
"About current moment", # 1 (97), January 2011

"De-Stalinization": dead souls at work...

The continued coverage of the issues raised in the CM-3 (96) in December 2010.

12 October, the Secretary of the Union of Journalists of Russian Federation Mikhail Alexandrovich Fedotov (lawyer, "human rights activist", the Minister of Press and Information of the RF in 1992 and 1993) by the decree of the President of the RF was appointed to the positions of the Presidential Adviser and Chairman of the Presidential Council for assisting the development of Civil Society institutions and Human Rights.

The task of "de-Stalinization of public consciousness"¹, about which M.A. Fedotov spoke in one of his first interviews after appointment to the mentioned positions, was elevated by mass media to the rank of the main task M.A. Fedotov is going to solve. However, M.A. Fedotov himself in the interview to the radio station "Vesti FM" (<http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=399432>) refuted this view, naming modernization of the Russian society as the main task, "de-Stalinization of public consciousness" he put on the third place in the list of individual tasks, in which on the first place he put judicial reform, and on the second – protection of children. Nevertheless, mass media has firmly associated his name with the theme of "de-Stalinization" and with upcoming activities of the Presidential Council of Human Rights, which M.A. Fedotov has headed.

On December 21, 2010 the Grani.ru website reported:

“On November 25 Fedotov has declared that the first meeting of the Presidential Council on Human Rights in the new composition will be devoted to de-Stalinization. According to Fedotov, human rights activists will demand to completely open the Soviet archives and to carry out trial on totalitarianism. The meeting of the President Medvedev with the new composition of the Council is scheduled for mid-January.

According to Council member Sergei Karaganov, there will be no word "de-Stalinization" in the agenda of the January's meeting, the subject is stated more broadly – about national reconciliation and the memory of the victims of the totalitarian regime. The broad theme was declared in order to not reduce everything to the Secretary General's cult of personality and to emphasize, that it is about overcoming the remnants of the past by the nation, explained Karaganov.

The Presidential Council and the Human Rights Centre "Memorial" has developed a draft of the Federal Program for the perpetuation of the memory of the victims of repression, consisting of the 4 blocks. The first – full declassification of the Soviet archives. It is proposed to remove the security classification from all the Soviet documents of the pre-perestroika period and to simplify the procedure of accessing departmental archives, investigative documents, archives of Cheka, State Political Directorate, All-Union Communist Party (bolsheviks), encrypted telegrams, that came from places to the central office, personal files of citizens.

¹ Formulation of the task in such a way – THIS is the path to the predictable failure of the regime, in part because that "public consciousness" is one of the marxism's fictions, non-existent in nature, because consciousness is always individual.

The second block relates to memorialization – searching camp burials, installation of monuments, creating full-scale museum exhibitions. The third block – the social protection of victims from reprisals. Them, according to the "Memorial", about 800 000 people – prisoners of camps and their children. By law they are entitled to monthly compensation, but now it is entrusted to regional authorities. Human rights activists offered to return prisoners the Federal guarantees of payments, and raise payments to the survived prisoners of camps (about 30 000 people) and allot to them natural benefits – for example, free medicine.

The fourth requirement of the Council is to give political and legal assessment of the crimes of totalitarianism. One option may be a Presidential decree with a clear list of crimes and stating the inadmissibility of glorification of stalinism².

The Council proposes also the trial of the regime's crimes. "We are talking not even about the crimes of specific people, — explained the member of the Council Sergei Krivenko. — It is necessary to evaluate from the legal point of view the block of regulatory documents: about collectivization, about Katyn, about big terror". **The verdict on the facts of extermination of entire populations, according to the Council, should be made by the Supreme or Constitutional court.**

In the government the project of the Presidential Council evaluate cautiously. "The history of the country must not be erased. One of our priorities — the struggle against attempts to distort history", said Prime Minister's Press Secretary Dmitry Peskov.

In 2009, in the Day of memory of victims of repression Dmitry Medvedev said, that justification of Stalinist repression under the guise of restoring historical justice is unacceptable. Medvedev noted that "no development of the country, none of its successes, ambitions can not be achieved at the cost of human grief and losses". "October 30 is the Day of remembrance of the millions of maimed destinies. About the people who were shot without trial and without investigation, about people sent to labour camps and exile, deprived of civil rights because of the "wrong" job or the notorious "social origin". The stigma of the enemies of the people and their supporters then laid down on entire families", — President said.

"It is impossible to imagine the scale of terror, from which suffered all the peoples of the country, — he added. — It peaked in 1937-1938. "The Volga river of people's grief", Alexander Solzhenitsyn was calling this endless "stream" of repressed at that time. During twenty years before the war entire stratum and classes of our people were exterminated. The cossacks class was virtually liquidated. The peasantry was "dispossessed" and drained. Intelligentsia, workers, and military were exposed to political persecution. Representatives of absolutely all religious confessions were exposed to persecution".

"We pay much attention to struggle against falsification of our history. And for some reason we often consider, that it is all only about the inadmissibility of revision of the results of the Great Patriotic War. But it is equally important to avoid under the guise of restoring historical justice the justification of those, who were exterminating own people", — Medvedev said" (<http://grani.ru/Society/History/m.184701.html>).

Those are the intentions for the future of the bourgeois-liberal public and statesmen. However, before turning to the consideration of the prospects of "de-Stalinization", which became the main ideological problem of state power in the post-Soviet Rusziony, refer to history and literature to understand the spirit of the policy: the imperial before 1917, Stalin's, rusziony's of our days.

In Russian history there are two literary characters and one historical figure, whose sociological views, being powerful over one or another segments of the collective unconscious, had largely

² This is the expression of the intention of "human rights" activists to induce the President to commit yet another act of legal nihilism, because such a Presidential decree would be contrary to article 13.2 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation: No ideology may be established as state or obligatory.

That is, if such a decree is issued, praise to A.D. Sakharov and his crowd is not forbidden, (and this is a certain ideologeme), but to remember the achievements of the Soviet people under the leadership of J.V. Stalin and to pay tribute to Stalin as the leader and man – would be a violation of the Presidential decree with all the ensuing of this fact legal consequences.

In our opinion, in sociology must be no taboo topics and opinions, but sociological science and society must overcome false and erroneous opinions. Trying to do it through legislation and fulfilling law enforcement practices – means to condemn society for the recurrence of mistakes and delusions.

“De-Stalinization”: dead souls at work...

determined the events of the past and the prospects of Russia in XXI century. These are the Grand Inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky, the Great Combinator of Ilya Ilf and Yevgeny Petrov and the Pskov's Spaso-Eleazar monastery's monk Filofey (also spelled as Philotheos; years of life approximately: 1465-1542), the first ideologist of the doctrine "Moscow — the Third Rome".

