

# Workers' Front of Ukraine



**Ukrainian Marxism  
and the Russian Invasion  
Different Mottos—One Truth**

Workers' Front of Ukraine - a Marxist-Leninist organization based in Ukraine. These pieces show their thinking and strategy regarding the war raging in their country and the role of communists.



This booklet published by Red Machete 2022. These articles were borrowed from Left Against the War [www.nowarleft.com](http://www.nowarleft.com)

Red Machete is a revolutionary communist organization in Portland, Oregon that seeks the destruction of capitalist white supremacy and settler colonialism. We believe very strongly this needs to be done through a militant feminist praxis.



[www.redmachete.org](http://www.redmachete.org)

[redmachete@protonmail.com](mailto:redmachete@protonmail.com)

---

# **Workers' Front of Ukraine: Ukrainian Marxism and the Russian Invasion**

**by Lev Sergeev**

The Russian-Ukrainian war is in full swing: it has been going on for a month now. The author of this article has had the opportunity to take part in it personally as part of the Ukrainian formations. Meanwhile, throughout the conflict, the Workers' Front of Ukraine, as the leading Marxist-Leninist organization in our country, has not stopped reporting on the communists' positions on pressing issues related to this war. The first article reviewing the causes and essence of the current conflict was published just before the war started. Several essential materials were published and continued to be published since the war began. To fully understand our point of view, it is worth reading all these publications, of which there are many. And now that the situation has reached a certain maturity, we can briefly summarize the views of the Ukrainian Communists and emphasize the critical points of the WFU's attitude toward the war.

It's well known that politics is the concentrated expression of economy, and war is the continuation of politics by other (violent) means. What is the contemporary economy? It is a great and very diverse variety of capitals. But they are pretty uniform in one respect—each of them represents value. The difference between them comes out only if we equate them to each other: it turns out that one capital is worth more than the second, the third is worth more than these two together, the fourth is less even than the second one alone, etc. In their totality, they form a very complex system of relations among themselves, each taking its own place under the sun. But this complex system is set in motion by the following simple factor (along with other factors): capital cannot stay still; it either increases or decreases. After all, what is capital? In essence, it is a specific value used to carry out a particular operation, which should, on completion, show an increased value— somewhat more significant than what was initially invested in this operation—to bring profit. Yes, it would also be possible to waste or squander the whole profit or do so with each

---

subsequent profit. But sooner or later, the good life ends: one must not forget that capital doesn't exist in a vacuum; other capitals surround it, the world of capital is very crowded, and the market—very limited. It is a world of an endless race, a world of war of all against all—competition (temporary alliances are certainly allowed, but they do not change the overall picture). To survive in it, it is necessary to manage profits wisely—to strive to use each profit to increase the subsequent profits, grow capital, and invest in the development and expansion of business by any means. Whoever does so has a chance for longterm success; whoever doesn't will be duped and surely go bankrupt. In addition, the larger the capital, the bigger its arsenal of means to suppress competition. And competition, like any struggle, generates winners—big business. It also sets the tone and reigns supreme in the complex system of relationships between all the capitals mentioned above. It's an economic world order where the giant corporations (and giant banks) occupy the lion's share of the world market with their networks and rule the ball for more than one hundred years. But no company, no matter how gigantic, can rest on its laurels because its place is constantly being claimed by competing firms, large and small, among which there is also a rivalry. A good soldier aspires to become a general, and good capital aspires to grow bigger and bigger and bigger to infinity, smashing the competitors.

And how is all this concentrated in politics? Roughly speaking, those who pay the piper call the tune. Public policy is a kind of weapon that appears in the arsenal of big business (and the bigger the business, the higher its ability to influence policy), one of the most effective methods of raising profits and strangling the competition. Providing its own candidates for legislative elections, bribing deputies in the parliament to get them to vote the right way, assisting in appointing their own proteges to high positions in executive bodies, bribing officials, and similar control over the judiciary—these are examples of how some capital gains political power and uses it to achieve its interests. Somewhere in the West, it is referred to with a beautiful word—lobbyism, but it is still called corruption in our country. And corruption is constantly being eradicated, but it, as if out of spite, goes deeper and deeper, only changing its forms occasionally.

