

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

CONTENTS

1. Russia’s place in the global crisis	1
1.1. Key question to Russian and foreign bureaucracy with an answer	1
1.2. Kingdom divided against itself	4
2. «Obama» — a project of global deceit	8
2.1. Why Obama and not someone else? — some aspects.....	8
2.1.1. <i>Aspect of internal politics</i>	8
2.1.2. <i>One of the aspects of foreign politics</i>	9
2.2. Forbidden questions in public politics of USA and Russia	10
2.2.1. <i>The original sin of statehood</i>	10
2.2.2. <i>Fairness in the life of society: political ethics — mercenary or work</i>	14
2.2.3. <i>An individual and culture</i>	19
2.3. Top secret: mentality of state power in the USA and in Russia.....	21
2.4. Barack Obama is not free.....	26
2.4.1. <i>Obama and Freedom</i>	26
2.4.2. <i>Globalization and the United States: issues of president Obama</i>	27
2.4.3. <i>Bible – slave’s shackles</i>	28
2.5. Prospective relationship between USA and Russia.....	31

1. Russia’s place in the global crisis

1.1. Key question to Russian and foreign bureaucracy with an answer

Global financial crisis forced heads of number of states to gather for two meetings: first on November 13 and 14 in Nice in EU + Russia format and then on November 15 in Washington in the format of twenty most economically powerful countries. Judging by media reports even though both meetings paid significant attention to global financial system malfunction (subject was impossible to ignore), it did not deliver any worthy results, because delegates of both summits do not take into account and therefore do not discuss the fundamental principles of functioning of the system of global finances and credits. As consequence, no one either discussed a complex of alternative principles for building global system of finance and credits nor ways of switching to them without revolutionary and post-revolutionary shocks, all aimed at eliminating even the possibility of such crisis’s occurrence in the future.

Therefore G-20 summit in Washington turned out to be just pointless talks, for which none of the delegates would be accounted for, and it ended with same in its essence pointless declarations of goodwill, even though all participants might be sincerely convinced that they have completed a big deal of preparation work and in the summit’s course produced constructive results guaranteeing an overcoming of the current crisis and economic prosperity of the humanity.

“The leaders of the Group of 20 nations, including the world’s richest countries and such major developing economies as China, Brazil, India and Russia, issued a joint statement and detailed action plan after their meeting Saturday pledging to take a variety of steps to combat the current economic crisis and make sure it doesn’t happen again.” – reports [The Washington Times](#).

In this article Martin Crutsinger, a corresponder of Associated Press agency, lists key points of the statement and the action plan.

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

According to the delegates, the root of the crisis lies in the fact that investors did not fully recognize the risks involved in their actions. *“Part of the problem stemmed from the fact that the global economy had been doing so well for so long that that investors were lulled into a false sense of security.”* - states the author, pointing out that this joint statement does not actually acknowledge the boom of high risk mortgages in the USA, which many believe to be the epicentre of the current crisis.

In the statement the leaders took an obligation to, when necessary, continue money transfers from central banks to commercial ones, aiming at restoration of normal lending and at stimulation of consumer demand, states the newspaper. According to them, Bush’s administration was opposed to these new pricey obligations especially now, in the times when USA budget is deep in deficit.

Mr. Crutsinger also mentions the improvement of regulation mechanism: G-20 leaders agreed on establishing before March 31 2009 a number of “supervisory colleges” which will include all major regulators of financial system from all over the world and which will meet regularly to discuss the state of largest banks, operating in several countries¹. The article also says that the participants pledged to improve regulation of derivatives.

In addition The Washington Times reports that the leaders agreed to quickly expand the “Financial Stability Forum” organization encompassing high-rank officials, management of central banks and regulator-agencies from a number of countries.

Leaders stated that International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank need to be comprehensively reformed to give more influence to developing countries and to expand the duties of IMF in economic monitoring of countries, mentions the author.

“Concerned that this severe financial crisis not lead to the same beggar-thy-neighbor trade policies that contributed to the Great Depression, the group pledged to refrain from erecting new trade barriers for the next 12 months” newspaper reports.

G-20 leaders pledged to meet again before April 30th 2009 and gave their ministers of finance an extensive list of measures to be taken before the next summit, concludes the newspaper (<http://www.inopressa.ru/washtimes/2008/11/17/09:29:28/g20>).

Many expected Washington summit to be sort of second Bretton-Woods (back then world leaders met to discuss post - WWII depression which resulted in creation of current financial system, oriented to US dollar as global currency). Gordon Brown, UK prime minister, held especially high hopes for such turn of events. However, breakthrough did not happen, delegates only outlined agenda for the nearest future. The only consolation to Brown was probably the fact that the next G-20 meeting in March 2009 which might bring the breakthrough might take place in the UK.

Dimitry Medvedev did not expect this summit to repeat Bretton-Woods, but in his speech he pointed out that “now world is in need for the ideas as powerful as decades ago”. Here is one of the many ideas expressed by the president before the summit: to establish an international organization of “recognized and independent “financial gurus””. Another one – make G-20 a main coordinator of reforms and development of global financial system – was supported in Washington. Consequently countries forming G-8 were named responsible for global financial security architecture.

Summit’s final declaration encompasses general principals for financial markets reform and tasks that all members of G-20 should give to their ministries and experts. Reformation plan also includes measures to be taken both in short term (before March 31 2009) and in mid-term. Those measures will affect standards of financial accounting, increasing requirements to rating agencies, management of risks. Declaration also mentions that Bretton-Woods financial organizations should undergo complete reformation. This concerns in the first place IMF and World Bank. For example, it has been decided to analyze if their resources are sufficient and to increase them if necessary. IMF will also inforce it’s role as a consultant in macro-economic policy².

All of the above show typically bureaucratic approach:

¹ And what if the colleges reveal that something goes wrong? Will it have any impact? – It is our question to the quote.

² D.A.M. did not care about Obama, Moscovski Comsomlets newspaper, November 17 2008 (<http://www.mk.ru/blogs/MK/2008/11/17/society/381345/>).

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

- a problem forced the biggest layer of international bureaucracy to gather in order to take measure towards this problem’s resolution
- however, bureaucrats themselves are not completely competent in the field and therefore could only direct financial resources and delegate problem resolution to the group of “financial gurus”, which come to think of it, has itself created the problem last year – same financial specialists were acting in the field of monetary exchange and providing consulting services to the same bureaucrats.

On October 12 2008, on the eve of the Nobel prize in economics winner’s announcement, a “news of the weeks” informational tv-show on Russian tv-channel “Rossia” dedicated it’s air time to financial crisis that has taken over the world. There was an attempt to figure out what was the role of Nobel prize in economics winners in the course of global economic processes. As a result, Nobel winners Harry Markowitz (USA) (also shared the prize in 1990 with Merton Miller and William Sharpe “For their pioneering work in the theory of financial economics”) and Robert C. Merton (USA) and Myron Scholes (Canada) (shared together the prize in 1997 “For the nez method to determine the value of derivatives”) were explicitly declared the creators of current economic crisis, because it was precisely them who theoretically proved the harmless nature of speculative machinations for the global economy, which reality proved were exactly the causes of crisis.

However information on pseudo-Nobel laureates, creators of global financial crisis, presented in Sunday (October 12th) news report on tv-channel “Rossia” was only an extended version of the report passed on the news of the First Russian tv-channel of October 5th 2008 (<http://www.1tv.ru/news/world/129484>).

None the less, blaming current crisis on Nobel prize winners is quite superficial in its essence. This crisis is not a result of evil intention or incompetence of pseudo-laureates of Nobel prize, to whom trusted honest stock brokers and bankers, but it is a purely a logical outcome of fundamental principles of organization of monetary exchange in liberal bourgeois West, principles that spread throughout the world, which turned this crisis into global disaster.

Since above mentioned economists and those winners of pseudo-Nobel prize in economics that have not been named here all are pretty far from resolving such issues as economical provision of human prosperity, then the only question to D.A. Medvedev and other participants of G-20 summit in Washington is as follows:

How do you – bureaucrats - intend to distinguish

- “gurus” that are actually competent in the matters of organization and management of regional and global macroeconomic systems and therefore have the ability to resolve this crisis once and for all
- from those “gurus” that with their thorough research and findings have actually paved the way to current mess

— provided that your own education in economics is either non-existent or of the same quality that those of the mentioned pseudo-Nobel laureates, and when you yourself are not willing to go into trouble of looking into the root, studying economic problematic and inadequacy of prevailing schools of economic science?

Unfortunately bureaucrats do not face the question of how to tell an efficient professional from efficient talker only posing as professional, and this problems concerns not only economic domain. And this is the major problem of *societies that rendered their governance power to bureaucratic apparatus. Sadly, post-soviet Russia is not an exception here.*

Who will be chosen into this international committee of financial “gurus” by G-20 bureaucrats if this suggestion will be put into practice – only time will tell. However one cannot hope neither that these “gurus” will be more capable of efficient functioning than above mentioned pseudo-Nobel laureates in economics nor that those chosen will produce “powerful ideas” which will lead world economy to the mode of crisis-proof functioning because:

- Firstly, economic theories of the West are meant to solve radically different problems. Example of that are Nobel laureates’ theoretic “proves” that the crisis was impossible and that pumping speculative “hernia” of economy is absolutely safe for the real sector, for the sphere of

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

consumption and political stability, which only allowed those managers of “hernia” achieve their goals and cause the crisis

- Secondly, bureaucracy is notable for its inscrutable “wisdom” and therefore does not need side ideas that in its content do not adhere to morals and opinions of authoritative “gurus” supported by bureaucracy.

As history of economic degradation of post-soviet Russia shows, its bureaucracy finds only defective “gurus” in its pursuit to solve its publicly declared goals of country’s modernization, poverty elimination and increase of wellbeing of its population, and not only multiplication of assets of oligarchs and other “elite” (including bureaucratic elite, which quotes its salary based not on its achievements).

If bureaucrats continue clinging to such approach to the problem, the matters will only become worse. None the less president D.A. Medvedev in his “Address to the Federal Assembly of Russian Federation, November 5th 2008” declared:

“We should not delude ourselves that the economic crisis is anywhere near over yet. We need to keep our wits about us throughout this period and pay close attention to the effectiveness of our work and the justification of our new plans and programs. This applies to the state, business, and to each individual.

I am sure that we will manage to resolve all of these difficulties and will soon put in place a modern and independent financial system able to withstand any external challenges and ensure stable solutions to its own tasks.” ([English version of the “Address to the Federal Assembly of RF”](#))

This last passage is particularly interesting because before stating anything of that sort it is necessary to:

- Unveil the flaws of current credit-financial system
- Work out principles of building a credit-financial system free from the flaws of the current one
- Prepare a transition plan from the flawed system to improved one
- Prepare executive resources that will be able to function efficiently in the new system
- Find ways and means to retire representatives of current executive apparatus which would not be able to conform to the new system

Otherwise the statement is nothing but empty words which will never lead to realistic results.

1.2. Kingdom divided against itself...¹

On the contrary to the leading countries of West and East who managed to successfully develop their economies in the past ten years after 1998 crisis Russian society accepted conditions of socio-economic crisis as a way of life for many years since back-stage junta hiding behind M. S. Gorbachev came into power. None the less Russia has also been affected by current global financial crisis and has to find means to recover from it.

A few weeks ago Russian prime-minister V.V. Putin asked business community the following question: “When oil prices in the world are falling why then in Russia oil and petrochemical products prices are not following the trend?” Russian petrochemical market responded to the question posted by the head of parliament by lowering prices, in particular: petrol prices dropped 1-2 rubbles per litre (5-8%).

Due to the fact that oil and its products are included in price-list basis - fall in its prices opened opportunities for manufacturers and sellers of goods (in conditions of lack of solvent demand on products with earlier announced prices) to be able to lower their prices not risking bankruptcy, and therefore support manufacturing and consumer exchange of goods in conditions of monetary deficit in times of financial crisis. But these opportunities were immediately eliminated by Central Bank of Russia.

¹ «And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand.» (Matthew, 12:25).

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

“Bank of Russia (Central Bank or CB) demonstratively decreased by 30% rate of Russian ruble to currency basket and [increased refinancing rate to 12%](#) - when traditionally right anti-crisis measure is considered to be interest rate decrease. CB’s official explanation to such measure – the need to fight outflow of the capital – did not convince analytical experts” (source: <http://www.newsru.com/finance/12nov2008/unpredictable.html>).

- Reduction in Russian currency exchange rate improves situation for export but only worsens it for import. If this measure is adequate to public needs in situation when Russia imports up to 70% of food supply and even bigger part of industrial good – is an open question. To answer it we must analyze balances of goods exchange and financial statements of both external trade and internal inter-industrial and inter-regional commerce. But there is not doubt that Central Bank is not trusted anymore to manage Russian ruble exchange rate in the best interest of socio-economic development or Russia since CB became a “state within the state” in 1991.
- Interest rate increase creates additional debt, which we know we will not able to pay and that is aimed at worsening the crisis and destroying V.V. Putin’s influence on stabilization of oil products market.