Most heard about the Grand Inquisitor of Dostoyevsky, but doesn't know the details, while solitary intellectuals in their studies address this subject almost from the time of the publication of "The Brothers Karamazov". Almost everyone knows about Great Combinator, but for political analysts and social philosophers he is not interesting, although he is *the hero and the role model for millions*. And the doctrine "Moscow — the Third Rome" attracts interest of some politicians and the politically active part of the population each time, when an alternative conception come to a standstill during tries to implement it in life in Russia.

"Legend of the Grand Inquisitor" was included by Dostoyevsky into the novel "The Brothers Karamazov". By plot, the Grand Inquisitor appeals to Christ, taken by him into custody, who again *peacefully* appear in flesh among the people of Seville in the XVI century:

"Judge Thyself who was right — Thou or he who questioned Thee then? Remember the first question; its meaning, in other words, was this: "Thou wouldst go into the world, and art going with empty hands, with some promise of freedom which men in their simplicity and their natural unruliness cannot even understand, which they fear and dread — for nothing has ever been more insupportable for a man and a human society than freedom. But seest Thou these stones in this parched and barren wilderness? Turn them into bread, and mankind will run after Thee like a flock of sheep, grateful and obedient, though for ever trembling, lest Thou withdraw Thy hand and deny them Thy bread." But Thou wouldst not deprive man of freedom and didst reject the offer, thinking, what is that freedom worth if obedience is bought with bread? Thou didst reply that man lives not by bread alone. But dost Thou know that for the sake of that earthly bread the spirit of the earth will rise up against Thee and will strive with Thee and overcome Thee, and all will follow him, crying, "Who can compare with this beast? He has given us fire from heaven!" Dost Thou know that the ages will pass, and humanity will proclaim by the lips of their sages that there is no crime, and therefore no sin; there is only hunger? "Feed men, and then ask of them virtue!" that's what they'll write on the banner, which they will raise against Thee, and with which they will destroy Thy temple. Where Thy temple stood will rise a new building; the terrible tower of Babel will be built again, and though, like the one of old, it will not be finished, yet Thou mightest have prevented that new tower and have cut short the sufferings of men for a thousand years; for they will come back to us after a thousand years of agony with their tower. They will seek us again, hidden underground in the catacombs, for we shall be again persecuted and tortured. They will find us and cry to us, "Feed us, for those who have promised us fire from heaven haven't given it!" And then we shall finish building their tower, for he finishes the building who feeds them. And we alone shall feed them in Thy name, **declaring falsely that it is in Thy name** (marked by us during cite). Oh, never, never can they feed themselves without us! No science will give them bread so long as they remain free. In the end they will lay their freedom at our feet, and say to us, "Make us your slaves, but feed us." They will understand themselves, at last, that freedom and bread enough for all are inconceivable together, for never, never will they be able to share between them! They will be convinced, too, that they can never be free, for they are weak, vicious, worthless, and rebellious. Thou didst promise them the bread of Heaven, but, I repeat again, can it compare with earthly bread in the eyes of the weak, ever sinful and ignoble race of man? And if for the sake of the bread of Heaven thousands shall follow Thee, what is to become of the millions and tens of thousands of millions of creatures who will not have the strength to forego the earthly bread for the sake of the heavenly? Or dost Thou care only for the tens of thousands of the great and strong, while the millions, numerous as the sands of the sea, who are weak but love Thee, must exist only for the sake of the great and strong? No, we care for the weak too. They are sinful and rebellious, but in the end they too will become obedient. They will marvel at us and look on us as gods, because we are ready to endure the freedom which they have found so dreadful and to rule over them — so awful it will seem to them to be free. But we shall tell them that we are Thy servants and rule them in Thy name. We shall deceive them again, for we will not let Thee come to us again. That deception will be our suffering, for we shall be forced to lie. This is the significance of the first question in the

wilderness, and this is what Thou hast rejected for the sake of that freedom which Thou hast exalted above everything. Yet in this question lies hid the great secret of this world. Choosing "bread," Thou wouldst have satisfied the universal and everlasting craving of humanity — to find someone to worship. So long as man remains free he strives for nothing so incessantly and so painfully as to find someone to worship. But man seeks to worship what is established beyond dispute, so that all men would agree at once to worship it. For these pitiful creatures are concerned not only to find what one or the other can worship, but to find community of worship is the chief misery of every man individually and of all humanity from the beginning of time. For the sake of common worship they've slain each other with the sword. They have set up gods and challenged one another, "Put away your gods and come and worship ours, or we will kill you and your gods!" And so it will be to the end of the world, even when gods disappear from the earth; they will fall down before idols just the same. Thou didst know, Thou couldst not but have known, this fundamental secret of human nature, but Thou didst reject the one infallible banner which was offered Thee to make all men bow down to Thee alone — the banner of earthly bread; and Thou hast rejected it for the sake of freedom and the bread of Heaven. Behold what Thou didst further. And all again in the name of freedom! I tell Thee that man is tormented by no greater anxiety than to find someone quickly to whom he can hand over that gift of freedom with which the ill-fated creature is born. But only one who can appease their conscience can take over their freedom. In bread there was offered Thee an invincible banner; give bread, and man will worship thee, for nothing is more certain than bread. But if someone else gains possession of his conscience — Oh! then he will cast away Thy bread and follow after him who has ensnared his conscience. In that Thou wast right. For the secret of man's being is not only to live but to have something to live for. Without a stable conception of the object of life, man would not consent to go on living, and would rather destroy himself than remain on earth, though he had bread in abundance. That is true. But what happened? Instead of taking men's freedom from them, Thou didst make it greater than ever! Didst Thou forget that man prefers peace, and even death, to freedom of choice in the knowledge of good and evil? Nothing is more seductive for man than his freedom of conscience, but nothing is a greater cause of suffering. And behold, instead of giving a firm foundation for setting the conscience of man at rest for ever, Thou didst choose all that is exceptional, vague and enigmatic; Thou didst choose what was utterly beyond the strength of men, acting as though Thou didst not love them at all — Thou who didst come to give Thy life for them! Instead of taking possession of men's freedom, Thou didst increase it, and burdened the spiritual kingdom of mankind with its sufferings for ever. Thou didst desire man's free love, that he should follow Thee freely, enticed and taken captive by Thee. In place of the rigid ancient law, man must hereafter with free heart decide for himself what is good and what is evil, having only Thy image before him as his guide. But didst Thou not know that he would at last reject even Thy image and Thy truth, if he is weighed down with the fearful burden of free choice?"³.

The position of the Grand Inquisitor is clear, worldly pragmatic, because his characteristic of a man from a crowd — *is adequate, if to forget about the ability of people to progress*, but the Grand Inquisitor did not become a positive hero in Russian literature. While recognizing tragic of the choice he made and its consequences, everyone who had applied to this plot, had found his sociological views unacceptable and had favored freedom⁴, which, however, they could not put into life for the reasons, named by the Grand Inquisitor.