---

But the fact remains: take any country in the world now at random, and with a significant degree of probability, the regime there will turn out to be pure oligarchy upon close inspection –almost everywhere the top of the state apparatus and big business have fused together, the state serves the interests of big business. The only entities that are not consolidated are the big capitals—a variety of financial-industrial groups—in Ukraine; we like to call them clans— which pursue different goals and fight with each other over political influence. And the fight is not necessarily only for the division and redistribution of influence within their home state, so to speak: borders do not constitute barriers to the ambitions of any capital. Suppose it outgrows them and takes up the economic conquest of the markets of another country to achieve success. In that case, it can benefit from the loyalty of both the state from which it is attacking and the state which it is attacking, which often finds expression in the subordination of one state to another. As a result, among other things, of this struggle, our world has long been firmly divided into dominant countries and countries economically and politically dependent on them. And the struggle between the former for the division and redistribution of power over the latter, for where one's sphere of influence begins and ends, has not diminished, just as the competition for capital has not diminished, since both are inextricably linked. At what point, then, does such a policy need to continue to be pursued militarily? It is simple: when at least one of the conflicting sides believes that a military venture offers a better chance of success and will cost less than resolving disputes by other means. Usually, this is a sign that the situation has reached an impasse, and methods of non-military influence (diplomatic and others) have been exhausted by one side without achieving a satisfactory result. Then in the fields of some country, the world explodes with the advent of another imperialist war for the redistribution of spheres of influence.

And now, with the understanding of all laid out above, let us look at Ukraine, and the essence of what is happening becomes as clear as a sunny day. Our country joined the order described above after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Then, domestic capital started forming within, taking its place in the global system of capitals. As any normal modern state should, it quickly developed its own oligarchy, with

---

extremely uneasy (to put it mildly, strained) relations between its different groups. This is where the fabled Ukrainian democracy takes its roots because it's precisely the fights between the oligarchic clans that constitute the permanent political quarrels and, consequently, are the main reason and driving force behind the political crises. Among them were the events from eight years ago, in which the following is transparent: with the establishment of the Yanukovich regime, the Donetsk clan had for once reached substantial power. It began to pressure the Dnipro clan and others with impudence but together, the other clans were able to fight back and overthrow the state power of their dangerous competitors.

However, the big domestic business has something in common with others of its kind: an interest in having guarantees of independent ownership of its share of our lands' wealth. For such guarantees to exist, these lands need to have an independent authority that's under their control—the independence of the Ukrainian state supports the independence of the Ukrainian oligarchy, and vice versa. These are the origins of the much-fabled Ukrainian independence that the state propaganda had ideologically defended since the emergence of this state thirty years ago, and the ideological defense of which demands to make this state more ancient, to prove the existence of the Ukrainian nation as such as early as the Copper Age.

By the way, if we continue the theme of 2014: even among the most pro-Russian (pro-Russian purely because their business is more strongly tied to the economic partnership with Russia than other businesses), Ukrainian oligarchs have not made an unambiguous transition to the side of the separatists, nor have they provided them strong support. But many have funded and continue to fund Ukrainian nationalist organizations. And since there is a need to defend independence so zealously, it seems that there must be something to be afraid of in this regard. Continuing the theme of 2014 again: in Crimea and the LDPR, the Russian capital has generally supplanted the Ukrainian capital for several years. This, but on the scale of the whole of Ukraine, is what the big Ukrainian capital has been having nightmares about. It has been afraid of it for the past thirty years—and

