

CHILDREN'S ILLNESS OF LEFTISM IN ANTICOMMUNISM

On the 29th of March this year there was a subject on one Russian TV channels with the story about one clearly not a young Libyan woman that cried to the cameras: "I was raped by a mercenary of Gaddafi!" Monitors showed several, probably, five Libyan women (the number of those present could not be determined, ie since the operator takes the form at the top), women shouted: "We are with you, raped!" Something like that. Of course, this story is simply obliged to bring a feeling of hatred against Gaddafi and his mercenaries. But it is unclear just one. Was raped woman in court? Was she examined of? If so, whether it has confirmed the woman's words? If not, or examination was not conducted, woman's crying is an impudent slander. After all, there were not the statements of expert bodies on TV. And most importantly – what was the reason for soldier to rape women that was not young? They have there, in Libya, sex problems? They are Muslims, they have several wives.

But similar cases have been on TV in Russia - during election campaigns, is not unusual to us.

If one follows the logic, it turns out that the plot on TV was necessary because no one believes in the atrocities of the dictator Qaddafi. Because interested parties, primarily the U.S., it was necessary to somehow stimulate the hatred for Qaddafi. It also means a lot: that the aggressor countries' people do not support the actions of the "peacekeeping" coalition. Population does not support the leftists who are opposed to Gaddafi too. One would like to talk not about the perpetrators, but namely those leftist groups, trotskists, "internationalists", "socialists" and others who violently agitating their populations against Gaddafi and for support Libyan "insurgents."

How do the atrocities of "mercenaries" Gaddafi?

Having set himself a noble goal to unite separated feudal principalities (I mean the Arab world in the United States of Africa), in 1971 (and 1980), Qaddafi proposed reunification of Syria - and to no avail. In 1975 - Algeria, also to no avail. Spitting, Gaddafi decided to act more vigorously. In 1977 unarmed demonstration under the green banner of Islam, with flutes and singing, crossed the Libyan-Egyptian border. As a result, after 4-day war, both sides had decided to live apart. The rest - Gaddafi sent mercenaries (the citizens of Mali, they were trained in the Soviet Union, in the Ryazan Airborne School) in different countries no less aggressively than the U.S., France, Britain and the USSR, though certainly not on such a scale and not so successful.

Russian leftists are also not left out of propaganda campaigns. Domestic trotskists, sponsored by the countries close to the U.S., do not miss the chance to kick al-Gaddafi. Apparently, this was not enough. TV channel "Russia 24" began to act in order to somehow mitigate the feeling of disgust that Medvedev did not use the veto power when voting for the aggression against Libya. It basically (newspapers marked) became a branch of «Fox News», passing in a plot that Qaddafi supported wahhabists of Doku Umarov. It pretty amused experts on the subject ("Arguments of the week», № 12 (253) on 03/31/2011) .

Following questions must come in the head of every normal person, not even drawn into politics:

1) Where have the insurgents from in Libya, in a country with the highest level of life? What are their requirements? "Gaddafi go away"? Why? Why leftists all over the world go on about a brutal dictatorship Gadhafi of Libya, if any refugees for decades is not observed, in contrast

with immigrants into Libya from other countries, the number of 1.5 million, a quarter of the population most of Libya? What was the reason of the “rebellion” in the country without mass protests during a lot of time? Where is the scientific, Marxist approach of the left, where are their brains?

2) Photographs of "rebels" made by the Western European and American journalists (look at, eg., a reprint on the website "Tatishev.org"), perform that it is clear that “rebels” are armed with the latest, from the warehouse, North American rifles and other modern North American Arms. We also see instructors near them, dressed in a brand new US form. These photos were made at the very beginning of the conflict. The question is: why did the trotskists, socialists and other leftists similar support groups of “rebels” that were created artificially and are armed by main imperialist in the world - United States?

Libyan “rebels” are very interesting people. USA wanted to place one Libyan colonel, defected to the U.S. 20 years ago, at the head of “rebels” army. But Libyan general Abdel Fattakh-Unis did it quickly. And after that he began to demand armored vehicles, artillery, rocket artillery, warplanes, helicopters, training of pilots from US. Such a revolutionary!

3) Russian tourists, who returned from Libya, seen as foreign student, first beat, and then reporters performed him like mercenary. What for?

4) At the very beginning of the conflict mass media, in the first place, left mass media, said that Gaddafi had killed 8,000 Libyans. But nobody has seen on TV more than 20 corpses. Where are the rest?

5) Do not understand the leaders of Russia, China, Germany, that their abstention in the UN Security Council on Libya will inevitably lead to aggression and murder of civilians?

Do not understand left parties, that their support of “rebels”, and voices against Gaddafi, that they cleaned the way for NATO? Or lefts in the world - full of nerds?

By the way, we can now see that the "socialist" China's foreign policy is no different from the foreign policy of any capitalist country.

6) Does not it seem trotskists and others like them strange that world imperialism supports those, that they, lefts, too, support – Libya "insurgents"? Could you imagine a picture that, for example, on the eve of October 1917 the Allies and Germany at the same time suddenly have openly supported the Bolsheviks and began wailing on Bloody Nicholas II? Does not it seem odd to the lefts their unity with world imperialism?