3 F.M. Dostoyevsky «The Brothers Karamazov», part two, book five, "The Grand Inquisitor". Cited from the publication on the Internet <http://www.pereplet.ru/misl/inkv.html> through the link, placed on the website "Modern russian thought": <http://xray.sai.msu.ru/~lipunov/text/misl/misl.html>.

(English version was cited from <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pol116/grand.htm>)

4 See, in particular, the works on this subject that you can find on the Internet:

V.V. Rozanov. "Legend about the Grand inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky".

R.M. Cabo. "Legend about the Grand inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky".

A. Maceina. "Cor inquietum".

“De-Stalinization”: dead souls at work...

In contrast to the views of this character of F.M. Dostoyevsky, the views of the monk Filofey up to the present are attractive to many Russian politicians. The quintessence of them expressed in the epistle to the Grand Prince of Moscow Vasily III, dated 1530-1540⁵, to which we will turn next.

Assertion "Moscow — the third Rome, the fourth will not happen", ascending to the Filofey, roams in different versions from work to work, but few people had completely read the epistle itself, and certainly almost no one commented it in the relationship to the real politics of the past and present. Some publications present it as the prophecy, which, due to its alleged divine inspiration just can't not to come true, forgetting, that the doctrine of "Moscow — the Third Rome" had twice collapsed in history: the first time with the death of the grandson of Grand Prince Vasily III — Tsar Fedor Ivanovich — dynasty of Rurik became extinct, what gave rise to the discord; the second time, if, contrary to history consider Petersburg as embodiment of the "spirit of Moscow", — in 1917, when the Russian empire collapsed.

Some analysts are convinced, that the revival of the USSR as the great power, which replenished political vacuum in global politics of the mid-twentieth century after the collapse of the Russian empire, — is a consequence of that I.V. Stalin, denying marxism de facto, covertly followed the doctrine of "Moscow — the third Rome". Accordingly, a certain part of the political establishment of modern Russia, having convinced that the ideas of bourgeois liberalism had led to a national catastrophe and do not promise an exit from it, lays there hopes on the revival of Russia on this same doctrine again, without thinking about why in the past it twice led to national catastrophes.

The answer to the question why adherence to the doctrine of "Rome" in all it's versions (first, second and third Rome) leads to catastrophe, regardless of the geographical localization and ethnic base (in the western Mediterranean, in Byzantium, in Russia, in the medieval holy Roman empire of the german nation and in the third reich in the XX century), can be obtained, if we will apply to the epistle of Filofey as a whole. The answer springs from the fact that sociological views of Filofey and of the Grand Inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky are essentially identical. But on this circumstance in the domestic social philosophy is not adopted to pay attention.

Filofey writes:

"So let your majesty, devout tsar, knows, that all orthodox kingdoms of the christian faith had gathered in your single kingdom: you only are the tsar to christians in the whole world under the skies. And you should, tsar, be observe it in the awe of God, fear the God, who gave this to you, do not hope for gold, and riches, and glory: it's all gathering here and here, on earth, remains. Remember, tsar, about the righteous one, who, bearing sceptre in hand and the royal crown on his head, was speaking: "To wealth flowing to you, do not give the heart", and the sage Solomon said: "Wealth and the gold not in the treasury has been recognizing, but when it has been helping the needy"; the apostle Paul, following him, says: "The root of every evil is the love for money", — and orders to deny it, do not setting hope and, even more, heart on it, but to hope upon God who gives all. Because your whole pure faith and love to God — is for God's holy churches... (...)

... fill saint cathedral churches by bishops, do not let the holy God's church be the widow in your reign! Do not break, tsar, the covenant your ancestors had established, Constantine the great, and blessed st. Vladimir, and Yaroslav the great the chosen by God, and other blessed saints, from the same root as you. Do not offend, tsar, the holy churches of God and honest monasteries, churches, as given to God into inheritance of eternal goods for the memory of later generations, on what the great sacred Fifth cathedral had imposed the strict prohibition. (...)

And if you will have built your kingdom good — you will be the son of light and the inhabitant of the heavenly Jerusalem, and as wrote to you above, and now am saying: keep and heed, devout tsar, that all christian kingdoms had converged in your single one, that two Rome have fallen, the third stands, a fourth will not happen. And your christian kingdom will not be replaced by an other, according to the words of the great Theologian, and for the christian church will come true the word of saint David: "Here is my chamber for ever, here I will settle, like I had wished this"⁶.

5 Some researchers consider it as forgery, created in the surroundings of bishop Macarius, based on Filofey's works.

6 Filofey. The epistle to the Grand Prince Vasily about correcting the sign of the cross and about sodomite fornication. (<http://old-ru.ru/07-19.html>).

In fact, Filofey's directions to the sovereign of all Russia are laying on the tsar the same three responsibilities, which also the Grand Inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky had laid upon himself:

- Implementation of the public administration, ensuring the production and distribution of "earthly bread" so that everyone were more or less secured, and there were no reason for grumbling and rebellion by the most of people ready to work for the system (the references to Solomon and the Apostle Paul, obliging to use the wealth to help people, which had been made destitute due to various reasons, imply this).
- Maintenance of social order and, first of all, "ideological conviction" of the population in the superiority of this order over alternative social organizations (about this — everything, regarding the attitude of the state to the church, and implying the special *pedagogical* mission of the church in society).
- Suppression of a few individuals, who are disputing the divine inspiration of this order and opposing him emotionally-unconsciously or consciously-motivated.

Besides, in contrast to the confession of the Grand Inquisitor, the message of Filofey is more hypocritical, since it implies that the church's doctrine is the doctrine of Christ himself. And therefore in the epistle are hushed up and left without comments the words of Christ, that Filofey couldn't but know, and which he was obliged to relate with life as such and to express his views on how these commandments of Christ must be realized in the orthodox community:

“25. Jesus called them unto himself (his pupils — our explanation of the context), and says: you know, that the lords of the nations rule over them, and nobles dominate over them; 26. but among you it should not be so: and who will want be great among you, let he be your servant; 27. and who wants to be first among you, let he be your slave” (Matthew, ch. 20).

In more common terminology without specific "lords," "masters" and other "majesties", "excellencies" and "holinessies" the meaning of this commandment of Christ can be expressed as: *"You know that over the nations satanic "elites" are ruling, but among you it should not be so..."*. And Christ proclaimed the alternative to that social order, to which both Filofey and the Grand Inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky were adherents:

"The Law and the Prophets⁷ were until John⁸; since now the Kingdom of God is gospeling, and any enters into it by the effort" (Luke, 16:16). "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His Truth, and all this (by the context — the earthly prosperity for all people) will be added unto you" (Matthew, 6:33). "Because I say unto you, that if your righteousness not exceed righteousness of scribes and pharisees, than you will not enter the Kingdom of God" (Matthew, 5:20).