It does not matter if Central Bank’s actions are manifestation of bad intentions of its perverse comprehension of the nature of macroeconomic processes, the consequences are all the same – crisis aggravation.

Besides for one more time it became clear that Russian bank sector as a whole (and not only CB) is not influenced by patriotism: commercial banks that received government aid to overcome liquidity crisis¹ immediately distinguished themselves in the banks statistics by increasing purchases of foreign currencies and transferring financial assets on overseas bank accounts, although financial aid was given to support the real sector of Russian economy. Then representatives of the real sector started to complain that they were having hard times in obtaining credits and in consequence were forced to save money by decreasing production volumes, cutting salaries and laying off people. Hence crisis is spread through chains of exchange of goods both in real sector and in end-consumption sector.

Correspondingly one of the problems of overcoming the crisis in Russia consists in overriding Central Bank and whole banking sector to the state and its crisis recovery policy. This task might prove to be more difficult than “forcing Georgia to the peace”.

But main problem is inadequacy of historic science, sociology and economics, which is supported and reproduced by educational system in these fields, by Russian Academy of Science (RAS), Higher Attestation Committee (HAC) and scientific councils that award candidate and doctorate degrees in history, sociology and economics – those are the “gurus” officially acknowledged by state officials² as intelligent and competent professionals. And as we know those are big on giving advices...

Because crisis is primarily a manifestation of intellectual and creative bankruptcy of historically formed social science, in order to advance in development our country needs to:

- Turn RAS into community of interest, suspending its unofficial status of “ministry of science”
- Annul already awarded degrees of candidates and doctors of science and HAC and respective science councils were dismissed for being useless¹
- Deviate from historically formed educational standards, primarily in history, sociology (inc. psychology and economics). Those need to be qualified as giving students an opportunity to learn about alternative opinions and views. It is only through such sort of deviation from standards that new knowledge, adequate to new needs of social development, can be introduced in the system of development of new generation of specialists.

On the one side abolition of scientific degrees will free many people from necessity to waste enormous amount of time and effort on writing dissertations and participating in its defense procedures, even more because dissertation defense is only a basis for receiving “official statements” to the fact that degree-holders are certified “know-it-all’s by default”ⁱⁱ. On the other hand this measure will force at least part of officials *to stop covering their expensive irresponsibility* (***funded***

¹Situation when lack of working capital disrupts continuity of operations

² Diplomas of Candidates and Doctors of science, issued by HAC and membership in RAS are recognized by the state as qualification and competence level of their owners

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

by tax-payers) with science degrees and titles of brought in “guru”-consultants, and try to understand on their own the heart of the matters and learn to tell real professionals and experts whose advice can be trusted from those sweet-talkers who take “consulting” for if not a horn of abundance than at least for guaranteed free lunch.

Besides, as we mentioned in analytical note of IP USSR “It is not worth making the same mistake twice” in the series “On the current moment” № 11 (71), 2007, “*socio-economical theories of liberal-bourgeois nature are principally not suited for realization of “Putin’s Plan”, because rise of Russia as a great state and major player of global politics is deeply repugnant and unacceptable for leaders of liberal-bourgeois West. Therefore based on liberal-bourgeois sociological and economical principles, these theories will inevitably become legal cover for political sabotage of “Putin’s Plan” by liberal-bourgeois branch of masonry*”

This is exactly what is happening at the moment: Russia was affected by the crisis “thanks to” its economic science, to its officials ideologically dependent on the science, to its banker and stock brokers and to its morally rotten “elite” in general. And now, actions of state officials, banking and stock moguls in Russia only aggravate the crisis, which in the best case scenario will slow down realization on “Putin’s Plan” if not kill it in the bud because current management will lead the country to full-on economic disaster. On the day when G-20 started its summit in Washington, newsru.com source published the following information:

“Judging by the poll of working Russians about 30% of companies were affected by the crisis: 9% of the respondents say that their employer had delayed salary payments, 6% indicate that there have been a few cases of lay-offsⁱⁱⁱ. At the same time 60% of employed respondents(35% of all respondents) sate that their colleagues and employees of various companies have not experienced any effects of the crisis. In addition, sociologists of [FOM \(Public Opinion Foundation\)](#) point out that these figures haven’t changed in the past week.

At the same time monitoring of personal well-being of respondents (in their own opinion) shows that for now only insignificant number of Russians were personally affected by the crisis. Today, according to FOM’s research, 37% of polled state that in the past 2-3 months state of their personal finances has worsened. Here sociologists point out that even before the crisis (in summer and in the beginning of autumn) this indicator has been constantly at 30% mark.” (<http://www.newsru.com/arch/russia/15nov2008/kri.html>).

Those “powerful ideas”, necessity of which declared D.A. Medvedev in Washington, have already been voiced by Concept of Public Safety (CPS) organization, but were ignored by the regime since parliamentary hearings in 1995. Apparently the regime does not need them. And massive preparation of executive and governmental personnel is and will still be carried out based on ideas that were proven harmful.

And this is despite the fact that lingering crisis of post-soviet society in Russia obliges the state to educate executive personnel not based on new ideas (whether already published or not formed yet, but in some way alternative to traditional thinking) but based on methodology of figuring out new ideas adequate to current reality by each individual facing one or another problem.



For now, the regime have not taken any measures as to lead the country out of algorithemics of development of times of troubles, which was described in analytical note of IP USSR “Time of troubles: its origin, rise, overcoming...” from “On the present moment” series #11 (59) 2006. The regime continues leading the country to the collapse of “mass-elite” culture. And the regime cannot avoid responsibility and say that it has no knowledge about it: photograph on the

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

left shows [Vladislav Surkov](#), First Deputy Chief of Staff of V. Putin’s Administration as he holds one of the issues of above mentioned article. As you can see the issue is in quite large format (A3 paper to be exact) and designed in contrast colors (designed to be noticed) – so obviously such *article can be either ignored or taken into consideration*.

To learn more about similarities in personalities of V. Putin and [B. Godunov](#) see analytical note of IP USSR “Egoists are doomed to be and die as slaves...” in the “On the present moment series” #5 (65), 2007.

To comment on it in the light of the events happened after it was printed – it is necessary to add that the beginning of the end of reign of B. Godunov was an economic crisis – several years of bad harvest, that caused famine in many regions of the country. Then B. Godunov opened state granary to the people, but was not able to organize efficient allocation of the grain. It resulted in quick rise of mass speculation, possibly fueled by Godunov’s political opponents, which only aggravated the situation. Very soon after that Godunov died and (not taking into account 4 years long reign of V. Shuisky, a.k.a. [Vasili IV of Russia](#)) Russian tsardom was taken over by a *man who called himself Dimitriy and who according to the prevailing belief of historic community was playing the role of somebody he was not (in other words [False Dimitriy I](#))*

There are two main reasons for the fall of Godunov’s regime:

- On the one hand – he was not practicing violent elimination (“slaughter”) of his political opponents, which was the favorite practice of [Tsar Ivan The Terrible](#) (also he was one of the contestants in “Name of Russia” project, the analogue of “100 Greatest Britons”)
- On the other hand – Godunov failed to establish his own pool of personnel, which he could have trusted to help him move “un-slaughtered” political opponents from the field of politics to more “domestic” activities
- In addition, ordinary people at the time were not interfering with politics, being too involved in their “domestic/routine” issues, but were actively spreading nonsense and irresponsible rumors “he killed the little tsarevitch (young heir)...”.

As a result – the uprise of Time of troubles

Possibility that financial crisis will put an end to Putin-Medvedev regime is also a hope of their many political opponents (inc. G. Kasparov, B. Nemtsov and others). And therefore it seems logical that the opposition and its allies (both inside Russia and abroad) will make a lot of effort to advance development of current economic disaster. In this connection economic ignorance of state officials and many entrepreneurs may well become both an instrument and a cover for well calculated sabotage in order to stop which it is *objectively necessary* to turn to stronger measures, then just verbal admonition and appeals to the conscience and common sense of saboteurs and fools-their allies; and even more so – *not years-long court trials which only serve to feed parasite-attorneys such as G. Reznik – those are not adequate measures to stop sabotage* (measures have to be quick and efficient).

In connection with this though we would like to quote an analytical note of IP USSR from December 31 2007 “On discharge of destructive anti-Russian matrix”, which a year ago explicitly warns:

“But the rumors that all evil events of the past are the fault of “Godunov” – is a “humanist factor”, which is capable of rising the trouble only in the specific sub-section of Russian intelligentsia. In order to motivate sufficient number of people to raise trouble one thing is necessary – financial crisis and inevitably following it – socio-economic crisis, which is capable of wrecking “Putin’s Plan”: we need to remember that even having state debt, due to the efforts of Putin’s regime the situation in the country is rather stable, but private entrepreneurs were put into such conditions that for many years it was more profitable for them to take credits in foreign banks^{iv}.”

In other words – the history is repeating itself, at least on the surface:

- The regime principally does not “slaughter” its opponents
- There are no signs of establishing executive personnel pool, based on new alternative ideas and principles, which is necessary for “pushing” the fools and saboteurs into “domestic” routine
- Meanwhile, simple people are occupied by the same “domestic routine”, not interfering into “tsars business”, but spreading nonsense and irresponsible rumors: “Buildings in Moscow were

blown up to start second Chechen war; they served polonium-flavored tea to Litvinenko, potential opposition to the regime; they killed truth-seeking Politkovskaya; they bankrupted “Ukos” and are “marinating” prisons ardent idealists-opponents – Khodorkovsky and pregnant Bakhmina, meanwhile they rob the people and hide money in offshore accounts...”

What in that situation is done by means of non-public politics, carried out based on discipline of internal corporations, special services and their periphery in the society – is still an open question, which everyone answers to the degree of their own perception of the world and understanding of it.

But in looking for such kind of answers it is utterly important not to turn one’s own thoughts into the ranks of conspiracy theories.

- None the less the regime will face the consequences of its actions, because personnel is a crucial factor. And personnel that received inadequate education and having flawed morale and ethics will do harm...
- In addition the people are not entirely innocent in their financial suffering – every nation deserves the leaders that they either purposefully chose or let them be chosen...
- And God does not help those who do not help themselves

2. «Obama» — a project of global deceit

2.1. Why Obama and not someone else? — Some aspects

2.1.1. Aspect of internal politics

One of the key factors of existence and development of every society is its psychological spirit or dominant – optimistic or pessimistic one. If pessimistic spirit prevails in a society for long period of time or several generations then this society will face not only problems in its development but also the issue of its survival in general.

If we were to compare Russian and American societies using this factor then the result will not be in favor of Russia:

- American society is in many ways dynamic because it is optimistic. Ask any American how he/she is doing and almost every one will respond “fine/great/terrific”. And even if his/her life is very far from perfect or even disastrous he/she will stick to the norms of society and would never off-load his/her pessimism on the collective subconscious. Russians are completely different case
- Ask anyone living in Russia how he is doing and his answer will vary from total pessimism- “worse then ever”- to very careful optimism – “well, nothing special, trying to survive”. And in this age of reform Russian mass media set the ton for pessimistic dominant. E.g. when Masha Gaidar, a host of “Echo of Moscow” radio show “Special opinion” on November 11 2008 asked her guest, well known publicist and humorist Victor Shenderovitch the following question: “How do you view our future during this financial crisis” he *immediately* responded “I don’t see anything good”.

Here the matter is not in introducing moral bans on “crying on the shoulder” of someone who can help or at least console the “crier”, but in the fact that one should not complain about his/her life, outpouring pessimism and therefore spoiling algorithmic of collective unconscious. And in relation to this cultural norms of USA are more socially safe.

All precedent presidents before Obama – were not just random people, meaning that all of them come from “elite” clans, and some of them (according to press) are heirs of Merovingians, just like Western European monarchs and therefore go way back in their genealogy to David and as it is perceived – directly to Jesus Christ.

And pre-election of B. Obama poses a question: What could have happened to force American establishment to deviate from “pedigree” rule, at least as it seems?

In the United States, as in Russia, not all of the citizens participate in the elections, including the president. Those who ignore procedures of American pseudo-democracy are people who feel that independently of who will win the election – republicans or democrats – their life will not change to the better.

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

In 8 years of republican governance the amount of those people (mostly afro-Americans and Latino Americans) have risen significantly. And in general in past 2-3 years usual American optimism in many layers of society has started to change into such a strange feeling to “middle-class American” – pessimism. This must have caught attention of those who really rule the USA and caused the appearance of “successful African American” – B. Obama.

2.1.2. One of the aspects of foreign politics

When on November 5 2008 the news of the election of Barack Hussein Obama for the president of the United States were announced, many TV-reports showed people celebrating on the streets not only in the USA but also Japan, Greece, UK, not even mentioning Kenya, where Obama’s father comes from. No other presidential victory caused such response before. In order to provoke ordinary people to go on the streets celebrating election of one or another candidate in presidential elections in foreign country, even if this country is the most economically and military powerful in the world – such people response takes special “psychological treatment” of the crowd.

