

The revolution of Lenin and its urgency

Mikhail B. Konashev (Association 'Soviet Union'-Russian Federation)

It is natural that in Russian mass media Lenin is described and evaluated mainly as negative figure in the history of Russia as well of the whole world. It is also natural that Putin too evaluated Lenin regularly in the same way and had no one positive word for him. Let me cite the most demonstrative of Putin's statements on Lenin.

On January 21, 2016, at a meeting of the Presidential Council for Science and Education, Putin said: *"To control the flow of thought is the right thing, it is only necessary that this thought leads to the right results, and not like Vladimir Ilyich's. Otherwise, in the end, this thought led to the collapse of the Soviet Union, that's what. There were a lot of thoughts like this: autonomy and so on. They put an atomic bomb under a building called Russia, and then it exploded. And we did not need a world revolution"*. In 2022 he added:

"As a result of the Bolshevik policy, Soviet Ukraine arose, which today can be rightfully called the Ukraine named after Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. He is its author and architect. This is fully confirmed by archival documents, including Lenin's directives on Donbass, which was literally squeezed into Ukraine".

Besides Putin openly named the key purpose of his own policy:

“Now grateful descendants have demolished monuments to Lenin in Ukraine. They call this decommunization. Do you want to decommunize? Well, that’s fine with us. But you do not have to stop halfway. We are ready to show you what real decommunization means for Ukraine”.

It can seem unnatural that some people who call themselves Marxists criticized permanently Lenin and had found serious mistakes in his activity as a politician and a theorist, a thinker. For instance, one of the relatively positive articles devoted to Lenin was entitled “Lenin’s fruitful mistakes.” The author of this article published in 1999 in so called patriotic journal *Nash sovremennik* - which means “Our contemporary” - was Sergey Georgievich Kara-Murza, publicist, author of works on the history of the USSR, sociologist, political scientist, Doctor of Chemical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Institute of Socio-Political Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. According to Wikipedia, he is a supporter of the “Soviet project.” A representative of left-wing patriotic thought, a defender of the ideals of collectivism, “traditional” ideocratic society and rational thinking. In general, Kara-Murza has a positive attitude toward the historical experience of the USSR, criticizing Marxism from positions close to Antonio Gramsci and populism. However, in 2007 he published an article in the *Russian Journal* “Hope for a third term. Putin’s Plan”, in which he stated that Vladimir Putin, despite a number of unresolved problems, “has become a symbol of Russia and fulfilled the mission necessary to save the country. Because of this, he became one of the historically significant politicians worthy of memory and respect.”

However such a strange attitude is also natural although marginal in all senses because this attitude is natural as an objective result of the destruction of the Soviet Union. The general or usual main reasons for their position are personal ambitions in connection with personal failure to reach any public recognition in Soviet times. However many famous authors also states that Lenin was a politician, at last a revolutionist but he was not a philosopher at all. This is a very wrong statement.

Lenin surely was not a philosopher in a traditional or a bourgeois understanding. But without any doubt he was just an original and profound philosopher, and precisely a Marxist philosopher, a disciple and follower of Marx. Why so? Because Marxism is not only philosophy, or political economy, or the theory of revolution, and even not only the whole of these three main organic parts of theoretical or philosophical unity. Marxism is also and first of all the organic unity of revolutionary thinking including philosophical thinking with revolutionary practice. That is why Lenin is a truly holistic, harmonious and at the same time contradictory embodiment of this unity of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice. Unity, which is in a constant process of revolutionary origin and development, its critical renewal.

This revolutionary unity is not understood by critics of Lenin including so called Marxist critics of him. We need this unity and we need such a revolutionary Lenin just now and in near future. We also need a new revolutionary politician like Lenin with Lenin’s key traits.