But the doctrine of the formation of the God's kingdom on Earth by the efforts of the people themselves in God's guidance, the historically established christianity in all its branches considers as the heresy⁹, in spite of unambiguous meaning of the prayer "Our Father": "Hallowed be Your name; let Your Kingdom come; let Your will be on earth as in heaven".

This same position, in fact solidary with the position of the Grand Inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky, during his pastoral visit to the far East, attending of the Yakutsk and Lena diocese, *once again*¹⁰ was expressed by the Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia Kirill (Vladimir Mikhailovich Gundyayev):

7 "The law and the prophets" in the time of Christ is what now called the "Old Testament".

8 John the Baptist, or — John the Precursor.

9 It's name — "millenarism" (based on Latin) and "chiliasm" (based on Greek). Both names stem from the word "one thousand", because "heretics" were convinced that the day of Judgement would be preceded by the millennial Kingdom of God on Earth.

10 As early as when he was metropolitan of Smolensk and Kaliningrad, Kirill visited Ivanovo. During this visit, which took place in 2002, he expressed the following opinion:

"The state exists not for creation of paradise on earth, but in order not to allow hell on it. The nature of the state and the church are different, but common to them is the pursuit to limit evil. And if to achieve this goal the state has the right to use force, the church can convince with the word only". According to metropolitan Kirill, the church should not interfere in the state administration, but in other spheres — culture, education, upbringing, health, environment, etc. — between these two institutions needs to be interaction" ("The speech of Patriarch Kirill in Ivanovo": http://religion-rodniki.ivplaneta.ru/index.php?p=news&news_id=5126&npage=5). On the basis of what conception such interaction should be organized, — Kirill did not say. But in case of rejection of the construction of the Kingdom of God on Earth by human effort in God's leadership, only two conceptions remain: the "grand inquisitor's" ("limitation of evil") and the "great combinator's" (also "limitation of evil", but in a different sense).

“De-Stalinization”: dead souls at work...

"Paradise on earth is impossible to build. The task of people is not to build paradise on earth, but so that human life was not turning into hell" ("Paradise on earth is impossible to build" — Site «Russian people's line», 24.09.2010: http://www.ruskline.ru/news_rl/2010/9/24/patriarh_kirill_raya_na_zemle_postroit_nevozhno/).

Actually in this conflict of religious doctrine of the historically established christian churches and of the original teachings of Christ, lies the answer to the question, why the doctrine of a "Rome" — a kingdom of caesar and of the inquisitor — inevitably leads society, which believes in it, to disaster: this doctrine is not finding support from the Above, and that is why, having exhausted the sufferance, is collapsing.

But what relationship the Great Combinator¹¹ of I. Ilf and E. Petrov has to this? — The "great combinator" in a society, living under the rule of the "grand inquisitor", — is an encumbrance to the regime and it's present or potential victim. And that's why the "great combinator" — is the antagonist of the "grand inquisitor" and one of the contenders for the establishment of own regime after the regime of the "grand inquisitor" internally degrade.

The point is that stability of the regime of the "grand inquisitor" is provided by 4 factors:

1. Constructive labour of the vast majority of the population under the general control of the "grand inquisitor".
2. Advantages in consumption of the produced and *the socio-status ratio of power and irresponsibility before lower-level people*, which are the results of moving up on the social hierarchy of individuals.
3. Self-discipline of the highest hierarchs, who should ensure the efficiency of labour and to maintain some measure of the distribution of different kinds of advantages between levels of the social hierarchy, that guarantees the stability of the system and support of it by the vast majority of population (at the same time a certain asceticism of the "grand inquisitor" gives him the moral right to "flog" everyone who is below him in the social hierarchy, but consumes more than the "grand inquisitor" HIMSELF).
4. Suppression of anti-systemic minorities, to which the community of "combinators" also belongs, but first of all — of anti-systemic representatives of the ruling "elite" itself.

However, the system is bearing in itself the causes of its own collapse, the main of which is the irresponsibility of "highest" people before "lowest". This leads to the fact, that at some stage of its self-reproduction in the succession of generations, social-status and consumer benefits of the higher levels of the hierarchy cease to be caused by real administrative competence in relation to the ensuring: labour effectiveness, accepted by the society justice of distribution of the produced and the suppression of anti-systemic factors. When the "elite" of the "grand inquisitor's" regime loses its business competence and begins to live for themselves, a fair amount of society feels deprived (including losing trust in government); and besides — some other part of the society acquires the conviction that they also can ensure their well-being at the expense of the labour of others not worse, than historically established "elite", whose parasitism sets an example for imitation for all lumpen, with whom it gradually becomes identical in the aspects of morality and ethics.

This social group of envious includes the subgroup of applicants in the "great combinator", which are characterized by the shunning of rude violence and shameless theft, i.e. they "honour the criminal code", but invent a "relatively honest ways of obtaining money and other benefits".

When the regime of the "grand inquisitor" is degraded so much that it can be demolished, then **pretenders into "great combinator" presents themselves to the rest of society as freedom fighters against tyranny of the "grand inquisitor"**. And if society does not see them as parasites from which freedom needs to be protected exactly like from the tyranny of the "grand inquisitor", the regime of the "great combinator" raised.

¹¹ Ostap Bender — is a fictional con man who appeared in the novels *The Twelve Chairs* and *The Little Golden Calf*. Bender is an extremely attractive, resourceful crook, full of energy while operating within the law ("Bender knew 400 relatively legal ways to make population part with their money."); his description as "The Great Combinator" became a catch phrase in the Russian language. His exploits have been enjoyed by readers throughout the Soviet times and in modern Russia. In post-Soviet times Bender's character was elevated from the status of a con man to that of an entrepreneur. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ostap_Bender)

However, if, in the ideal, the regime of the "grand inquisitor" imposes on everybody, without exception, the duty to work in a particular field, the regime of the "great combinator" imposes this obligation only on "dupes", recognizing for those, who are able to "combine", the rights on "combinations", that do not violate the law, which is written by the similar "great combinator" of jurisprudence in such a way, to create possibilities for "combining".

Domestic intelligentsia since the times of F.M. Dostoyevsky had been scaring itself and the rest of society by the threat of tyranny of the regime of the "grand inquisitor". But since the times of N.V. Gogol, who warningly showed *the great combinator P.I. Chichikov* in all his glory, domestic thinkers did not care about the essence of the "great combinator", and they did not think about what kind of will be his regime, if the "great combinator" will gain monopoly power over society.