Such sort of pro-Obama “psycho-treatment” of masses has not reached Russia and its population took the results of presidential elections rather neutrally. None the less, an unprecedented event took place in Russia: in the course of US presidential election campaign – 25000 of copies of a book were published and hit the stores – that was a book of then candidate, senator Barack Obama “The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream”. Interesting that Russian edition of this book has the following line on its cover: A book from a man who can change America and the whole world” (those words “and the whole world” mean that Russia as a part of it is going to be changed as well). To our knowledge, never to this day a book or speeches or a monograph of an American presidential candidate or a president has been published in Russia in thousands of copies. However none of the speeches or publications of competing candidates (H. Clinton, J. McCain) have been printed in such quantities.

In the USA this book quickly became a best-seller according to “New York Times”, “Los Angeles Times”, “Washington Post”, “San Francisco Chronicle”. In general book answers the question why it was Obama who was chosen by American back-stage to win the elections, although neither now president nor other democrats and republicans could notice the fact of this “*back-stage pre-election*” for further strengthening in this position based on US “democratic procedures”

One of the West problems in doing politics after year 2000 consisted in the fact that western leaders looked quite pale comparing to Putin and were not able to produce in public polemics with him on difficult issues between Russia and the West. One of the causes for is in that Putin’s horizon is wider then mental outlook of western politicians and journalists, and his understanding of the world is a lot deeper. Because of this Putin was able to raise discussion and view virtually any question to a level that was unavailable to western politics and journalism because of either their limited worldview or psychological blocks.

That is why to look credible in their political relationship with Russia West needed to find such politician that would have even wider horizon than Putin in his views on human history and regions, on politics – past, present and prospective- and who would be not a “desk-worm” but a true human with initiative and sincerity (at least when circumstances demand) required to be able to maintain dialog with different people, to understand their opinions and who earns respect to his persona for sounding his opinion on various issues of life in the USA and the world, who would be convincing in maintaining stability of American model of crowd-“elitarism”. And judging by “Audacity of hope” backstage powers of USA found this man in Barack Obama.

Without a doubt, this is just one of many aspect of the answer to the question “Why Obama?”. The other aspects consist in the fact that USA also has problems, partially rooted in local American specifics and partially in globalization, which USA do not manage, as well as any other country cannot manage it.

Barack Obama writes about many of such sort of problems and about some *connections*. And even if the book is written with support of speech-writers from his team, then not only they were “selling”

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

Obama to the public like dumb puppet, but Obama with their help could express in the book his actual opinion on questions of life in the US and the world, their problems and those ideals that in his view had to come true for the good of people of USA and the whole world. And it was his book and his speeches that inspired and drawn crowds of voters: if none of it made sense to people Barack Obama would have lost the elections.

However the principle “everyone works for his own good to the extent of his own understanding, and for the good of others to the lack of thereof” works even for Obama. And it is obvious from his book – Obama himself is not on the required level of understanding the problems that he said he was ready to tackle. Precisely because of this American “back-stage management” gave him heads up for the elections... **In other words Obama’s endorsement as the president of USA just seems as an indicator of growth and development of *true democracy* in biblical “crowd-elitarisme” of USA.**

Due to the fact that neither Putin nor Medvedev have published such books we can only benchmark both of them on the basis of their public speeches. Such comparison is not in favor of the duo, but in Obama’s: *topical spectrum of the book is a lot wider and deeper than subjects that Putin and Medvedev can discuss in their public speeches. In other words Barack Obama in his book goes into depths of the questions that both Putin and Medvedev have to avoid in public.*

2.2. Forbidden questions in public politics of USA and Russia

2.2.1. The original sin of statehood

One of the forbidden subjects for public discussion in post-soviet Russia is the issue of its “original sin”. The matter here is that **post-soviet statehood of Russian Federation as well as of the rest of post-soviet states on former USSR territory originated despite the will of people of USSA, who during 1991 referendum explicitly declared their desire to maintain the union and continue development of its culture and economy**¹.

And consequently current statehood of RF is legislatively illegitimate, which both Putin and Medvedev are bound to understand as both have degrees in law².

And the “founding farther” of post-soviet Russia – Boris Nikolaevitch Yeltsin³, often referred to as EBN by the people – one of the destroyers of the USSR despite the will of its people. But this is not all: liquidation of socialist regime and Soviet power with its own internal forces, dissection of the country, destruction of its military force and creation of the system of economical and ideological dependency of the country on outside world is clearly stated in the Directive of Department of Homeland Security of the USA 20/1 of 08. 18.1948 “The goals of the USA in Russia”⁴. Therefore one cannot help but raise a question of treason of the people of USSR and RF by M. Gorbachev, A. Yakovlev, B. Yeltsin and number of other politicians of the time (officially is a crime).

And fairly large part of ex-USSR population is convinced that Yeltsin was not at all the leader of democratic movement and founder of democratic (and in future prosperous) Russia. They believe that he was nothing but ambitious carrier bureaucrat of party-apparatus incompetent in any professional field, whose outlook and depth of worldview were clearly insufficient to lead a country not mentioning country in crisis. They are convinced that he was hypocrite and shameless villain who was tricked with ambitions to take the role of the “motherland savior” in order to, behind his back, first execute above mentioned DHS Directive 20/1 from 08.18.1948 and secondly “cut coupons” on the principle “money don’t smell, and if they do – they smell quite nicely”: what was primary

¹ In addition Russia still holds the Judas’ sin of XXth convention (see article of IP USSR “The Judas’ sin of XX convention”) and the oldest sin – its christening allegedly into orthodoxy realistically into Byzantine Lies.

² Judging by the quality of life in 17 years of its existence RF has not earned legitimacy for itself: it has not been able to meet 1986 indicators of production per individual, and its population keeps on shrinking, not even mentioning that honest work cannot lead to great wealth in current conditions.

³ This abbreviation carries audio-similarity to some Argo expressions, which only shows the lack of respect among people, as well as his earlier nickname “BaNana” derived from his initials.

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

objective of every participant of USSR destruction and of building bandit-oligarch's capitalism in Russia of Yeltsin times – does not matter.

However on the contrary to this historical truth^{vi} all representatives of Russian “elite” and mostly political “elite” in all their public speeches talk about Yeltsin as a man of exceptional good will, who work hard and honestly, risking his health and life (second presidential campaign continued despite his heart attack) for the good of humanity even though he made a lot of mistakes in the difficult business that he started. However for those mistakes he sincerely apologized in his address to the people of Russia on 12.31.1999, which showed his non-lust for power and an example of democracy. He also found very capable successor, under whose management Russia succeeded to solve many issues of nineties, which boosted his ratings higher than those of Yeltsin himself. And all in all for the total sum of his actions he deserves respect and therefore to preserve his memory his name should be given to many streets, libraries (inc. the Presidential Library in St. Petersburg), scholarships and educational institutions.

Opinions of those who stick to negative assessment of Yeltsin's personality and his work are not discussed in Russian public politics, as if those opinions do not exist at all, or as if those are obvious nonsense and lies, as if there never was DHS's Directive 20/1 of 08.18.1948, executed in its major propositions with active involvement of Yeltsin, who allegedly returned the country to the main route of the development after 70 years of deception and evil actions of Soviet forces.

The worst that Putin could allow himself to say in public speeches was admitting that fall of the USSR was the greatest tragedy for many people and for which he was reproached by whole liberal community both in Russia and abroad. In all other cases Putin publicly acknowledged his adherence to the following version: “Boris Yeltsin is the founding father of democratic Russia and an outstanding politician whose grateful memory should be kept for centuries”, although as an employee of Special Agencies Putin is bound to know about DHS's Directive 20/1 of 08.18.1948 and many other facts that do not conform to the cult liberal myth about establishment of post-soviet states on former USSR territory. And neither Putin nor any other public politician or journalist bothered to look into algorithmic of that catastrophe, *using facts that do not fit into sweet-liberal version of Russian history*.

United States of America also have an “original sin” of their own: USA started as slave-ship state and functioned in those conditions for not less than hundred of years before legislative abolishment of slavery as a result of the North victory over the South during civil war of 1861-1865.

It is well known that slaves were massively imported from Africa, they were black and even founding fathers who wrote American Constitution and Bill of Rights themselves owned slaves. Now black people in America (in the majority descendants of slaves) are called African-Americans¹ and legislatively have the same rights as any white citizen of the US. But American historical past has such nature that US future is in many ways dependent on the question of whether or not their society can overcome “original sin” of American statehood, elaborating a common and uniting approach to the historic past of their country, which will be a sound foundation for building future America, free from flaws of the past and present one.

Barack Obama, who himself is not a descendent from African slaves (his father immigrated from Kenya and his mother is Caucasian) freely deliberates on the problem of “original sin” of American statehood, focusing on the task of freeing society from its burden, in the way that he understands it. He is *ready to dialogue with his opponents, but only if the talk is to the point, and not in some “abstract humanism” style deadly to people*; and he does not hold grudge towards founding fathers of the US, who, although owned slaves, could however express ideals that can be supported by many millions, if not billions of people around the world. Barack Obama writes:

«I recognize the risks of talking this way, In an era of globalization and dizzying technological change, cutthroat politics and unremitting culture wars we don't even seem to possess a shared language with which to discuss our ideals much less the tools to arrive to at some rough consensus about how, as a nation, we can work together to bring those ideals about. Most of us are wise to the ways of admen, pollsters, speechwriters and pundits. We know how high flying words can be deployed in the service of cynical aims, and how the noblest sentiments can be subverted in the

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

name of power, expedience, greed, or intolerance. Even the standard high school history textbook notes the degree, to which, from its very inception, the reality of American life have strayed from its myths.” (p.8).

And never the less he insist on the truthfulness of ideals and necessity of bringing them about, despite all the mistakes and abuse of the past and despite the actions of those who make mistakes and abuse their power in present.

And this is precisely the key idea of the book, that gives an impression that Obama is not a talkative hypocrite, but sincere activist with good intentions, and then one can understand those Americans who trusted him with presidential power.

“ “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness“

Those simple words are our starting point as Americans; they describe not only the foundation of our government but the substance of our common creed. Not every American may be able to recite them; few, if asked, could trace the genesis of the Declaration of Independence to its roots in eighteenth-century liberal and republican thought. But the essential idea behind the Declaration – that we are born into this world free, all of us; that each of us arrives with a bundle of rights that can’t be taken away by any person or any state without just cause; that through our own agency we can, and must, make of our lives what we will – is one that every American understands. It orients us, sets our course each and every day.

Indeed, the value of individual freedom is so deeply ingrained in us that we tend to take it for granted. It is easy to forget that at the time of our nation’s founding this idea was entirely radical in its implications, as radical as Martin Luther’s posting on the church door. It is an idea that some portion of the world still rejects – and for which an even larger portion of humanity finds scant evidence in their daily lives.” (p.53)

Of course every nation has their own [Smerdyakovs](#)^{vii} and at times there are too many of them due to the particularities of historical development of events, but generally the majority of people will full heartedly agree with the above quoted words of Declaration of independence of the USA, because they would prefer to live in such society which will make those words reality.

However the problem is in the fact that the majority, including Americans, does not know how to bring those ideals about...

And therefore entire history of the USA is a consequence of their original sin: a gap, often abyss, between undoubtedly humanistic declarations and practical politics.

A bit further in the book Barack Obama looks in more details into Constitution of the USA and its role in life of the country throughout its entire history (obviously, talking about Constitution in a manner detached from life with its many realistic factors is nonsense):

In sum, the Constitution envisions a road map by which we marry passion to reason, the ideal of individual freedom to the demands of community. And the amazing thing is that it’s worked. Through the early days of the Union, through depressions and world wars, through the multiple transformations of the economy and Western expansion and the arrival of millions of immigrants to our shores, our democracy has not only survived but has thrived. It has been tested, of course, during times of war and fear, and it will no doubt be tested again in the future.

But only once has the conversation broken down completely, and that was over the one subject the Founders refused to talk about.

The Declaration of Independence may have been, in the words of historian Joseph Ellis, “a transformative moment in the world history, when all laws and human relationships dependent on coercion would be wept away forever”. But that spirit of liberty didn’t extend, in the minds of the Founders, to the slaves, who worked their fields, made their beds, and nursed their children.

The Constitution’s exquisite machinery would secure the rights of citizens; those deemed members of America’s political community. But it provided no protection to those outside to constitutional circle – the Native American whose treaties proved worthless before the court of the

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

conqueror, or the black man Dred Scott, who would walk into the Supreme Court a free man and leave a slave.

(...)