He invariably kept his finger on the pulse of life, on the pulse of the rapidly rushing and menacing stream of history, and, in particular, on the pulse of the revolution. He spoke to everyone in their language, both with a peasant from a

distant province, and with a worker from the Putilov factory, and with a refined intellectual. He understood everyone and everyone understood him. Everyone who was a person, who was a worker, who brought benefit not only to himself and not so much to himself as to other people with his work, his actions, his creativity. And he certainly brought it to them himself.

The purpose of Lenin and that revolution, which became his life's work, so that his enemies, slanderers and haters would not invent there, was the liberation of man – the liberation of the proletariat, all workers and all mankind. He dreamed of a revolution, predicted a revolution, prepared a revolution and accomplished it together with those who, according to Marx, were supposed to accomplish it. All those who accomplished the revolution, and he along with them, fulfilled their vocation and destiny. He was a true liberator, from a cohort of the best, great people, dreamers, thinkers and accomplices, true humanists. He was the very thought and the very action, a thinker and a figure of a global, universal scale. A materialist. A dialectician. An optimist. The poetic metaphor “he turned over hundreds of provinces” is not hyperbole, but an expression of the essence of his thoughts and actions. In a sense, he was a premature man, a man of the future, who lived for the future and for the sake of this future – a truly bright future for all mankind.

Thus, he saved Russia and guided it along the only path that only gave the country the possibility of existence, the possibility of a future, and a true and humane future – the future of Russia and the whole world. He did everything he could for this, everything in humanly possible, but also everything that seemed to be beyond human strength; he accomplished the impossible. He has given immeasurably much to all the peoples of Russia. He does not need to be compared with Christ, not with the ecclesiastical, magnificent one, but with the one who was a revolutionary in religious clothes. But he really came to give people a new world and a new person, and not after a thousand years, and he gave this new world. His world. The very world in which, as he claimed after Karl Marx, there would be neither the poor nor the rich, neither the humiliated nor the insulted, where universal liberation would take place and universal freedom, equality and fraternity would come.

At the same time, he was not only a genuine Russian and a genuine European, but also a real universal, all-human person. Absorbed all the best that humanity has developed, and that, in his own words, only allows a person to become a communist, that is, a real person, a reasonable, creative and humane person, *Homo sapiens, creatrix et humanus*. This is all the man about whom Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky spoke inspiringly and visionarily in his famous speech about Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin. He himself would not object to the fact that what he did, his role in history was evaluated in the same way as he proposed to evaluate the role in the history of others: “Historical merits are judged not by what historical figures did not give in comparison with modern requirements, but by what they gave new in comparison with their predecessors”. His key role in the history of Russia and his global importance in history is irrefutable, recognized by everyone, including his enemies”.

It was precisely such a revolutionary, someone who was so missed in the USSR and in the world in the 1930s and all subsequent years, especially in the 1960s,

when there was still a chance to save and develop the revolution in the USSR, Lenin was perceived and understood in the Soviet Union by all thinking, searching, conscientious people, especially revolutionaries even if they were revolutionaries in their hearts, in their thoughts, and very little, sometimes negligibly little, in their actions. That's how we all love and need him. He is our Lenin, he is my Lenin, and he will always be like that. And he is highly relevant in modern Russia and around the world.

Someone may doubt, lose faith, lose their bearings, stumble and give up, finally give up. But Lenin continues to fight, and he will win. Indeed, the wheel of history cannot be turned back, and it is rolling, albeit in zigzags, albeit with delays, with reversals, along the road that Lenin entered and which the Russian proletariat and the working people of other countries entered with him. Sooner or later, this road will lead to a new human world anyway, and then the prehistory of mankind will really end and its genuine human and human history will begin. It will begin because it already began in 1917 and he, Lenin, stood at the beginning of this story, but the revolution has not ended and the main battles are still ahead.

This Lenin's path is difficult and thorny, but we must go through it. Therefore it is best to end with the lines from the famous Vladimir Mayakovsky's poem *Vladimir Ilyich Lenin*: "***Lenin is now more alive than all the living. Our banner - strength and weapons!***"