The success of the perestroika and reforms in the spirit of bourgeois liberalism, in the form in which it became history, was possible primarily because in the Soviet Union Ostap Bender was the cult literary character, which many liked because they carried in their psyche the features of his morality and character. Accordingly, after the Central Committee's sanctimonious and ideological control over the mores of society was left in the past, the true morality of the people began to express freely and the monuments to Ostap Bender appeared in many cities in the former Soviet Union¹². This means, that the task of overcoming the crisis of the Russian multinational civilization remains in that, that each should overcome in himself both the "great combinator" and the victim of his deception:

"Most Russians thinks that modern men of this country are most often resembling Ostap Bender from the film "The Twelve chairs", performed by Andrei Mironov (24% of respondents are saying so), and modern women — Katya Tikhomirova from the film "Moscow does not believe in tears" performed by Vera Alentova (19%), All-Russia centre of studying of public opinion, which published the results of this survey, is reporting on its official [website](#).

Among the contemporaries, russians also frequently meet prototypes of Sasha Bely from the TV series "Brigada" (18%), the Afonya of the eponymous film (16%)... (http://www.newsru.com/cinema/29dec2010/kinogeroi_print.html).

What is the regime of the "great combinator" in its pure form in practice — the "dashing 1990s" showed.

Regime of the "great combinator" does not guarantee anything to anyone, since even the "great combinator" inevitably will be attacked by "even more great combinator"¹³ or he will face brutal violence of the envious, not capable for "noble combining"¹⁴, — it's a matter of time. And especially those, who creates the wealth of society by their own labour, and on whose life "combinators" of different ranks are parasitizing, under the power of the regime of the "great combinator" are devoid of any warranties, except for guarantee for poverty, because they are busy with labour and they have neither time nor energy for "combining".

Therefore from the point of view of a simple worker, living on one salary, regime of the "grand inquisitor" is more preferable, because it — if certain social norms, prescribed by the "grand inquisitor", are followed, — ensures to the basic statistical population some well-being and growing of welfare.

The complaint of the majority to the "grand inquisitor" may be only that he is badly supporting that quality of life based on the four above mentioned factors: 1) quite effective management of labour in the scale of society, 2) distribution of wealth *by justice in its historically-established understanding*, 3) self-discipline and honesty of the ruling "elite" in the line with the conception of organization of society, which the "grand inquisitor" follows, 4) suppression of anti-systemic

12 On the Internet you can find information about the monuments to O. Bender, installed in St. Petersburg, Odessa, Pyatigorsk (was destroyed by "vandals" in March 2010 but will be restored), in Elista (on the Avenue of Bender), in Kharkiv, in Berdyansk (the birthplace of Lieutenant Schmidt), in Zhmerinka, in Starobilsk of Luhansk oblast, in Yekaterinburg, there was a discussion about the installation of the monument in Tashkent. In addition, the motor ship and a lot of restaurants and cafes were named after Bender.

13 Like O.I. Bender attacked the peaceful underground Soviet millionaire A.I. Koreiko.

14 Bender ran into this the first time when Kisa Vorobyandinov tried to cut his throat, and the second time when the Romanian border guards fleeced him during the transition of the state border.

“De-Stalinization”: dead souls at work...

minorities, among them community of "combinators", but first of all — of anti-systemic elements in the "elite" itself.

This difference in the relation of a worker to the regimes of the "grand inquisitor" and of the "great combinator" explains the failures of attempts of "de-Stalinization" of the society both in past and in present. Khrushchev and C^O were unable to carry out de-Stalinization, because, wrote off the vices of the regime on Stalin, did not establish themselves as the more effective "grand inquisitor" or as the true liberators. In the Brezhnev era KAMAZ trucks on the roads of the country went with the portraits of Stalin on the windscreens without any compulsion to the drivers by the "totalitarian" state. This can be seen as folksy hint to the regime, personified by Leonid Brezhnev, that it is not only not democratic, but even badly cope with duties of the "grand inquisitor". The attempt of "de-Stalinization", which was started by M.S. Gorbachev and A.N. Yakovlev, recruited by CIA, also was not successful, but led to the replacement of the regime of ineffective "grand inquisitor" by the regime of the "great combinator", about whose managerial efficiency and public usefulness it is not necessary to speak at all. Another attempt of "de-Stalinization", started in the 2000s, is also not achieving success, and the reason for this is that it is carrying out by henchmen of the regime of the "great combinator", trying to present themselves as true freedom-lovers¹⁵.

In fact freedom as the property of personality and "combinatoring" as the character of its activity are incompatible with each other: in Russian language the word "freedom" objectively is the abbreviation — God-Given Leadership of Conscience (СВОБОДА — С-ОВЕСТЬЮ ВО-ДИТЕЛЬСТВО БО-ГОМ ДА-ННОЕ). But F.M. Dostoyevsky was understanding freedom somehow differently, and so Dostoyevsky's Christ did not find objections to the grand inquisitor. And accordingly the propensity or at least the moral readiness of the individual to "combinatoring" is depriving him of liberty, and a society, in which "combinators" are free to do what they want, "honouring the criminal code", can not be free.

And that is why the TV program "Court of time" of N.K. Svanidze — illustrative example of "combinatoring" in the field of study and forming of public opinion. 10.11.2010 there were discussed the topic of industrialization of the USSR, led by Stalin in the 1930s. N.K. Svanidze not quite at the right time remembered the fragment from Joseph Brodsky: "a thief is dearer to me than a bloodsucker"¹⁶. Having bickered a little about the accuracy of the citation of J.A. Brodsky, S.E. Kurginyan and N.K. Svanidze had moved to another question. But none of the parties (S.E. Kurginyan against L.M. Mlechin, under the control over discussion by N.K. Svanidze) did not begin delving deeper into the consideration of the place of the Brodsky's thesis in the real life.

In our opinion, for the morally healthy man, a thief cannot be DEARER than a bloodsucker, because both a thief and a bloodsucker are enslaved by vice, and vice arouse not tenderness, but disgust. That is, the thesis "a thief is dearer than a bloodsucker" — "Freudian slip", expressing solidarity with the thieves, including "great combinator". And accepting this thesis without objections — the same expression of solidarity with thieves, as the proclamation of the thesis itself.

But for us in this case it is important not that all participants in the program, not having objected to the lyrical hero of J.A. Brodsky, admitted by default their solidarity with the regime of the "great combinator"; for us the important is the other: from the point of view of a thief — the one who punishes thieves and protects workers from various types of parasitism, especially systematically organized parasitism under the authority of the regime of the "great combinator"¹⁷, — is a tyrant, a despot, a bloodsucker.

¹⁵ Hence the attempt to present as the "freedom-lover" the loser-combinator M.B. Khodorkovsky, and the struggle of the bourgeois-liberal public for his release from prison.

¹⁶ "Both from a Caesar far away and from a snowstorm. / No need to fawn, to fear, to hurry. / You say that all governors — are thieves? / a thief is dearer to me than a bloodsucker" (J.A. Brodsky. The Letters to the Roman Friend (From Martial)).