There's a school of thought that sees the Founding Fathers only as hypocrites and the Constitution only as a betrayal of the grand ideals set forth by the Declaration of Independence; that agrees with early abolitionists that the Great Compromise between North and South was a pact with the Devil. Others, representing the safer, more conventional wisdom, will insist that all the constitutional compromise on slavery – the omission of abolitionist sentiments from the original draft of the Declaration, the Three-fifths clause, the self-imposed gag rule that the Twenty-fourth Congress would place on all debate regarding the issue of slavery, the very structure of federalism and the Senate – was necessary, if unfortunate, requirement for the formation of the Union; that in their silence, the Founders only sought to postpone what they were certain would be slavery's ultimate demise; that this single lapse cannot detract from the genius of the Constitution, which permitted the space for abolitionists to rally and the debate to proceed, and provided the framework by which, after the Civil War had been fought the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments^{viii} could be passed, and the Union finally perfected.

How can I, an American with the blood of Africa coursing through my veins, choose sides in such dispute? I can't. I love America too much, am too invested in what this country has become, too committed to its institutions, its beauty and even its ugliness, to focus entirely on the circumstances of its birth. But neither can I brush aside the magnitude of the injustice done, or erase the ghosts of generations past, or ignore the open wound, the aching spirit that ails this country still.” (P.95-97)

In short, his position on the matter of the relationship between present and past is similar to the one of Russian historian V.O. Klutchevski: “*We need to know the past not because it has happened, but because on its way out it could not hide its consequences*”, which means that unacceptable consequences of the past must be eliminated.

Further on B. Obama concentrates on history of fight against slavery and names those – slaves, free, simple people, and state officials – who sacrificed their lives to the noble task of slavery elimination, and concludes:

“The blood of slaves reminds us that our pragmatism can sometimes be moral cowardice. Lincoln, and those buried at Gettysburg, reminds us that we should pursue our own absolute truths only if we acknowledge that there may be a terrible price to pay” (p. 98).

He also pays attention to the crimes of USA statehood towards both its own people and population of other countries, which throughout American history were a great many. And he clearly expresses his opinion getting to the heart of the matter.

In relation to the whole problematic mentioned in Obama's book, he expresses a right – from managerial education point of view – position:

- It does not matter how the managed object (managed system) has come to one or the other situation
- It only matters to what extent this situation is adequately identified and its problematic is being diagnosed, what future goals are set, and what ways towards achieving those goals are suggested.

The goals themselves are unchangeable – bringing to life ideals, expressed in the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, Bill of Rights, which includes the totality of: 1) *objective ideals*, 2) *real goal-setting in politics, which is provided by objective and subjective factors of historical specifics*, and 3) *means to achieve the goals*. The second and third, as history shows, can be deceiving, and keeping in mind possibility of mistakes, it is necessary to act in the direction of revealing and bringing those ideals about. To illustrate such example Obama brings up A. Lincoln:

“ I like to believe that for Lincoln, (...) it was a matter of maintaining within himself the balance between two contradictory ideas – that we must talk and reach for common understandings, precisely because all of us are imperfect and can never act with the certainty that God is on our

side; and yet at times we must act nonetheless, as if we are certain, protected from error only by providence.” (p. 98).

That last phrase would have been a more precise expression of the reality of life is it sounded like that: “*we must act in the way for the providence to protect us from error*”. But independently from the way you put it in words, this morally-ethical principle is in itself very *well grounded in reality, provided that the subject will follow it sincerely, because God is not indifferent to what is happening on Earth, and religion – dialog with God through one’s inner world and flow of life circumstances*.

From the systematic position of such sort of principles B. Obama concentrates not only on problematic of life of American society: possibility of personal growth and self-realization in given historical and cultural circumstances, real and desired policy of American statehood in relation to these circumstances; internal and external policies and other questions. He looks at those issues in their mutual correlation, in specifics, not avoiding the facts, that are unpleasant for nice myths about USA, and thus confirming the principle mentioned in the beginning of his book:

“I believe in free speech, whether politically correct or politically incorrect...” (p. 10)

2.2.2. *Fairness in the life of society: political ethics — mercenary or work*

And another un-politically correct subjects in Russia – theme of justice in the life of society, “elite’s” approach to “simple people” and of people’s approach to “elite”.

But before showing how the subject of social justice is given in “The Audacity of Truth” and in the public speeches of Russian political “elite”, we’ll focus on some specificities of socio-political life of the USA and Russia, that characterize each of the countries.

In general, comparing US life with ideals mentioned in the Declaration of Independence and in the Bill of Rights, than undoubtedly, the USA are progressing in the task of turning their cult ideals to life; racial inequality they have already overcome de jure, and are working on overcoming it de facto; many other problems were solved as well.

And the source of this progress is – public discussion of the real divergence between declared ideals and real life, which, although it is often clouded by lengthy speeches of the participants and although the truth often gets lost in those speeches, still is a notable part of socio-political life of the United States, and Obama’s book is very clear example of that. Of course in the US, as in any other country, there is also a non-public discussions of the issue, which in many ways form country’s politics and business actions, but this part is forced to react on the public part of the process.

But along with such progress the USA created many problems both locally and globally, and in the historically defined shape, they became a problem to the rest of the world, *that need a solution*. One of the main reasons for this is that in the public and non-public politics even as free speech is a cult – free thinking in the US is still limited by their specific culture, which is why US in their demands on the role of the global leader and a wheel of progress are constantly faced with objections, which can be responded to only by force, following wisdom of the unrighteous: “Out force will be the true law, because powerlessness proves to be useless” (The wisdom of Solomon 2:11) – but not many people in the States know these words, because “The wisdom of Solomon” is excluded from the Canon and is not in the standard Bible.

Russia is indeed not America. For the centuries of it’s historical past (starting at least from the “Words of Law and Prosperity” of Kiev’s metropolitan bishop Illarion, dated 1037-1050) its socio-political life is characterized by:

- In public politics the desired is often taken for the real
- In public politics the subject of power abuse and other problems are often left unspoken, as if they do not exist
- And when problems become critical, and force to be openly discussed, then

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

- ∅ Discussion of them is often far from the point (e.g. mass media discussion of the global financial crisis during the tenth meeting of “United Russia”)
- ∅ Or the discussion is substituted for by official declarations like “yes, there are some problems, but our father-tsar has already taken measures to solve them, and they might be already solved and the messengers have not yet reported on that...” (e.g. mass media coverage of the Tchernobul catastrophe and the first few days of rescue operation of the “Kursk” submarine sunk by NATO).

- And when some of the events move to the past, then an official myth is created, which in its content can be very far from the actual reality (e.g. official version of the establishment of post-soviet statehood of the RF or the official story on the “Kursk” submarine).

And overcoming development problems in Rus’ is taking place based on the non-public “underground-couloirs politics”, to which both the power and the opposition are equally adherent. **In Rus’ everything is secretive, but nothing is secret, although along with non-secretive truth society has and spreads many rumors:** that’s why everybody “knows” that Alexandr I officially publicly died in 1825 in Taganrog and was buried in Peretburg side by side with other emperors.... After what he spent few more decades incognito living as in Siberia, where he died very old.

And if in Rus’ official declarations the power says that

- Everything is fine, that they have achieved some goals in life and that many problems have been solved
- At the same time many people do not see any proved of that in their everyday life

— then the powers, on the background of public, knowingly hypocritical declarations of loyalty by unbelieving and despising it people, faces politically amateur actions of the people – as un-public as the actual politics.

All of it happens because direct appeals to the power on the issues and ways of solving them, are ignored by it, because those issues do not fit in the format of public policy of the state.

The question is in:

- How much time will it take the state power to commit suicide by not being able to handle the problems *ignored* by it?
- And how much time after that will it take the underground opposition to become legitimate de-facto state power?
- In such circumstances de jure legitimacy of power – is a question that means little to both sides – to power and its social opposition.

The key reason for such difference in public and non-public approaches of socio-political lives in Rus’ and in the USA is because:

- **Russian “elite” is *shameless anti-nation egoistic corporation that only wants the people to admit that they are rednecks in whose presence the “elite” does not have to explain itself.***

Whether ‘elite’ takes this position consciously or unconsciously does not matter – it would have been just as comfortable in cast society: you belong to one group and therefore you have the right, if not –you don’t have the right, and all your talents and advantages worth nothing. It is almost impossible and very rare to work one’s way from the bottom to the top/ ‘elite’, because all the space in it has already been taken by representatives on historically formed “elite clans”, some of which manage to keep their status despite revolutions and counter-revolutions (e.g. clan of Mikhalkov). With the change of ‘elite’ after catastrophes, the process starts again (e.g. Yeltsin came from deep country, but where are his kids now – highly elite, but for what concrete talents or work? And besides Yelstin there were many other officials, whose children were ‘eliterized’..)

- **And in the U.S. “elite”, *with all its flaws, prefers that people beleived that the “elite” responsible to him and is working in the general public interest, being an «avant-garde» of the people in their socio-historical development.***

And ‘elite’ occupies this position as a corporation, knowingly or unconsciously - does not matter. In the American “elite” there is also a hereditarily-clan core (in particular it is widely known by its representatives such as Kennedy, Mc Cain, senior and junior Bush, Rockefeller, Ford), but a lot of those who withdrew from the American common people or the middle class (the most widely

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

known, General Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice,- At different times were both U.S. Secretary of State; even B. Obama - elected president: all are black and would not have been able to make their career, have they been born at least 50 years earlier). And the influx of new mass flows of people into US "elite" has been going on throughout U.S. history in every generation, resulting in that "elite" of the US is more clever and more capable than hereditarily clans isolated from the rest of society "elites" of other countries, including Russia, and corporate discipline and lack of freedom (this is explained further in the case of B.Obama) in the USA "elite" are different.

Consequently, all political and ideological conflicts between the U.S. and Russia (except for the period starting from about 1930 to 1953) are - conflicts over good and civilized, refined *ways to implement the "elitist" slavery on the basis of the Declaration of Independence, U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights by the U.S.* against the ancient unabashedly naked "elitist" slavery in Russia. Now we can go back to the essence of justice in society and its implementation.

Notions of fairness and injustice in life of society if double-conditional:

- Firstly – from the Above, by humanity’s sole purpose (in atheist formulation – by genetic potential of personal development of all members of society, which it either allows to grow and realize in its full capacity or suppresses and limits it).
- Secondly – by historical facts – by what of the already predetermined from Above is already implemented, what needs to be implemented and to which implementation is blocked by greed of some or the others social groups, often supported in written and unwritten social laws influencing personal growth of people in this society.

Therefore notions of justice in social life are, firstly historically concrete and secondly are changing from age to age according to the character of social development of degradation.

Besides, in its cultural conditioning they are the consequence of the answer on the question about relationship between body physiology and biology of Homo Sapiens species and a *raison d’être* of humans and society. History knows only two answers to this question:

- **Live to experience pleasure**, including pleasure from food, sex, not necessarily aimed at reproduction.

Actually United States are programmed on it, and with more or less success are implementing it. This is a consequence of the fact that their cult Declaration of Independence and a Constitution, Bill of rights do not say anything about what objectively is dignity of a successful person, and even though the dignity is not defined, his pursuit of happiness can still be realized. But the USA do not know that¹. In Russia “elite” also lives but this principle.

- **Eat and procreate to live**: meaning to implement some higher plan.

In Russia the “Smerdyakovs” among common people as well as among the “elite” are more or less active in that direction.

And both principles are objectively and inevitably antagonistic to each other, in addition adepts of the first one are aggressive.

¹ «1 For the ungodly said, reasoning with themselves, but not aright, Our life is short and tedious, and in the death of a man there is no remedy: neither was there any man known to have returned from the grave. 2 For we are born at all adventure: and we shall be hereafter as though we had never been: for the breath in our nostrils is as smoke, and a little spark in the moving of our heart: 3 Which being extinguished, our body shall be turned into ashes, and our spirit shall vanish as the soft air, 4 And our name shall be forgotten in time, and no man shall have our works in remembrance, and our life shall pass away as the trace of a cloud, and shall be dispersed as a mist, that is driven away with the beams of the sun, and overcome with the heat thereof. 5 For our time is a very shadow that passeth away; and after our end there is no returning: for it is fast sealed, so that no man cometh again. 6 Come on therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are present: and let us speedily use the creatures like as in youth. 7 Let us fill ourselves with costly wine and ointments: and let no flower of the spring pass by us: 8 Let us crown ourselves with rosebuds, before they be withered: 9 Let none of us go without his part of our voluptuousness: let us leave tokens of our joyfulness in every place: for this is our portion, and our lot is this. 10 Let us oppress the poor righteous man, let us not spare the widow, nor reverence the ancient gray hairs of the aged. 11 Let our strength be the law of justice: for that which is feeble is found to be nothing worth.» (Wisdom of Solomon, chapter 2), but as mentioned earlier, the Book of Wisdom is not included in Canon nor in any standard American Bible

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

Then social life in civilization of technical-technological nature, where production is based on the organization and collective work, one of the aspects of justice is linked to an opportunity for a person to receive sufficient (in one of the above senses) part of the product, manufactured by collective work – whether directly (sharing the product in its natural state – when there is no monetary exchange) or in financial equivalent (when monetary exchange prevails products exchange).

Societies that have realized in themselves the meaning of human existence in all its fullness do not exist at the moment.