Does it seem to the left just absurd that NATO launched a massive operation at a time when Qaddafi gave a rebuff to the opposition, ie, when Qaddafi had been supported by Libyan masses? Ie that NATO supports the “revolutionaries”, that name is raised on trotskist flag?

7) All trotskyists opposed the UN resolution authorizing NATO aggression. All trotskists hide behind their declarations about this resolution. And by what body place they thought, when coupled with NATO's support "rebels" armed with the U.S., and cried against Qaddafi?

8) Now in its essence. All American newspapers are full of articles that tell that every U.S. president had a personal enemy. At the Kennedy - Castro, the Clinton - Miloshevich, Reagan - Qaddafi. Qaddafi has robbed oil, nationalized it. All trotskyists - for nationalization. But not in the case of Qaddafi!! Does not it seem odd that lefts smell in surprising manner, who is the enemy of Washington, and immediately act against this enemy?

Washington commanded: "Lukashenko!" And the whole trotskist gang hits the totalitarianism of Lukashenko. The strange coincidence of positions in the world's policeman and the international lefts!

Washington fraternally slapping the international labor movement on the shoulder and says: "Moscow and Minsk can join. Transnistria can secede from Moldova. This is very dangerous for you. Do you know that? Don't you know? Go and ask trotskists."

In this case, neither Washington nor smelly trotskists do not touch Azerbaijan, where for opposing not that in prison, but just killed, and friends of those killed, fired from their job. Do not touch because Aliyev did not try to safeguard their country's economy from seizing States, gave the whole oil industry to his son Ilham, who sold it to the U.S.. Washington did not command - so trotskists did not pay attention to Azerbaijan.

Washington commanded: "Down with the Euro!" British Journal «The economist» draws euro as a viper. And Ernest Mandel's Trotskyist group immediately organized a march in Amsterdam against the final treaty of European integration (the first agreement - at Maastricht, 2 weeks after the collapse of the USSR). Oh, and the Swedish anarcho-sidikalistskie unions, SAC, who said that do not participate in politics, took an active part in the march!

Washington commanded: "Miloshevich!" And all the trotskists are fleeing en masse to fight against Miloshevich and supported his enemies - the Islamic fascists, who after the occupation of Kosovo began to kill Serb children and sell their organs.

Washington commanded: "Chechnya!" - And all the trotskists, never having been in Chechnya, with no absolutely no information from the field except **false bourgeois press** – are yelling "We want self-determination of Chechnya!" "British Petroleum", which was need access to the Caspian oil through Dagestan, was applauding them: "Well done, the lefts! Thank you!"

If these "leftists" at least a little remembered, if they do not have MS - it's Chechnya invaded Dagestan, that separates Chechnya from the Caspian Sea. Chechnya attacked Dagestan in August, just when Moscow paved the first 14 sections of the pipeline on the territory of Dagestan, bypassing Chechnya. British Petroleum supplied the Chechen rebels instructors, dollars, arms and techniques. For each killed Russian - \$ 100, for slain officer - \$ 300, and Dagestan Divisions moved from Siberia to Chechnya, violating the orders of commanders, to arrange in Chechnya and to begin a bloody revenge. With regard to the first Chechen war, as a human rights activist Andrei Babushkin told, the Chechnya population did not organize a single rally or meeting for self-determination, as, say, in the Baltic populations generally unwilling to withdraw from Russia. Maskhadov decided besides population.

When one of us told this to Pancho, one Argentine trotskist, he said: "I do not believe it." But **believes bourgeois newspapers**.

And how trotskists shrieked, when Russia defended South Ossetia! They all at once en masse and unequivocally **believed false bourgeois press** that Russia suddenly invaded the defenseless Georgia. Georgia, that just before that was armed U.S., Israel and Ukraine.

All Trotskyists happily embraced the Soviet collapse - because this decay is predicted by Trotsky himself. They are ready to strangle millions of people - for a nation's right of self-determination. That was happened: after the collapse of production chains costs soared, prices have risen, plants have closed, the unemployed have become extinct. Loss of Russia alone - 25 million unnecessary deaths. Much more, than Stalinist regime (5-6 millions). Long live the right to self-determination! Long live international trotskism!

In this case, all the leftists immediately forgot about this right - as soon as it touched the selfdetermination of Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Nagornii Karabakh and Moldovian Pridnestrovie (Transnistria). No half of a word, their mouth was felt by sand.

Special case - Kosovo. Leaders of all the former CMEA countries regrouped - in the twinkling of an eye - instead of the old master, Moscow, moved to a new owner, Washington. These economies had collapsed, just as in Russia. In order to save themselves from population that might strangle such leaders one needed a unifying material. What could be better, if not hatred of Russia, these Russian invaders! And how Washington is satisfied!