¹⁷ Also note that in Soviet times, J.A. Brodsky was prosecuted under the article "parasitism", i.e. for evading work. And the western "democracy" — is the highly civilized realm of the "great combinator", so *in this realm* the Nobel award for literature for J.A. Brodsky — is fully deserved. But since this awarding is conditioned by the regime of the "great combinator", then there is no need to absolutise it, raising to the rank of "world recognition of talent".

However, the one who eradicates parasitism, including suppressing parasites, not necessarily is the tyrant, despot, bloodsucker, "grand inquisitor". The fact is that real democracy is not boiling down to elective procedures and observance of their periodicity: history knows many tyrannies, received ruling mandates by the organization of exactly formally democratic procedures of voting on certain questions. Real, not formal, democracy — is the first and foremost the freedom (at least of most people) in the previously defined sense of the word, but not only those or other procedures of nominating by the people their representatives into authorities. Therefore its main characteristic property — **responsiveness of authorities to the aspirations of the people, which finds its expression in practical politics, as well as protecting the future of the people from their own vices, inherited from the past.** Responsiveness to the aspirations and protecting the future of the people from vices requires discipline in the state apparatus, and accordingly — the ruthless removal from the state apparatus of those who violate this discipline. That is, we can agree with the view, expressed by G.A. Yavlinsky in one of the telecasts in the Soviet times: *if I want to have a democracy in the society, in the state apparatus I must have a dictatorship.*

And in doing so real democracy must solve the same problems in relation to the production and distribution of "earthly bread", self-protection of the system and its reproduction in the succession of generations, which "grand inquisitor" laid on himself, though on the principles of differently understood justice.

Therefore, from the point of view of "combinators" — the tyranny of the "grand inquisitor" and real democracy are indistinguishable: both for the "great combinator" — tyranny, which prevents him from "freely combinatoring". But **for the conscientious worker, the tyranny of the "great combinator", the tyranny of the "grand inquisitor" and activities aimed at building real democracy and ensuring real freedom of personality — three differences.** And the most disgusting tyranny — the tyranny of the regime of the "great combinator", representing itself as a true democracy and freedom.

Because and in the conditions of the tyranny of the regime of the "great combinator" someone needs to work a lot, but at the same time is doomed for poverty, thus the "de-Stalinization", implementing from moral and world-view positions of the "great combinator", can never achieve success. It can succeed only in a society consisting mainly of "combinators", but such a society cannot exist because there is no one to supply it with products of their labour.

The prospects of "de-Stalinization", implementing from moral and world-view positions of the "great combinator", exacerbated also by the historically objective fact, that the entire range of activities of the regime, led by J.V. Stalin, does not fit into the scheme of "regime of the grand inquisitor". Although the inquisitorial component in it was really present and there were happening, among the other, mass abuses of the "inquisitorial power", however there was something that was alien to the meaning of life of the "grand inquisitor", how this meaning was expressed by F.M. Dostoyevsky.

Marxism — is the political project indeed meeting the goals of the mission, which the Grand Inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky laid upon himself, because on the base of the philosophy, that leads the reader away from consideration of the problem of predictability of the consequences of one or another life choice, society is not capable to self-ruling and therefore can not be free. In addition, the political economy of Marxism is based on categories, which have no place in the real economic activities of the society. With these two features, the doctrine of socialism — is just the bait to an otherwise organized slavery that fully complies with the sociological views of the grand inquisitor.

And if Stalin really would be the epitome of the grand inquisitor of F.M. Dostoyevsky, the contents of his collected works would be different: he would not have touched in his works issues, that undermine both the power of the regime of the "grand inquisitor" and *the regime of the "great combinator", the epitome of which became the real capitalism, based on the ideas of bourgeois liberalism.*

In particular, among the individual rights in the Soviet Union was included and the right for labour, as guaranteed both by the Constitutions of the country of 1936 and 1977, and by the practice

“De-Stalinization”: dead souls at work...

of government management of the economy. About this right and its role in ensuring freedom of personality J.V. Stalin was speaking in 1936 already:

"It's hard for me to imagine what kind of "personal freedom" an unemployed may have, who goes hungry and finds no application of his labour. The true freedom is available only where the exploitation is eradicated, where there is no oppression of any people by others, where there is no unemployment and poverty, where a man is not trembling because tomorrow may lose job, housing, bread. Only in such society personal and any other freedom is possible in reality, not on paper" (from the talk with the chairman of the newspaper association Roy Howard, March 1, 1936).

Besides, Stalin did not reduce all the rights of the individual to the duty to work, as do the slaveholders, but thought that an effective implementation of the freedom of the individual requires the development of the culture of a society, and respectively — development of the personalities of the members of this society.

"It is necessary, thirdly, to achieve such cultural growth of society, *which would ensure to all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that members of society have the opportunity to receive education sufficient to become active figures of the social development...*" [J.V. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR. — Moscow: separate edition, State publishing house of political literature. 1952., p. 68, italic text selection is ours].

Active work on public development of society is powerness. Providing all society members with opportunities for education, allowing to responsibly wield power over the consequences of decisions being made, is the expansion of the social base of the ruling corps to the ranges of the whole society and the elimination of monopoly for powerness of biologically degenerating "elite" clans. As a consequence, the qualitative composition of the people coming into power, in these circumstances, can be the best compared to the clannish-"elite" control system.

That is, J.V. Stalin cared about the information-algorithmic provisioning of the true democracy and freedom, not about voting in a madhouse, being brought by custodians on a circus show of politicking clowns, about what, in fact, care "grand combinators" — fighters for "democracy" of the western style.

Stalin's understanding of democracy excludes the possibility of irresponsible tyranny over voting ignorant crowd, as of the "grand inquisitor's" regime and of the "great combinator's" regime. But the guarantee of the establishment of such a society, can only be the intellectual activity, for which the majority of the population simply did not have time, being engaged in manufacturing for a most part of the period of wakefulness. Therefore we read further:

"It would be wrong to think that it is possible to achieve such an important cultural growth of society without major changes in the current situation of labour. For this we first of all need to reduce the working day at least to 6 and then to 5 hours¹⁸. This is to ensure that members of the society received enough free time, necessary to obtain a comprehensive education. Further, for this we need to bring in compulsory polytechnic education, necessary to ensure that the members of society have the opportunity to freely choose the profession and not be chained for the entire life to some one profession. To do this, we need to further drastically improve housing conditions and to raise the real wages of workers and employees at least twice, if not more, as by directly improving cash wages, and especially by further systematic reduction of prices on items of mass consumption.

These are the basic conditions of preparation of the transition to communism» [J.V. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR. — Moscow: separate edition, State publishing house of political literature. 1952., p. 69].

As for the policy of systematically reducing prices of products of mass consumption, it is — the direct act of "aggression" against the social base of the regime of the "great combinator": in the conditions of systematic price reduction, buying-up of anything with the purpose of resale at increased prices becomes impossible.