Now let us move to Obama’s statements on the questions of economical justice in social life.

In 1980, the average CEO made forty-two times what an average hourly worker took home. By 2005, the ratio was 262 to 1. Conservative outlets like the Wall street Journal editorial page try to justify outlandish salaries and stock options as necessary to attract top talent and suggest that the economy actually performs better when America’s corporate leaders are fat and happy. But the explosion in CEO pay has had little to do with improved performance. In fact, some of the country’s most highly compensated CEOs over the past decade have presided over huge drops in earnings, losses in shareholder value, massive layoffs, and the under funding of their workers pension funds.

What accounts for the change in CEO pay is not any market imperative. It’s cultural. At a time when average workers are experiencing little or no income growth, many of America’s CEOs have lost any sense of shame about grabbing whatever their pliant, handpicked corporate boards will allow. Americans understand the damage such an ethic of greed has on our collective lives, in a recent survey, they ranked corruption in government and business, and greed and materialism, as two of the three most important moral challenges facing the nation (“raising kids with the right values” ranked first). Conservatives may be right when they argue that the government should not try to determine executive pay packages. But conservatives should at least be willing to speak out against unseemly behavior in corporate boardrooms with the same moral force, the same sense of outrage, that they direct against dirty rap lyrics.” (p.62)

Is there any Russian politician that has publicly brought up such questions? – No, there isn’t

Publicly discussing greedy ethics of ‘elite’ of Russia and its basic flawed morality of praising itself and other hedonism – representatives of “elite” in Russia (inc. politicians) tend to avoid, although in doing that they can theatrically reproach so-called “social greed” – discontent of those who did not receive “elite” positions. So-called “social greed” in fact exists, because as it has been known for centuries, a large part of slaves are not dreaming about freedom, but about having their own slaves. However, reproach of social greed should not replace discussions of issues of justice and reproach of other forms of injustice, besides the “social greed”. In particular this concerns economic aspects:

Justice manifests in the fact that statistics of distribution of finances in executive level of state and business should not be different from statistics of financial statistics in all other fields. Justice in this sense is really economically functional despite the Wall Street Journal’s opinion that effective management is army of “fat and nice” executives, and to make sure they are nice and fat their incomes must be many times the average salary.

Besides, there are no biological or cultural objective reasons to lift top executives and their families according to their consumption above social statistics to the heights unreachable to the rest of the society.

However Russian political “elite” is fundamentally against public discussion of problem of social justice. Here is a recent example: Once a well-respected Russian newspaper “Vedomosti” published an article discussing injustice in relationship between bureaucracy and common people in conditions of crisis, it immediately received a warning “on necessity of strict obedience to the law of counteraction to extremism” from Federal Service on Supervision over the Legality in the Sphere of

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

Mass Communications (<http://www.newsru.com/russia/22nov2008/ved.html>). It seems that for Russian political ‘elite’ it is rather easy and common practice to issue a law of extremism counteraction. But it is a lot harder to raise and discuss the matter of social justice and expressions of injustice of system of social relations, inherited from soviet times, on the congress of “United Russia” and then take real binding decisions and implement them in life – for the ‘elite’ and its ‘entourage’, from party mass gathered at the congress. In such conditions issuing orders on “necessity of obiding the law of counteracting extremism” means purposefully charge revolutionary situation. And therefore it is those people who issued this order who should be taken to court.

More to the point:

From purely managerial point of view, price of a good *in conditions of somewhat free market* is a measure of its defect. This also concerns the price of qualified personnel in all industries.

In other words, if a society is ready to pay executives according to “the higher in hierarchy – the deeper is the gap between your salary and average one” principle, then such society is experiencing an acute deficit of effective managers. Situation is aggravated by the fact that various aferists, that neither are able to nor are willing to learn to do anything useful, can successfully penetrate managerial field driven by greed for high incomes and irresponsibility in the face of their employees and hard workers.

This is exactly the reason, according to Obama, why it was namely high-paid executives that made the worst mistakes in their company’s management

It is no surprise that Barack Obama noticed this – at least for those who are familiar with articles of Concept of Social Security. They described this phenomenon already back in 1994 in the paper of IP of USSR “Short course...” giving examples of USA, then GDR and Japan.

However such materials are only an obstacle for Russian bureaucrats and top executives crushed by their ethics of greed in their work of dividing the budget and obtaining gigantic salaries on the basis of the laws taken by themselves and in their task of extortion of bribes.

And we repeat:

Subject of justice in specifics of displayed injustice – is also a banned subject for public discussion amongst all representatives of “elite” (political, corporate, “intellectual”) in post-soviet Russia, including editors of mass media under their control.

And if in non-public circle of representatives of political “elite” they were forced to address the issue of injustice in its full, then instead of dialogue and talking to the point we would receive only cheap talk of the sort “*those people deal with increased responsibility, and therefore to reward them for taking such burden we have to pay substantially higher salaries*”

But when directly asked “*which of those bearers of “enormous responsibility” has actually been called up on their mistakes? Which of them have actually paid for making mistakes of strategic gravity?*” those adepts of inflated salaries get stunned, often turning to hysterical remarks that “repeats of Stalinism must not be allowed”. And even less often some of them start mumbling something incoherent on “guilty conscience” and mistakes they have made (M. Gorbachev, B. Yeltsin, A. Yakovlev, A. Tchubais, E. Gaidar, B. Berezovsky and many others – those are just victims of their conscious??). But agree with us, please, that real victims and real tortures of guilty conscience are actually beneficial and priceless and therefore cannot be financially estimated and paid and therefore – super-incomes of top executives as compensation for “damages caused by guilty conscience” are inappropriate.

Besides, in such extent of income comparison of top executives and other people manifests deviation from God. In particular, Koran clearly expresses on the choice of leaders: “Follow those who do not ask you for reward and who is on the straight path!” (Sura 36:20) – in other wards managers should be as righteous as possible and do not ask for any consumption privileges from the rest of society.

From above arguments it is clear that in public discussion of the problems of social justice Obama, if necessary, can beat any Russian politician (Putin, Medvedev, Zupanov, etc) either because for them social justice is a banned topic because of their “elite’-corporate obligations and deeply rooted

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

psychological blocks, or because their understanding of the problem is very vague because they see the world from the window of their corporate cars and luxury apartments and from behind the backs of bodyguards, living in the conditions that everything they need is already prepared for them and paid from state funds.

Only one politician could adequately and convincingly stand up to Barack Obama – Joseph Stalin:



“You have the point, Mr. Obama, but you do not go to the limits in your argumentation: in economy, that operates in best interest of workers, increase in production will inevitably involve decrease of prices, as peoples needs in certain products are being met, and the state objective is to manage the extremes of profitability in industries, based on price dynamic. But in your countries economy usury and stock speculations. However you are right in general: to make economy work for people, and not for small group of parasites, it is necessary to increase general culture and improve upbringing of

children, as you put it “in right value systems””

Now in your (Russia) country’s economy the main obstacle for this is the ethic of greed of all generations of post-stalin ‘elite’, multiplied by impudent parasitism and stupidity of economic science, and add here indifference of the majority of population too involved in their routine business or slaving on several jobs at the same time to somehow provide for their families.

2.2.3. An individual and culture

The question of ‘right value systems’, which is essentially the question of ideals and ethics, that should be the key values of the society and in children’s upbringing are also taboo for Russian ‘elite’. Therefore in Russia there is not and cannot be public discussion on right values and culture that should normally form the foundation of child’s personality and which he should carry on in his life and express in his ethics, independently from his family, ancestors and chosen sphere of work.

When Russian ‘elite’ representatives, including politicians, talk about supporting cultural development, their speeches are restricted to:

- Issues of funding: realistic and possible
- **However, support of development of culture itself, meaning “right value system’ in which kids should be brought up, is avoided, or expressed with meaningless phrases unrelated to reality – when this is a question of utmost importance for society.**

In this topic, Barack Obama is more independent than any Russian ‘elite’ activist, ‘patriot’ and ‘mecenats’:

“ Dr. King once said: “It may be true that the law cannot make a man love me but it can keep him from lynching me and I think that is pretty important, also”

Sometimes we need both cultural transformation and government action – a change in values and a change in policy – to promote the kind of society we want. The state of our inner-city schools is a case in point. All the money in the world won’t boost student achievement if parents make no effort to instill in their children the values of hard work and delayed gratification. But when we as a society pretend that poor children will fulfill their potential in dilapidated, unsafe schools with outdated equipment and teachers who aren’t trained in the subjects they teach, we are perpetrating a lie on these children, and on ourselves. We are betraying our values.

That is one of the things that makes me a Democrat, I suppose – this idea that our communal values, our sense of mutual responsibility and social solidarity, should express themselves not just in the church or the mosque or the synagogue; not just on the blocks where we live, in the places where we work, or within our own families; but also through our government. Like many

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

conservatives, I believe in the power of culture to determine both individual success and social cohesion, and I believe we ignore cultural factors at our peril. But I also believe that our government can play a role in shaping that culture for the better – or for the worse.” (p. 63)

And on the first pages he talks about culture:

“I think much of what ails the inner city involves a breakdown in culture that will not be cured by money alone, and that our values and spiritual life matter at least as much as our GDP.” (p. 11)

And further he points out that key to solving all social problems is in proper upbringing of its children. (“instill values of hard work and delayed gratification..”). If kids are brought up with right values they can do better job for the good of the society they live in. But only those parents that have right value system can instill it in their children. And if for some reason parents do not have such values – then it is a work of government to teach kids a love for work and patience through day-care, school and arts.

Can anyone recall Putin or any other Russian ‘elite’ politician raising the issue of “*hard work and motivation for creative activities as critical factors of stability of social system and development of its culture and economy*”? That’s right – it has never happened. And even so-called “fighter for the good of people”, [Gennady Zuzanov](#) (now First secretary of Communist party of RF) avoids this topic.

And main reason for avoiding this subject is that talking about it will inevitably lead to discussion on what is fair and what is unfair in social life. And as we know, this is not their favorite topic. Because historical facts of life of civilization, whose economic prosperity is based on collective work, and not just some abstract hard-working and motivation, but very concrete motivation to work for the system of inner-social relationship of people. Therefore,

- If the workers find the system fair and satisfactory of their needs, then work motivation exist and their diligence is rewarded by the result of their work.
- If workers find the system unfair because all their lives it cannot satisfy their primary needs, then work motivation disappears and the less diligence, supporting the system, there is, the quicker it moves to full collapse. However, here some part of residual ambitions can be directed on destruction of current system and its substitution with another one, or on efforts in cleansing this system from its flaws.

In accordance with this B. Obama many times turns to the subject of work ethics and personal initiative (entrepreneurship in its wider sense) which in the context of his books is strongly tied to the subject of fairness.

“I believe in the free market, competition and entrepreneurship, and think no small number of government programs don’t work as advertised. I wish the country had fewer lawyers and more engineers.” (p.10)

As long as individual men and women are free to pursue their own interests, society as a whole will prosper. Our system of self-government and our free-market economy depend on the majority of individual Americans adhering to these values. The legitimacy of our government and our economy depend on the degree to which these values are rewarded, which is why the values of equal opportunity and nondiscrimination compliment rather than impinge on our liberty”. (p/54)

Obama reproaches the situation when in the USA for many people “politics became business rather than mission”, and further down the text, talking about the role of money in his campaigns, he reminisces on some of his sponsors: “As a rule they were smart, interesting people, knowledgeable about public policy, liberal in their politics, expecting nothing more than a hearing of their opinions in exchange for their checks. But they reflected, almost uniformly, the perspectives of their class: the top 1% or so of the income scale that can afford to write a \$2,000 check to a political candidate. They believed in the free market and an educational meritocracy; they found it hard to imagine that there might be any social ill that could not be cured by a high SAT score. They had no patience with protectionism, found unions troublesome, and were not particularly sympathetic to those whose lives were suspended by the movements of global capital.” (p. 114).

And further down he characterizes social consequences of such human behavior.

“...the Ownership Society doesn't even try to spread the risks and rewards of the new economy among all Americans. Instead, it simply magnifies the uneven risks and rewards of today's winner-

take-all economy. If you are healthy or wealthy or just plain lucky, then you will become more so. If you are poor or sick or catch a bad break, you will have nobody to look to for help. That's not a recipe for sustained economic growth or the maintenance of the strong American middle class. It's certainly not a recipe for social cohesion. It runs counter to those values that say we have a stake in each other's success.

That is certainly not who we are as people”

However, let's come back to the subject of how money influence politics. Further on, Obama describes his relationship with unions and their leaders, that also financially supported his campaigns through the course of his political career. Here is his conclusion:

«So I owe those unions. When their leaders call, I do my best to call them back right away. I don't consider this corrupting in any way. I don't mind dealing obligated toward home health-care workers who clean bedpans every day for little more than the minimum wage, or toward teachers in some of the toughest schools in the country, many of whom have to dip into their own pockets at the beginning of every school year to buy crayons and books for their students. I got into politics to fight for these folks and I'm glad a union is around to remind me of their struggles.

