the “average” man himself keeps looking for someone to bribe (if he has money) in order to solve his own problems at the expense of other citizens or of his homeland at large and always breaching the law? What claims can one make on the quality of the Russian cars if in his own profession the “average” man is even less diligent and skilful than the personnel at VAZ? What claims can one make on incompetence of officials when there are scarcely a few people among the average citizens who at least are ready to acquire the necessary for state management knowledge and skills(if they don’t have them now) that would enable them to substitute those officials unfit for the civil service or, alternatively, to bring up a new generation of “officials” who would enter the government and make the righteous expectations of the majority come to life?

Since the times of Peter the Great and probably even earlier times than that Russia has been experiencing constant shortage of officials to staff her State machine, whose morals and professional skills would satisfy both the needs of their contemporaries and the need to ensure a perspective of social development. This means that every man should study his profession *properly* (and stop pretending to study, pretending to work), and to do that he needs to learn how to be a *proper* human and stop pretending to be a

man while psychologically remaining an impudent talkative ape trained by civilisation and programmed by television.

Today the situation is similar to that following the civil war of the past century in Russia, when due to the efforts of true bolsheviks the Russian multinational society was not just undergoing a “cultural revolution” but a total transformation through introducing the working majority to reading and writing and thereby introducing them to the cultural heritage of the civilisation. In the beginning of the XXI century Russia is also facing a necessity to undergo a new cultural transformation but this time it should be a magnificent one, a one that has never been seen before by the peoples of the Earth. Its point is an *ethical transformation* made possible only if the adherence to the authority of scriptures and leaders gives way to a culture of morality, feelings and thinking, which will provide to everyone vast possibilities to become a human being. And this process has already begun in Russia.

For more than a decade the Concept of Social Security (CSS), based on dialectics and the Sufficiently Common Theory of Control (SCTC), is being developed in our country by efforts of many volunteers. That is why in our society there should be no dependant attitudes like: when on earth does the government stop teaching nonsense at schools and universities and start teaching the Truth? Neither the Ministry of Education, nor the multitude of its officials are capable to do it, because they are “average” people just like others. That is why in several universities of Russia SCTC is delivered as an optional course by the initiative of lecturers and heads of universities themselves. The society should understand that the government even by default does not hamper now the activity leading to an ethic transformation of future generations and a part of our contemporaries. If this activity is more actively supported by the society itself, if the initiative is manifested more clearly it would become the beginning of bringing up a government which the people would be happy with.

But to achieve it one must stop watching every rouble or buck, stop hunting them. One must start learning to believe to God by Life and not to substitute the true *religion* by believing in the authority of Scriptures, dogma and priests. Learn not to give in to fears, including the fear of hell, and not to succumb to desires, including the selfish craving for Paradise that would be defiled by most people if they get there unchanged just like they have defiled the Earth. And at the same time one must not turn into a senseless and thoughtless zombie that does follow the desires and fears just because he does not feel or want anything. One must learn to engage in a meaningful dialogue with God. One must learn to feel and think in order to be God’s co-creator in concord with

his omnipotence. One must learn to tell the Truth from deliberate lies and sincere mistakes. One must learn to communicate with other people and beings, so that they would elicit from your word the same meaning that you wanted to get over to them and would not sincerely ascribe to your words or actions a meaning you have not implied. One must learn to communicate with other people and beings without putting your own delusions in place of their actual qualities. One must learn to keep making the Truth a reality in every circumstance that God may send to you.

Only in the course of this policies which can be implemented by “big” and “small” persons alike the Russian-Chechen relationship problem would vanish as if all by itself. So will all the other problems. Yet, actually they would not solve “by themselves”, nor by “police actions” of the state or God, but by the *common* effort of the *common* people, who might make mistakes but who sincerely wish to build God’s Kingdom on Earth – right here and now, and forever.

Internal Predictor of the USSR.

30 October – 1 November