¹⁸ In the USSR in that period the 6 days of the week were working, i.e. the point is about the transition to, firstly, 36-hour, and then to 30-hour work week. In this regard, recall that in 2010 the Union of industrialists and business owners of the Russian Federation raised the question of legal simplification for businessmen of the introduction of 60-hour work weeks on their enterprises, ostensibly on the initiative of employees who wish to work for 60 hours a week.

But moreover, Stalin in passing, in effect, had reproached marxism for metrological insolvency of its economy, saying: "... our commodity production radically differs from commodity production under capitalism" [J.V. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR. — Moscow: separate edition, State publishing house of political literature. 1952., p. 18].

And after the given phrase J.V. Stalin continued:

"Moreover, I think, we need to throw away some other notions taken from "Capital" of Marx, ... artificially glued on to our socialist relations. I mean, among other things, notions such as "necessary" and "surplus" labour, "necessary" and "surplus" product, "necessary" and "surplus" time. (...)

I think that our economists should put an end to this discrepancy between the old notions and the new state of affairs in our socialist country, replacing the old notions with the new ones, correspondent to the new position.

We were can enduring this discrepancy up to a certain time, but now the time has come, when we must finally eliminate this discrepancy" [J.V. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR. — Moscow: separate edition, State publishing house of political literature. 1952., p. 18, 19].

All of these notions, mentioned by J.V. Stalin in the fragment of "Economic problems of socialism in the USSR", — are metrologically insolvent: i.e. there are no phenomena behind them, whose parameters could be measured (identify, differentiate) in the real processes of economy; these notions — are illusory-existing fictions, and not abstractions that can be filled with vital content in the solution of practical problems.

If metrological insolvency of any theory was detected, it means its scientific insolvency. This — is the death sentence to marxism, since J.V. Stalin exposed the metrological insolvency of its political economy, and as the consequence — the insolvency of its philosophy, the product of which, as taught by marxism, is its political economy. If J.V. Stalin really would have been the "grand inquisitor", then he would never have written things, that can be read in the "Economic problems of socialism in the USSR".

But, excepting the texts, there were also real politics, expressing the meaning of the texts practically.

The stated above — the signs that J.V. Stalin, in the historically established conditions, taking on the mission of the "grand inquisitor", in fact was leading the society to real freedom and democracy. Exactly for this reason, after elimination of Stalin, subsequent "great inquisitors" and "great combinator" withdrew studying of his works from the programmes of social science education and from the free access in libraries and stop their republication.

Therefore, those who see in J.V. Stalin, due to various reasons, only the embodiment of the "grand inquisitor", will never be able to carry out "de-Stalinization" in society, where there are enough of those, who do not accept both types of tyranny and who see in his activity the component, directed both against the tyranny of the "grand inquisitor", and against the tyranny of the "great combinator", and who consider this component not a concomitant effect, independent from the will of Stalin, but the main meaning of his life and activities.

Accordingly, the assertions that J.V. Stalin ostensibly followed the conception "Moscow — the third Rome," while maintaining in words the devotion to marxism — does not correspond to historical reality.

The conception of life of the Roman civilization in all its historically known versions (Rome, Byzantium, Moscow — the third Rome, Germany — the third Reich, etc.) — is the slaveholding conception, for this reason it has nothing in common with the teachings of Christ and therefore is not supported from Above. Therefore it is necessary to come to sense, to develop and implement the alternative to tyrannies of the "grand inquisitor" and of the "great combinator": no need to step on the same "rake" repeatedly.

However, the regime of the "great combinator", showing habits of the "grand inquisitor" without necessary for success self-discipline, decided to follow the conception "Moscow — the third Rome" and for this to "de-Stalinize public consciousness". And there are instigators to this. So, one of them is Mark Semenovitch Solonin, the author of the series of books on the history and prehistory of the second world war of the XX century. Let us cite a fragment from his interview to website "Free press", published under the title "In 2011, Medvedev will equate Stalin to Hitler?":

“De-Stalinization”: dead souls at work...

"FP": — What, in your opinion, is the main problem of "de-Stalinization"?

— Without reservations, without equivoques ("on the one hand", "on the other hand") the unconditional recognition of Stalin as the creator and leader of the anti-people totalitarian dictatorship. The criminal dictatorship, committed countless and terrible in their cruelty mass crimes against the Russian people, against other peoples of the USSR, committed equally cruel crimes against the people of other countries of the world. These indisputable, from the historical science point of view, facts, must be, finally, recognized at the state level. I consider that appropriate and right, not at all inconsistent with our Constitution, if the criminal liability will be established for public glorification, the public apology for this criminal regime, its leader Joseph Stalin and his minions. We need the same mechanism, which was launched in Germany, during the post-war destruction of the Hitler's regime. The only difference is that in our case the perpetrators already escaped the earthly court and we can't repeat the Nuremberg trials — nobody to hang. But again, Stalin's regime must be defined as aggressive and criminal, not in the least better than the fascist regime of Hitler" (<http://svpressa.ru/politic/article/36526/>).

During the interview, Mark Semenovich — "a typical Russian patriot" — reasoned about the History as cultural phenomenon¹⁹:

"The history exists in three forms, in three, sorry for the grandiloquent word, hypostasises. History as scientific study, history as state propaganda and history as people's myth. This formula is not mine, but it seems to me as fully adequate. It is important that these "three hypostasises" are overlapping in only a few places. Scientific studies exist in form of some set of people who are sitting in libraries and archives, thinking and writing texts that are then published with a number of 500 copies. State propaganda is television, radio, newspapers, films ... The very important component here — state program of history for middle school: textbooks, recognized by the state as suitable, the training system of school teachers. State propaganda only sometimes, greatly disfiguring, snatches out something from what was made in the scope of scientific research.

And a people's myth is a huge, hardly controllable, irrational sphere. Of course, state propaganda wants to influence on people's myth, but not always successfully: a myth lives by its own complicated laws. But the bridge between scientific researches and popular myth, simply does not exist.

If take such a scheme as the basis, it is clear enough what to do for "de-Stalinization". Need to use a huge organizational, technical and information resources of the state in order to connect scientific knowledge forming in the field of historical science, with people's consciousness. Simply put, need to use huge capabilities of the modern mass media for large-scale campaign of historical literacy" (same place).

We also have some ideas about the History — both about as an occurrence and as a cultural phenomenon. First of all it is necessary to object: history as the cultural phenomenon exists not in three hypostasises, named by this typical "Russian patriot", but in four: 1) science, 2) state propaganda (including school's history course), 3) people's myth and the fourth component — society's deep-psychological unconscious memory.

The latter is expressed in that, even if with the help of the first two you will modify the people's myth in a desirable for politicians direction, — in the fourth component will stay both the memory of the real historical past, that happened before the change of the myth, and the memory of who and how, using the first and second components, was breaking the third one.