But I also understand that there will be times when these obligations collide with other obligations – the obligation to children not yet born whom we are saddling with debt.” (p.118).

So this is to say that problems of upbringing, teaching kids diligence and maintaining fairness are connected from the point of view of Barack Obama and his voters. And although these issues are broadly discussed in public, very little is done in real politics in order to enforce those values, which only brings problems both for Americans and the USA as a state. Obama writes that upon his initiative was passed a bill protecting Americans from losing their jobs to immigrants, willing to work for smaller wages. And then he cites a part of conversation he had with one of his colleagues:

“ – My small business guys are still going to hire immigrants,” he said. :All your amendment does is make them pay more for their help.”

“But why would they hire immigrants over U.S. workers if they cost the same?” I asked him.

He smiled. “Cause let's face it, Barack. These Mexicans are just willing to work harder than Americans do.” (p. 266)

For Russian “elite” however, the question is different: “How can we make or trick people to work for our own prosperity in conditions when we deliberately impose injustice?” This problem has no solution and all attempts to solve it, as history shows, have only led to political suicide of some “elite” representative and of “elite” as a social class.

2.3. Top secret: mentality of state power in the USA and in Russia

In the works of the Concept of Social Security concerning global historical process from the point of view of Sufficiently Universal Theory of Ruling, as early as in 1991 we defined hierarchy of instruments for ruling social systems in the *continuity of generations* (from most to least powerful):

1. Information of *worldview* nature, or methodology, which, once adopted, allows men to project – individually and socially – their “standard automations” of identification with regard to particular processes within the completeness and integrity of the World, and to define *in their individual perception* the hierarchic order of these processes in their mutual interconnection. This information lays foundation for the *culture of thinking* and for the completeness of ruling activities including also *intra-social absolute power* both on regional and global levels.
2. Information of *annalistic, chronological* nature, in all do-mains of Culture and all domains of Knowledge. It allows seeing, in which direction the processes are developing, and to correlate particular domains of *Culture as a whole* and of branches of Knowledge. To those, whose *worldview* is based on the sense of proportion and is conformable to the World, this information allows identifying particular processes while sieving the “chaotic” flow of facts and phenomena through the *worldview “sieve” – subjective human measure of identification*. (Within the present context the culture means all information, which is not transferred genetically in the succession of generations).
3. Information of *fact-descriptive* nature: description of particular processes and their

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

interconnections constitutes the substance of information of the third priority, which includes the faith-teachings of religious cults, secular ideologies, technologies and facts of all *domains* of science.

4. Economic processes, as an instrument of influence subordinated to purely informational instruments of influence through finances (money), which embody a totally generalized type of information of economic nature.

5. Genocide practices, affecting not only those who live today but also the generations to come, eliminating the *genetically determined potential* for learning and for development by them of the cultural heredity of ancestors: nuclear blackmail-threat of use; alcohol, tobacco and other kinds of narcotic drugs genocide, food additives, all ecological pollutants, some medicines-real use; “gene engineering” and “biotechnologies” – potential danger.

6. Other instruments of influence mainly by force – *weapons* in traditional sense of this word; killing and crippling human beings; destructing and exterminating material and technical objects of civilization, cultural monuments and bearers of their spirit.

Although there are no evident distinctions between the instruments of influence because many of them, by their capacities, could be related to different priorities, their classification in *hierarchical order*, as presented above, allows nonetheless to identify the dominating factors of influence that may be used as instruments of ruling, and in particular, as instruments of suppression and elimination of those phenomena in the social life that are conceptually inadequate in the sense of ruling.

Although there’s no certain differentiation between named instruments of influence, because many of them hold qualities allowing us to classify them to different priorities, but this hierarchically organized classification allows to define dominating factors of influence, which can be used as instrument of ruling, particularly for suppression and elimination of conceptually unacceptable events in the life of society.

This set of instruments when used inside a social system is just a general way to manage it. However when used by one social system towards another and provided that their concepts of ruling are the *generalized weapons*, meaning warfare in its widest definition; or those are the means to maintain self-ruling in another social system, provided that there is not conceptual incompatibility between their systems.

Above mentioned order defines priorities of names classes of instruments of influence on a society, because any change in the condition of society, caused by the instruments of the highest priorities, will have much worse consequences than those, caused by the instruments of lowest priority. Therefore

In long historical intervals efficiency of instruments grows from the top to the bottom, and irreversibility of the consequences of their use (predominantly defining how effectively states goals were reached – *meaning once and for all*) – declines from the first to sixth. The same is fair in majority of cases and how noticeable they are.

In our culture it was made public back in USSR era in “Young Guard” magazine #2, 1990 in the article “Conceptual power: myth or reality?” published in 700 000 copies, distributed mainly among patriotically concerned and politically active audience. Reaction of more than 700 000 “patriots” was close to zero, as many of them were either atheists or controlled by biblical-“orthodox” conceptual power, equating it (power) to the Gods will. Since than, although some people often mention terms “conceptual power” or “conceptual independence of Russia” none of the public politicians neither political analysts ever go into details of these social events, as they never realize the real outline of internal and external policy of Russia and foreign countries according to six priorities of universal instruments of ruling / weapons.

- Russian ‘elite’ can acknowledge instruments of **sixth tier priority** as means of reaching political goals (meaning as means of management both inside and outside our country), but they never realize potential of instruments of higher level of priority.

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

- **Fifth tier priority** is actually a total mess made out of “individual rights”, people claiming that it is unacceptable to force alcohol/drugs detox and rehabilitation, and whose right to see explicit sexual and violent scenes on TV should not be violated, same as their right on depravity – on the one side and on the other – on social needs of sobering all people from all addictive substances (drugs) and protection of young generation from corruption (including concept of “safe sex”) coming from both older relatives and from society, mass media and school.
- As reality shows – financial crisis is unquestionable prove to it – credit-financial system (**forth tier priority**) for Russian political ‘elite’ is not an instrument of ruling, but an analogue of natural disasters.
- **Third tier priority** is the state’s ideological position – state (national) idea, which is in fact banned by Constitution of RF, and the way it is formulated is a manifestation of outrageous stupidity of those who agreed on it, and a sabotage act by those who pushed it into the constitution. But despite this, Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) is still very persistent in trying to make its ideology a state religion.
- **Second tier priority** is taken by parliament, ROC and RAS and also their representatives in power. In the same way as in A. Gertsen’s times, they are concentrated on “improving the past” according to their wishes for the future, which actually only puts obstacles on the way of improving *unavoidable* future.
- The **first tier priority** comes from Lenin’s saying “Marks’ doctrine is omnipotent because it is right”, which meant only that at least politically part of society should study dialectic materialism as a method of learning – ‘elite’ abandoned this principle, but has not come up with any alternative. Current communists – Zuganov and his comrades – being deeply in opposition still have not reported to people why and how even armed with “omnipotent” doctrine they managed to lead USSR to stagnation, after what they ruined perestroika seizing their power to all the bad guys.

And therefore:

- ∅ To become strong on the sixth-tier priority, country has to have sober nation and powerful army (fifth tier priority), because nowadays intoxicated generals won’t be able to adequately protect the country and will sober up either in the afterlife either in captivity (not even mentioning that intoxicated militaries cause enough trouble even in times of peace)
- ∅ Country should also provide it’s military financially (fourth tier priority), and therefore it need to not only open financial programs of all sorts but also to learn how to manage monetary flow.
- ∅ In addition it is necessary to have some cutting edge ideas in various fields (military, strategic, and tactical, technical and technological). Because without ideas (third tier priority) financing of programs will turn not into progress of science and technology (including military) but also into just a show of reports on prosperity (as it was in Brezhnev era)
- ∅ Ideas (third priority) come from good knowledge of the past (second tier) and it’s negative experience, dissatisfaction with inherited issues. Additionally systematically “intoxicating” descendents (fifth tier) by the force of biological and social degradation are barely able to learn and understand culture of their ancestors not even mentioning developing their own.
- ∅ And the ideas in itself are an expression of effectiveness of individual cognitive and creative culture (first tier priority) and how well it is spread in the socium.
- And the totality of all mentioned above demands appropriate organization in order to enable the universal instruments of ruling/ weapons to mutually support one another in their common implementation (and as statistic shows, Russian ‘elite’ can’t deal with them as their sum)

None the less individual’s culture of learning and creation – is the most important skill in life, as it allows to reproduce (even from the scratch) all knowledge and skills that prove to be necessary to define and solve problems people face by Life. And due to the fact that linguistic culture is a dominant way of knowledge exchange, **dialectics then is a method of learning and creating, that is available to everyone because it is genetically encrypted in us.**

Dialectic is an non-formalized psychological practice – a method of solving uncertainties in the process of leaning and creating through raising special in their sense questions and finding appropriate answers, confirmed by life.

Dialectics efficiency in this case is provided by individual’s psychological organization and the discipline of his psychological activity – both being a matter of practice.

All of it was important to mention in order to clearly explain Obama’s reasoning on U.S. Constitution.

“ In the end, the question I keep asking myself is why, if the Constitution is only about power and not about principle, if all we are doing is just making it up as we go along, has our own republic not only survived but served as the rough model for so many of the successful societies on earth?

The answer I settle on – which is by no means original to me – requires a shift in metaphors, one that sees our democracy not as a house to be built, but as a conversation to be had. According to this conception, the genius of Madison’s design is not that it provides us a fixed blueprint for action, the way a drafts-man plots a building’s construction. It provides us with a framework and with rules, but fidelity to these rules will not guarantee a just society or assure agreement on what’s right. (...)

What the framework of our Constitution can do is to organize the way by which we argue [Methods] about our future. All of its elaborate machinery – its separation of powers and checks and balances and federalist principles and Bill of Rights – are designed to force us into a conversation, a “deliberative democracy” in which all citizens are required to engage in a process of testing their ideas against and eternal reality, persuading others of their point of view and building shifting alliances of consent. Because power in our government is so diffuse, the process of making law in America compels us to entertain the possibility that we are not always right and to sometimes change our minds; it challenges us to examine our motives and our interests constantly, and suggests that both our individual and collective judgments are at once legitimate and highly fallible.” (p. 92)

“It’s not just absolute power that the Founders sought to prevent. Implicit in its structure, in the very idea of ordered liberty, was a rejection of absolute truth, the infallibility of any idea or ideology or theology or “ism”, any tyrannical consistency that might lock future generations into a single, unalterable course, or drive both majorities into the cruelties of the Inquisition, the pogrom, the gulag, or the jihad. The Founders may have trusted in God, but true to the Enlightenment spirit, they also trusted in the minds and senses that God had given them. They were **suspicious of abstraction and liked asking questions, which is why at every turn in our early history theory yielded to fact and necessity.**” (p.107, italics made by authors)

The quoted paragraph shows that Obama adequately covers problematic of the first-tier priority of universal instruments of ruling, and the only question is – how effective is his individual culture of dialectic cognition and creativity.

At the same time in the given section he answered the question on the reasons for such historically proven stable capacity of USA statehood (in comparison with other contemporary states) both in defining and solving their issues and in implementing their political views: the U.S. Constitution has programmed procedures, that express dialectic in its essence - culture of cognition and creativity.

And according to its pre-programmed procedures, expressing dialectical essence of cognitive and creative culture, the Unites States have an advantage on the matters of first tier priority, and, as consequence, on other lower priorities of the universal instruments of ruling/weapons in comparison to other cultures of self-governing societies, in which dialectic of perception and understanding of life and creativity is suppressed in the operations of state apparatus as well as in life of the rest of society.

But above mentioned issues, regarding problematic of first tier priority of universal instruments of ruling/weapons, stated by B. Obama in a way, that can be understood only on the basis of the

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

principle: *those who know and master dialectic will understand what it's all about, and as for those who doesn't know – it's their problem...*

And evidently, Russian ruling 'elite' and as consequence – all people of Russia, have and in the coming future will have many problems coming from the fact, that they do not master first tier priority of the universal instruments or ruling, and therefore they do not master lower priorities as well.

But there is still a huge paradox – even taken into account above mentioned advantage of the USA over other cultures the root of all their problems lies in the same fact that, in the States neither public-political 'elite', nor 'elite' in general, nor common people do consciously master the instruments of ruling of first-tier priority; everything, that's going on the first level of priorities of universal instruments of ruling/weapons, is just unconsciously automatic activity.

As can be seen from quoted reasoning of Obama on general methodological-creative-cognitive level, programmed by U.S. Constitution – hardly he knows what sort of issues he had touched, and therefore his understanding of it is quite superficial: most probably in the sense that results, given by dialectic, are useful for the society, rather than in the sense of the core of cognitive-creative processes.