But Yugoslavia - alas, no occupation may be presented. So one was forced to quickly invent ethnic cleanings, who allegedly arranged the Serbs against the Albanians, fled to Kosovo. Later, when the Yankees had bombarded the childrengardens in Belgrade, it turns out that ethnic cleansing - juggling, film montage. That in fact Albanians staged the ethnic cleanings for Serbs: burned their houses, killed cattle, beaten population - forced out of the territory. What, then, were trotskists employed in the late 90's objectively? Cleaned the road for NATO.

For trotskists Miloshevich ordered Washington to become the main enemy of world labor movement. After the overthrow of Miloshevich hundreds of thousands of Serbs were forced to leave Kosovo and refugees. But none of trotskists said anything, no half of a word against Albanians, who staged a humanitarian catastrophe. You see, their mouth was felt by sand. And why? After all, they've done their job, and the job against the Albanians nobody ordered.

Like it or not, please reply!

A similar situation was in Bosnia, the trotskists not miss the chance to serve the big bourgeoisie in that place too.

Some people claim that one can not separate Gaddafi from world bourgeoisie, Gadhafi, Sarkozy and Obama – the same Satan. However, Plekhanov and Lenin were always encouraged to support the progressive bourgeoisie against the reactionary. If Gaddafi in Libya created the highest standard of living, your personal opinion that he a dictator is no one cares. You're go at first in Libya and ask Libyan public opinion around, you beast! If people do not mind - and you've got to keep mum in a rag.

Secondly, as mentioned Chistyakov, truth, screaming out of place - a fool. It is the high level of stupidity - when a bandit chief beats bandit smaller – to cry: "Right, so why should he, for the one to beat, gangster!"

9) And now normal, not drawn into politics and especially into party abracadabra man himself will try to answer all these questions.

Engels said that the big bourgeoisie is always ready to create the army of the petty bourgeoisie, small businessmen - against the proletariat. Let us remember it well - the petty bourgeoisie is the servant of largest. When the leader of the AFL CPT Samuel Gompers during the election campaign of Theodore Roosevelt offered to support Roosevelt's desire to help the petty bourgeoisie against the big, he said that it did not cause trade unions to fight against the monopoly in supporting of the small property. Because monopoly gives relatively higher wages and a relatively stable employment. And so it happened: it turned out that Roosevelt's election campaign, ie, performance against itself was paid by big bourgeoisie.

What happens if a small political group begins to call for some actions when these actions have not yet matured social order? If the masses of these actions are not yet ready? For example, in Russia, the Communist Party created numerous Soviets. If in 1905 the Soviets had a huge social order, the Soviets were not created on the initiative of the party, but from below, more than 12,000 in Russia. In the early 90's workers had no idea themselves to create something. As a result, modern Soviets had degenerated, their activity had been reduced to writing appeals to various authorities. This means that workers are now more difficult to create a form that discredited.

That Argentine trotskists (UIT-CI) cried, cried about world revolution and assure everyone that we have world revolutionary situation. But it is nowhere. Hence, when the world will really approach to a revolutionary situation, cloying slogan prevent workers moving forward. Trotskists, in this sense, serve as the capital fuse. Leftist aspirations, as an expression of petty-bourgeois character - as a service to big bourgeoisie - was characterized by Plekhanov ("Socialism and Political Struggle", "Once again, socialism and political struggle"), Engels ("The Communists and Karl Heinzen"), Lenin in "Children Illness of Leftism in Communism". Only the word "communism" in this case is unacceptable. Acceptable word "anti-communism."

Listen, listen to trash that talk seriously trotskist dogma: "Is the workers' state saved under Yeltsin?" They would be rotten eggs in Russia, if they with so smart luggage heads have to get out in front of labor collectives.

Now you understand why and, more importantly, what for did the trotskists - such as headless Brunetkin-Volkov and Sogrin (Committee for the International business, sponsor David North), prokaryotes such as Nastya Maltseva of Revolutionary Workers' Party (Trotskyist withdrawn from KRDMS of Sergei Biets), brainless proletarians like Vladik Bugera, etc. - threshed nonsense about the proletarian revolution in Tunisia and Egypt? And before - about the need to help the "poor Bosnian Muslims", about a popular revolution in Ukraine, which actually turned out to be pro-American, and 300 dollars on the snout for participation in the Maidan?

See, how the world responds to the trotskyists. They in their own countries have failed to do anything useful. Because, for example, such trotskyist group, as "4th International" (late Lambert, now Glyukshtein), has about 1% of vote in elections. Note: there are a lot of 4th internationals in the world. Some trotskists in this regard are already offering the 5th International. Nowhere, in any country in the world trotskists do not have weight. And rightly so. What for? These are small groups. Leaders of the trotskyist groups are corrupt (in Russian - hungry for memory loss), but major trotskist groups need major spending from big bourgeoisie. So bourgeoisie doesn't pay too much miney... As to the workers - they are seeing in front of a large bourgeois parties, why should they vote for a minor.

Boris Ikhlov, secretary of executive committee of Russia political union "Worker", Perm-city
Helen Cuclina, Member of Soviet of union "Worker", Chelyabinsk-city,
Gennadii Baranov, member of executive committee of union "Worker", Ryazan-city

02/04/2011