Thoroughly about this see the work of IP USSR «"The garden" is growing by itself?..», where on the example of Europe and USA had been shown, that it is impossible to destroy the fourth component, and to neutralize its impact for a historically long time, — it is necessary to destroy the people — its carrier.

In the life of Russia this is expressed, in particular, in that those people who enjoy reading and re-reading historically unreliable works of A. Dumas about the three musketeers, do not read or after the first reading forget the novel by A.K. Tolstoy "The Silver Knight", dedicated to the events of the epoch of Ivan the Terrible, written in good literature language and in general corresponding to the

¹⁹ That is, not about the historical process as such, but about the reflection of this process in culture and in the psyche of people.

views of the official historical science, established to the time of its writing. The reason for this difference in attitude to the literary works is that the history of France and the unreliability of its representation in the works of A. Dumas — are no concerns of a Russian reader; but historical unreliability of "The Silver Knight" is something, that affects some of the depths of the psyche of a Russian reader, they reject this unreliability and, as a result, — the novel does not excite the desire to read it again and forgotten.

Therefore, the "de-Stalinization" by the recipe of the "truly Russian patriot" M.S. Solonin is impossible, because it does not suppose impact on the fourth component; and in case of an attempt of neutralization of the fourth component, should be understood "de-Stalinization" = genocide against a huge share of the population of the RF (*typical* results of the viewers voting in the TV shows "Court of time": 94% — for Stalin, 6% against).

In addition, even within the three components the recipes of "typical Russian patriot" M.S. Solonin — are not leading to the achievement of guaranteed result. Mark Semenovitch does not understand this because of weak-mindedness, due to which he is not aware, how pseudo-historical ostensibly scientific knowledge (i.e. official, not the people's historical myth) is different from the scientific knowledge of History.

History in its entirety and minuteness — the aggregate of biographies of all the people that have ever lived on Earth from the moment of appearance in its biosphere of the species "Homo sapiens".

That is, history as the aggregate of biographies of all the people — lots of facts and their interconnections, since the perception of life by humans is discrete by its nature. It is clear that such historical science in the modern civilization is impossible. Objective reality is such, that possible for humanity and any human society history — some subset of *history in the whole its entirety and minuteness in the above-specified meaning*: i.e. really possible historical science — is a selection of facts and their interconnections out of all their full set.

V.O. Klyuchevsky on this occasion wrote:

"The subject of history — the past that does not pass as a legacy, a lesson, an unfinished process, as the eternal law. By studying grandfathers, we are learning about grandchildren, i.e., studying *a n c e s t o r s*, we are learning about *o u r s e l v e s*. Without knowledge of history we must recognize²⁰ ourselves as fortuities, who not knowing how and why we came into the world, how and what for we live in it, and towards what we should strive to achieve, as mechanical dolls that are not born, but are made, are not die according to the laws of nature, of life, but break by someone's childish whim" (V.O. Klyuchevsky. Works in 9 volumes. — Moscow, "Thought", 1990, v. 9, p. 375).

"What all these phenomena mean? What is the meaning of this chaos? This is the task of histor[ical] studying. We can't go by touch in the dark. We m[ust] know the force that guides our private and people's life. (...)» (V.O. Klyuchevsky, cited publication, v. 9, p. 433).

These statements relates to the history in its whole entirety and minuteness, but they also determine the requirements to selection of facts and their interconnections, which represents versions of history, generated by different schools of historical science: *one and the same algorithmic of development, objectively present in life, must be recognizable in the adequate to life conceptions of the historical past, and its fame should be the basis for predictability of the future in its possible multivariability*.

The historical facts in so doing — just illustrations of the manifestation of the algorithmic itself. That is, the algorithmic can be one and the same (both in one and the same society, and in societies being compared with each other), but the illustrative facts may be different in the works of different historians; in addition, detailing of description of the algorithmic can also be different — depending on the tasks the historian is solving. But the algorithmic of the real life in any case must be recognizable. But this requires personality orientation of the researcher on the perception of history not in aspect of identifying and registering plenty of heterogeneous facts, but in the aspect of

20 Over the string: seem. — The footnote in the quoted source, explaining the structure of the manuscript text of V.O. Klyuchevsky (our explanation when citing).

“De-Stalinization”: dead souls at work...

identifying *algorithmic of development / degradation as such* through facts²¹, which become known from the entire set of the available to the researcher sources.

And enough one single fact that is "not fit" into the constructed by historians conception of the historical past in order to recognize this conception historically deceitful.

And into the conception of "history", which the "truly Russian patriot" M.S. Solonin expressed in words: *"Without reservations, without equivoques ("on the one hand", "on the other hand") the unconditional recognition of Stalin as the creator and leader of the anti-people totalitarian dictatorship. The criminal dictatorship, committed countless and terrible in their cruelty mass crimes against the Russian people, against other peoples of the USSR, committed equally cruel crimes against the people of other countries of the world. These indisputable, from the historical science point of view, facts, must be, finally, recognized at the state level"* — a lot of things does not fit.

So, to Mark Semenovich, the advice can be given: *Before pronounce the sentence to J.V. Stalin and stalinism, understand for a start the world history of at least the last three millennia and the role in it of your tribesmen (even if not in flesh, than in spirit) and their masters...* — Then also the history of the era of "stalinism" will appear in a different light²².

For the present, we can say that the scientific and methodological basis of the "de-Stalinization" is inadequate to Life and that's why "de-Stalinization" in the form, intentioned by M.A. Fedotov, M.S. Solonin and so on and so forth, — will not take place; and even attempts of its implementation will provoke consequences, — not only unpredictable for the regime of the "great combinator" with manners of the "grand inquisitor", but unpleasant for him.

Internal Predictor of the USSR
16 Dec 2010 — 7 Jan 2011

21 Just so was setting the goal of historical research by V.O. Klyuchevsky, although he was using different terminology:

"HISTORICAL PROCESS. In scientific language, the word *history* is employed in twofold sense: 1) as movement in time, the process, and 2) as the cognition of the process. Therefore, everything that occurs in time has its history. The content of history as the separate science, the special branch of scientific knowledge, is the *historical process*, i.e. the course, the conditions and success of human community or the life of the humanity in its development and results. The human community — the same fact of world being, as the life of the surrounding us nature, and scientific cognition of this fact — the same unremovable need of the human mind, as the study of the life of this nature. The human community is expressed in a diverse human unions, which can be called historical bodies and which arise, grow and multiply, pass one into another and finally collapse, — in a word, are born, live and die like organic bodies of nature. Arising, growth and change of these unions with all the conditions and consequences of their lives, is what we call *historical process*" (V.O. Klyuchevsky, "The course of Russian history", lecture one, cited from publication on the CD "ITF", IDDK Moscow).

22 Look the work of IP USSR "The Judah's sin of the XX congress".