Some more quotes from the book:

“We have no authoritative figure, no Walter Cronkite or Edward R. Murrow whom we all listen to and trust to sort out contradictory claims. Instead, the media is splintered into a thousand fragments, each with its own version of reality, each claiming the loyalty of a splintered nation. Depending on your viewing preferences, global climate change is or is not dangerously accelerating; the budget deficit is going down or going up.” (p.126)

We underlined phrases that are key to understanding the core of the issue. If a culture is based on the foundation of cognitive methodology, dialectic, then:

- Its society doesn't need authoritative figures, that are though to be unerring in all their judgments and recommendations
- The world and its development trends, although versatile, can not be unambiguously cognized, therefore such nation cannot be split by 'pluralism of opinions', which can exist only as an intermediary half-raw product in the process of development of common for everyone, adequate, and therefore well functioning opinion on any matter, be it global climate change and environmental catastrophe or problems of corporate budget.

In this “plurality of opinions” only few are concerned by which one is true, and even less are preoccupied by the need for methodology of dialectic cognition and creativity to form the foundation of individual culture of each man. And such plurality is dangerous for Obama, and for the U.S., and makes this country a source of danger for the rest of the world, because ambiguity of the answer to the question on differences of a man in fullness of his dignity from a highly civilized man-like, that's not established culturally because of different circumstances, but still dangerously self-assured and certain of his rights as highly-civilized man-like – such ambiguity is fraught with disastrous consequences.

Soon after publication of Russian translation of “The Audacity of hope” internet burst with accusations of this book being just an ordinary populism and election propaganda of those powers, that pre-approved Obama for the president of the United States.

Indeed, in crowd-'elitist' society politics cannot do without attempts of 'selling' a charming and appealing 'cutie' candidate to the crowd, with intention of making policies on his behalf, and in worst case scenario either make him the scapegoat or start brainwashing the crowd saying that “the 'cutie' is an outstanding politician and you, the illiterate crowd, just don't appreciate the fact that in times of crisis he spared you of even worse disasters”. However there is a difference between two different PR techniques:

In our case “The Audacity of hope” is a campaign for happiness, which (happiness) requires a lot of effort from the nation, in which (nation) people believe in themselves and in their leaders.

If Barack Obama will succeed in mobilizing creative potential of Americans from different social classes and unite them in this work, then many of the problems discussed in the book will be solved,

and dealing with the rest of them will be just a matter of time, because the United States (as a state and as a society) will stay on political course, that leads to guaranteed solution.

And to unite the nation and mobilize its creative potential “The Audacity of hope” presents as a dramatically more efficient remedy, than introduction of meaningless public holidays (e.g. Day of national unity) by Russian post-soviet ‘elite’, which (introduction) in its essence is just a means to distract people and thus “unite the nation” outside any concept of solving actually critical problems.

However the principle, that “everyone works for himself to the extent of his understanding, in the lack of thereof – for someone who understands more”, is also valid for B.Obama and his team, as well as for *those who actually pre-elected B.Obama*.

And therefore, even if Obama will be able to mobilize the creative potential of his nation, this will be followed with some side effects. And the question is – what sort of effects will those be – because some of side effects can be harmful... But such kind of effects do not result from anything: they have their own causes, that lie in some flaw of the culture of thinking and worldview based on it.

2.4. Barack Obama is not free...

2.4.1. Obama and Freedom

In Russian language word ‘freedom’ (“свобода”) derives from abbreviation of “conscious leadership given by God” (С(овестью)ВО(дительство)БО(гом)ДА(нное)).

And the problem of both Obama and the U.S. (and possible of the world in prospective future as well) is in that fact that:

B. Obama is not a “sower of freedom” but a captive of general American culture, in which he was brought up like the rest of Americans, as well as of that special political sub-culture of the USA, based on which U.S. politics is developed and implemented.

In other words Barack Obama is not free in two ways:

- First – in the sense that he’s limited by certain ‘elitist’-corporate discipline, as well as all other representatives of these ‘elite’
- Second – in the sense that his conscious, intellect, worldview – are all limited and perverted by historically developed culture of the USA, which Obama himself does not fully realize

In the book he never mentions freemasonry, and none of the politicians are named as a mason, although freemasonry in the USA is a skeleton base of their subculture of socio-political activity.

We point out: **“free masons” were originally assigned to politics, including geopolitics, it’s not just a hobby like collecting coins or stamps...**

None the less the book mentions series of episodes, in which Barack describes his relationship with people, whose association to masonry on quite high level is whether already a publicly known fact, or can be deduced by some circumstantial evidence. Therefore, according to “those in the know will understand” masonry circles took Obama’s campaign according to the hints, that can be found in his book: he is already one of that back-stage political mafia, even if by some chance he manages to “pass” formal initiation. And masonry ringleaders wouldn’t trust him with presidential post, if by the moment of his nomination, he hasn’t already proven himself in the capacity to support an appropriate “elitist”-corporate discipline.

In particular, one of the indicators of Obama’s loyalty to masonry and its leaders consists in the fact, that in public he gives opinion typical for those, who portraits masonry as non-implicated into real policy making.

Expressing his opinion on worldview, typical for both political parties of the U.S., Obama writes:

“And yet publicly it’s difficult to find much soul-searching or introspection on either side of the divide, or even the slightest admission of responsibility for the gridlock. What we hear instead, not only in campaigns but on editorial pages, on bookstands, or in the ever-expanding blog universe, are deflections of criticism and assignments of blame. Depending on your tastes, your condition is the natural result of radical conservatism or perverse liberalism, Tom DeLay of Nancy Pelosi, big oil or greedy trial lawyers, religious zealots or gay activists, Fox News or the New York Times. How well these stories are told, the subtlety of the arguments and the quality of the evidence, will vary by

author, and I won't deny my preference for the story the Democrats tell, nor my belief that the arguments of liberals are more often grounded in reason and fact. In distilled form, though, the explanations of both the right and the left have become mirror images of each other. They are stories of conspiracy, of America being hijacked by an evil cabal. Like all good conspiracy theories, both tales contain just enough truth to satisfy those predisposed to believe in them, without admitting any contradictions that might shake up those assumptions. Their purpose is not to persuade the other side but to keep their bases agitated and assured of the rightness of their respective causes – and lure just enough new adherents to beat the other side into submission.” (p.24)

From this extract, as well as from some others, one can understand that:

- Although dialectic as cognitive method is by default programmed in Constitution of the United States, but nobody is going to make this fact public, and a very small circle of *those, who, mainly by default and also not realizing it*, is still using this dialectic in political **goals, which spectrum is limited by traditional U.S. culture.**
- Conspiracy theory in public political culture of Euro-American crown-‘elitarism’ is the only theory that is trying to convince an average man that global historical process is not developing independently, but is being managed and adheres to certain reasoning, developed by some (depending on the theme of given conspiracy theory) initiators of conspiracy.

2.4.2. Globalization and the United States: issues of president Obama

However, inarticulateness of all cult for crowd-‘elitarism’ conspiracy theories devoted to problems of cognition, creativity and theory of ruling, actually allows to classify them as “urban myths”, as does classify them Obama. But the latter doesn't eliminate the need to answer the questions, discussed by Internal Predictor (IP) of USSR in the papers of Concept of Social Security:

- Is there a ruling/management in global historical process and if there is – to what extent?
- How is it (ruling) executed?
- What are the goals (and for those who do not buy into conspiracy theories – what is the direction of the course) of historically real globalization?
- If a prospective of historically real globalization is unacceptable, is there an objective alternative?

And if a prospective of historically real globalization is unacceptable and its alternatives are objectively possible, then independently of the core of historically formed ‘conspiracy theories’ (meaning independently from the extent of adequacy or inadequacy of each of them as a whole, or of their parts) – then we are facing a milestone, where objective possibility of, alternative in its prospective, globalization demands to organize **the ruling of the course of global historical process, that will be true to chosen prospective (i.e. goals) of an alternative globalization.**

Therefore in order to identify an opportunities for alternative historically real globalization, which many people estimate as unacceptable for it's prospective, it is necessary to not only work out a conspiracy theory, but also to implement it.

However B. Obama is getting lost in the face of problems of globalization. A problems there are indeed, and those are pretty big. U.S. development trends in the course of un-managed globalization, as portrayed by Obama are as follows:

«A strategy of doing nothing and letting globalization run its course won't result in the imminent collapse of the U.S. economy. America's GDP remains larger than China's and India's combined. For now, at least, U.S.-based sectors as software design and pharmaceutical research, as our network of universities and colleges remains the envy of the world.

But over the long term, doing nothing probably means an America very different from the one most of us grew up in. It will mean a nation even more stratified economically and socially than it currently is: one in which an increasingly prosperous knowledge class, living in exclusive enclaves, will be able to purchase whatever they want on the marketplace – private schools, private health care, private security, and private jets – while a growing number of their fellow citizens are consigned to low-paying service jobs, vulnerable to dislocation, pressed to work longer hours, dependent on an underfunded, overburdened, and underperforming public sector for their health care, their retirement, and their children's educations.

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

It will mean an America in which we continue to mortgage our assets to foreign lenders and expose ourselves to the whims of oil producers; and America in which we under-invest in the basic scientific research and workforce training that will determine our long-term economic prospects and neglect potential environmental crises. It will mean an America that’s more politically polarized and more politically unstable, as economic frustration boils over and leads people to turn on each other.” (p.148)

In other words, in the above quote Obama talks about the fact that trends, indicating that “propaganda organization” of liberal-bourgeois capitalism in the foreseeable future will stop its existence, in the form so much desired by many people - are not just groundless speculations of the IP of USSR.

For many people in American population globalization means lack of prospective in life for their children, because for many years now there is a substantial outflow of capital from the U.S. and manufacturing off-shoring in the regions with substantially lower labor costs. As a consequence, collapses the usual for many people picture of the world, as well as American myth saying that, if one works hard, than no matter what his job is, it is possible for him to *lead a wealthy life, being able to provide himself and his family with everything necessary*.

This disillusionment and crash of the myth, *fundamental for millions of people*, jeopardizes continuation of U.S. existence in its current state. And Obama, as the president, will have to deal with it:

- In the best case scenario – he will manage to solve it not damaging interests of his country and the rest of the world.
- In worst case – America (and possibly the rest of the ‘highly civilized’ liberally-bourgeois Bible-based world) during his president term will face a disaster, which has long been predicted by many analysts, and which American ‘elite’ is preparing to survive in advance. Such possibility is another reason why Obama was pre-chosen for the president in such dangerously close to catastrophe period; if it happens he will be a good scapegoat for white Anglo-Saxon and Jewish ‘elite’...

Obama admits that the USA is not in control of its own destiny, when talking about mass immigration to the U.S. and life of immigrants, who in vast majority, came to the States on their own, and not as a result of an effort from the American government:

«Native-born Americans suspect that it is they, and not immigrants, who are being forced to adapt. In this we, the immigration debates comes to signify not a loss of jobs but a loss of sovereignty, just one more example – like September 11, avian flu, computer viruses, and factories moving to China – that America seems unable to control its own destiny.” (p.264, underline – ours)

The underlined phrase is a confession of conceptual powerlessness of American ‘elite’ and U.S. society as a whole. But because neither such term nor the theory of conceptual power exist in public politics of the USA, then they do not understand the essence of this confession, and as consequence – they can’t see the source of their captivity and ‘slavery’.

2.4.3. Bible – slave’s shackles

B. Obama Characterizes America:

«... our law is by definition a codification of morality, much of it grounded in Judeo-Christian tradition.” (p.218)

When describing his conversation with Senator Byrd (the oldest member of U.S. Senate and is thought to be freemason), Barack Obama quotes him:

“So few people read the Constitution today,” Senator Byrd said, pulling out his copy from this breast pocket. “I’ve always said, this document and the Holy Bible, they’ve been all the guidance I need.” (p.100)

Barack Obama is a professional lawyer, and although he notices massive incompetence in practical solving of concrete problems by many professional lawyers and political scientists, he still doesn’t go into investigation of the reasons for this incompetence, that is programmed by the own character of historically formed legislative and political education.

Many professional lawyers are incapable of understanding the following:

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

- Any legislation is in essence a manifestation of an algorithmic of self-ruling of society and of state operating in the following concept – ruling ALWAYS assumes a conceptual certainty: legislation is written according to a given concept. Legislation’s objectives are: 1) provision of standard ruling according to this concept; 2) resolution of its internal conflicts; 3) it’s self-protection from ruling according to other concepts
- Conceptual ambiguity shows in the life of society as a controversy of its legislation, when different laws on the same subject give different solutions; as well as the flaws of law-executing practice, executed by the principle that the law can be used in many different ways based on the different wording and convenient precedent

Besides, conceptual uncertainty (as well as certainty) shows through state symbols. State symbols are a serious business, that should be taken seriously. Has anyone thought: Why in 1991 new regime changed soviet symbols for the symbols of Russian monarchy – two-headed eagle? The fact that change of symbols on its own and its procedure were not impromptu but thoroughly planned at least in Gorbachev’s times, if not earlier, says in the highest levels of soviet political hierarchy there were people powerful enough to sentence UUSR statehood to liquidation, ignoring public opinion (referendum). This group knew very well the history of Rome and Byzantine and must have had an understanding that two-headed eagle, being a symbol of conceptual uncertainty of the ruling, has destroyed not only Empire of Rome but also Roman dynasty of Russian Emperors. Did they lack in creativity and imagination to come up with a new heraldic, or did they knowingly started the algorithm of “kingdom divided in itself” in order to continue collapse of USSR with the fall of Russia? And as it is obvious from the later events, this conceptual uncertainty of symbols has continued in Russian anthem: it has soviet music but words are of liberally—bourgeois-‘patriotic’ mood. Ask any Russian student a question – which part is the strongest: music or lyrics?

- Conceptual incompetence of management shows in the fact that strictly following the norms of concept of ruling provokes many problems that cannot be solved in this particular concept of problematics, and resolution of which demands refuse of the prevailing concept and switching to an alternative one.

Obama feels the conceptual incompetence of ruling according concept to prevailing on the West in general, and in the States in particular, because in his book we can read such expression as “incurable soars of capitalistic system, which either lower effectiveness of the market, or irreparably damage the society.” (p.173 of Russian edition). However a algorithmic of the origin of conceptual incompetence of ruling is outside Obama’s understanding.

As it says in one Russian expression “some things we cannot understand not because we have weak notion, but because these things are not included in the list of notions that we have”. In this case the reason for incompetence of some honest politicians, acting on the basis of traditional law or political education is in the resolution of many critical problems of social development – in their managerial and mathematical illiteracy.

- Sufficiently universal (meaning can be used in different ways) theory of ruling, including the method of dynamic programming (not as a formal algorithm or solving one or the other problems of optimization of all processes or ruling in general), is not included in the schools syllabus.
- And in order to be able to metrologically efficiently talk about financial problems, ways and means of their solution, it is necessary to have at least notion of linearly algebra, probability theory and mathematical statistics.

In regards to the economics of the society the second requirement provides an opportunity to work with balanced models of products and financial exchange in industries and regions, and the first one provided an opportunity to build managerially-coherent balanced models and excludes a leaning towards managerially-incoherent models.

Combination of the first and the second form the necessary basis for implementation of many sincerely good-willed economic scientists’ dream: to combine in one system a planned origin, expressing economic interests of social development in general (not only needs of richest 1% of the

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

society), and macroeconomic mechanism of market self-regulation (providing optimization of manufacturing-consumption activity on the macroeconomic level).

Actually this is one of the components of that knowledge that is objectively necessary to become a public notion in order to guarantee salvation of the USA, as well as other countries, from historically real globalization.

However, having degrees in both law and arts, Barack Obama does not possess such knowledge, primordial for execution of his, publicly announced, political mission. Chapter 5, Opportunities, of his book is a kaleidoscope of possibilities, but not a mosaic of their inter-connections in the concept of ruling, which Obama should have known. We have to point out also the fact that Barack Obama reproaches Bushes administration in the lack of ‘coherent concept of management’ (p.160), although he deserves such reproach too, if not a more serious one.

Therefore a success of publicly declared political mission of Barack Obama, as a savior of the USA from historically real globalization, [success] is explained not by Obama as a person, but by the support from the owners of financial ‘know-how’, which he will include in his team, and by adequacy of those ‘know-how’ towards goals declared, including economic ones.

Without such support Obama will find himself in the same position as Gorbachev and Yeltsin, when they had nominal state power, but despite their good intentions were manipulated.

The same works for his second, global, mission – to build a worldwide socially-oriented, environmentally-friendly “capitalistic socialism with human interface”, which should make the States a wheel of progress.

Being managerially-incompetent in above mentioned sense and ruling the country on the foundations of the Bible and Constitution, the good-intentioned part of American ‘elite’ and Obama do not perceive the Bible as a source of the concept of ruling and doesn’t think whether or not this concept is a manifestation of Good or Evil. While the concept of ruling of historically real globalization is actually written in the Bible and is:

- Firstly, a doctrine of buying the whole world with all its inhabitants and their property by international Jewish usury mafia (fourth tier priority of universal instruments of ruling/weapons) and building a system of financial usury based slavery (or if you wish – usury feudalism) of humanity and destruction of those who is opposed to this project or unable to abide.
- Secondly, a faith and system of brainwashing (third tier priority) with the fact that this global political doctrine is a manifestation of Gods Will.

Without asking himself a question about differences between a human in his fullness of dignity and a highly civilized human-like, and not answering it, Obama doesn’t realize the subject of crowd-elitarism in general, in which foundation lies purposeful imposition of anti-dialectic worldview and thinking, and also – perversion of individuality by people’s religion (inc. atheism).

On the subject of religion Obama writes:

“For my mother, organized religion too often dressed up closed-mindedness in the guard of piety, cruelty and oppression in the cloak of righteousness.

This isn’t to say that she provided me with no religious instruction. In her mind, a working knowledge of the world’s great religions was a necessary part of any well-rounded education. In our household the Bible, the Koran, and the Bhagavad Gita sat on the shelf alongside books of Greek and Norse and African mythology. On Easter or Christmas Day my mother might drag me to church, just as she dragged me to the Buddhist temple, the Chinese New Year celebration, the Shinto shrine, and ancient Hawaiian burial sites. But I was made to understand that such religious samplings required no sustained commitment on my part – no introspective exertion or self-flagellation. Religion was an expression of human culture, she would explain, not is well-spring, just one of the many ways – and not necessarily the best way that man attempted to control the unknowable and understand the deeper truths about our lives.” (p. 203-204)

Having such a library of religious and cultural sort Obama was ought to notice that all scripts, pretending to be from one source, are contradicting on the same issues of both religion and society. However Obama somehow passed this by. Eventually in his religious quest Obama chose one of the

evangelical churches, which leaders of freemasons have appreciated as a pass of another test of loyalty to the biblical project.

And consequently Obama doesn't understand the specifics of American crowd-elitarism and the fullness of spectrum of its problems, provided by biblical doctrine of enslaving humanity on behalf of God, although Obama writes quite adequately about many other issues. But in this – he is a captive of the Bible and variations of historical myth of USA, and he doesn't doubt that myth in general (second tier priority). For examples he mentions a false statement:

“ Woodrow Wilson instituted the Federal Reserve Bank, to manage the money supply and curb periodic panics in the financial markets.” (p.152)

Whereas in reality, with establishment of Federal Reserve System American statehood lost control over its financial system, delegating to private hands of representatives of trans-governmental “financial aristocracy”, by which they robbed the U.S. of a chance for more independent development, and let it sink into situation when whole population is held hostage by usury and financial speculations.

Although Barack Obama write something somewhat adequate concerning priority of universal instruments of ruling, he still does not possess dialectic as a method of cognition and creativity to the extent that would let him out of captivity of inadequate historical myth, under which reign lives the USA (as well as other countries where Bible is a foundation of culture) and biblical project of enslaving humanity on behalf of God.

2.5. Prospective relationship between USA and Russia

Undoubtedly, policy of statehood in the USA and in Russia (both domestic and foreign) – are not two free flows. Both have mass-elitarism, in both it is modified based on the biblical project of Mafioso-corporate political activity of various ‘elite’ groups, whose ambitions in many cases concern global policy – the policy that encompasses goals of whole humanity. But at the same time, obviously there is some deception. Then, in his book, Obama often and ironically uses expression “ten points plan”. Also as you might know Medvedev's “Address to the Federal Assembly of the RF” was made public on November 5 2008 – the day when the election results were finally announced and the world found out that Barack Obama would be the next president of the United States. Medvedev's Address to the Federal Assembly has exactly ten points. Since “The Audacity of Hope” was published before Russian president' address, his copywriters should have added or removed at least one point in order to avoid Obama's irony. But since it was left as ten – then it is a hint to the political ‘elite’ of Russia: *“those who started Obama projects do not take view them as serious opponents”*.

Also mass media focused its attention on the fact that D.A. Medvedev's congratulating speech to Obama was left unanswered, mentioning at the same time, that he thanked leaders of Australia, UK, Germany and other countries.

What does Barack Obama say about Russia in his book? – he mentions his visit in 2005. The aim of it was control over execution of the Nann-Lugar program for protection of nuclear arsenals in on post-soviet territory (financed from the U.S. funds).

“It was my first trip to Russia and Ukraine (...) we visited the nuclear facilities of Saratov, where Russian generals pointed with pride to the new fencing and security systems that had been recently completed; afterward, they served us a lunch of borscht, vodka, potato stew, and a deeply troubling fish Jell-O mold.” (p.312)

And further: “There were moments during our travels when we were reminded of the old Cold War days. At the airport in Perm, for example, a border officer in his early twenties detained us for three hours because we wouldn't let him search our plane, leading our staffs to fire off telephone calls to the U.S. embassy and Russia's foreign affairs ministry in Moscow. And yet most of what we heard and saw – the CK store and Maserati show-room in Red Square Mall, the motorcade of SUV's that pulled up in from of a restaurant, driven by burly men with ill-fitting suits who once might have rushed to open the door for Kremlin officials but were now on the security detail of one of Russia's billionaire oligarchs; the throngs of sullen teenagers in T-shirts and low-riding jeans, sharing cigarettes and the music on their iPods as they wandered Kiev's graceful boulevards – underscored the seemingly irreversible prices of economic, if not political, integration between East and West.

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

While they were in Donetsk “ One of our team called me over and showed me a yellowing poster taped to the wall, It was a relic of the Afghan war, we re told: instructions on how to hide explosives in toys, to be left in villages and carried home by unsuspecting children.

A testament, I thought to the madness of men.

A record of how empires destroy themselves” (p.314)

Ask international warriors that have been through Afghanistan: how would they comment on this passage

We can stay: This statement is a lie, aimed at common man in the USA and in other countries as well. Even such sort of operations by soviet military on Afghanistan territory could have taken place, then such poster could not have been printed (for obvious reasons of necessity to cover this fact from the eyes of public, including international community) or would have been classified as “top secret” and hidden in the archives now, and at a time it would have had to be checked in and out personally by those who had clearance to view it. Therefore it is not possible that a poster containing “top secret” information would be just hanging on the wall for public display, especially in USSR, because such event violates principle of personal responsibility for secret strategic information of the state.

If Obama really saw described poster in one of the facilities of independent Ukraine, then taken into account that it does not conform to USSR norms of handling secret information, all questions should be addressed to special services of post-soviet Ukraine.

Besides from above quotes it is clear Russia fascinates Obama with things that he considers serious issues in the life of the USA. Here is an obvious example of double standards of morality and ethics and imperial syndrome of the States, that allegedly have undisputable rights to teach other nations how to live, although themselves they cannot live realistically due to the conceptual powerlessness; and those alleged rights to “teach” other nations only mean intrusion into domestic business of other countries under various groundless reasons following the principal: **“Our power will be a law of truth, because powerlessness turns out to be useless”**.

Talking about politicians on the U.S., that supported Obama – amongst them are some well known in Russia – Madlen Albright, Clintons – all of whom in some way in the past expressed their intentions towards Russia as an object of potential colonization.

And some of the speeches of Obama’s supporters on the prospective of American policy leaked into mass media:

Back in 19 October 2008 Senator J. Biden, vice presidential candidate, impressed public with his sensational revelations. While speaking amongst small circle of fund raisers for presidential campaign he said that in the first six months of presidency Obama will face serious trials that can be compared to those of JFK in 1961-1962. It will be strongest international crisis when Obama will have to make tough and possibly unpopular decisions, both in domestic and **foreign** policies.

In very vague manner Biden said that for international crisis there are 4-5 scenarios, where cause of one of the crisis will be Middle East, Afghanistan, North Korea or Russia. He also mentioned Pakistan, bristling with nuclear weapons.

In Biden’s opinion Obama will have to clean up the mess in American economy, because current crisis is of a system nature, not only financial. Therefore Biden advised his audience to “gird their loins”.

When asked to comment on those speeches of Biden, Obama write it off on Senator’s rhetorical flourishes, saying not to take it too seriously. However there is something serious to think about. Even more so because Madlen Albright called Biden’s talks a “stating the fact”. This means that something might actually happen, although not necessarily by the will of the new president. Source: http://www.rpmonitor.ru/ru/detail_m.php?ID=11591)

In other words there already exists a political scenario for Obama – both on domestic and external policies.

All of these are signs that project of “orthodox renaissance” with monarchial prospective, which Russian ‘elite’ supports, or in the absence of better pretends to support, is not accepted by the rulers of the biblical project and they will be working on suppressing it, and alongside on suppressing Russia as it’s bearer.

Bureaucratic despair in Russia and global project “Obama”

Barack Obama is a manifestation of alternative global project of “capitalistic socialism with human face”, controlled on global scale by the world’s “backstage mafia” and not “Politburo of Central Committee of Russian Orthodox Church”.

Consequently adepts of ‘elite’-‘patriotic’ ‘orthodox renaissance” will face many problems in communication with B. Obama and his team members.

As for the Russian people – each project means trouble, as well as a conflict between them.

Internal Predictor of the USSR

17-27 November 2008