---

it is fearful for a reason. In Russia, things went the same way. When the Soviet Union collapsed, Russia's own capital was formed, and soon it formed its own oligarchy. The oligarchy found the strength to unite to some extent, establishing the notorious authoritarian regime of Putin as a concentrated expression of this unity and laying claim to the sphere of influence beyond the borders of Russia. They very much desired to see our country in it for obvious reasons. And here lies the root of the notorious denial of the existence of a fullfledged Ukrainian nation today: bids for the absorption of Ukraine by the so-called Russian world merely frame the interest of big Russian capital to absorb the Ukrainian one. The latter has always understood these direct hints; that is why it initially tried to keep its Russian partners at a certain distance. All the more so because an alternative exists: as soon as our present state emerged on the international scene, it began to drift slowly but surely into the arms of the United States and the European Union.

The battle for Ukraine between them and Russia dragged along quite sluggishly for a long. In general, for the Ukrainian capital, it was pretty profitable to cooperate with both sides—it tried to sit on two chairs at once. But the social order in which we live, at its current stage, implies a shortlist of economically and politically powerful imperialist states and a long list of puppet states that are subservient to a particular imperialist or union of several imperialists (of course, there are exceptions, but these are the exceptions that prove the rule). Ukraine was not destined to become an imperialist. The pitcher often goes to the well but is broken at last—and it is only a matter of time before the upper echelons of our country are forced to make up their minds as to whom they will submit.

The time to choose came eight years ago. At that time, the U.S. and the EU won a convincing victory in the fight for Ukraine. They managed to reap its fruits in full—they gave the minimum and took the maximum: we had already opened the market-wide for the European capital and, in exchange, were being promised that someday they would take us to the EU; we had already secured the commitment to the North Atlantic Alliance at the constitutional level, and in return, we were promised

---

that someday they would take us to NATO, etc. Maybe they're just not that into us. The only promise they kept was regarding visa-free travel, and even then, mainly because it increased the flow of cheap labor force of our citizens to Poland and Czechia. Ukraine was eagerly sold for loans, but the Western encroachments went so far that in recent years, a conflict between the Ukrainian oligarchy and the corresponding oligarchy abroad began to develop slowly, and it would definitely lead to something in the future.

But the Russian invasion upset all the plans. Its immediate prehistory also dates back to 2014. At that time, the Russian Federation succeeded in abducting a part of Ukraine's territories, and, what's interesting, is that Crimea was included in the Russian state, while the LDPR was merely taken under its wing. The Poroshenko-Zelenskyy government (on this, as on many other issues, there was virtually no difference in policy between the two presidents), under the patronage of Western partners, could not accept such a turn of events and carried out ATO/JFO against the separatists, or, to put it simply, waged war against them. At the same time, Putin's government tried to bargain for a partial revanche for losing the fight for Ukraine and having the share of Russian capital in our country's economy lowered. However, it did not succeed.

Now this stalemate has been sort of reversed. For eight years, the conflict had been kept within the framework of an internal one: big Ukraine was hovering over the small separatist republics, which Russia assisted without directly engaging in the war. But since February 24th, the conflict has become openly external, with big Russia hovering over small Ukraine while NATO is assisting it without directly engaging in the war. In general, NATO is not what it used to be. This alliance gathered around the U.S. to confront the socialist bloc, after the fall of which the U.S. entered a golden age of undivided domination. Their hands were untied to do almost anything, and, using this, they tried to tie the hands of the rest of the global community. But for various reasons, the last three or four decades have become the era of China's rise, and at this point, Chinese capital roughly equals that of America. Where there is economic power, there is also political power; where

---



there is capital, there is competition. Between the U.S. and China lies the main frontline of our time, while Ukraine is a secondary development. The U.S. & co. are not going to throw all their forces at it; they will benefit from the outcome of the conflict, in which their position against China will be strengthened. That means that the protection of the independence and territorial integrity of Ukraine is not a goal for them—moreover, Ukraine can also be valuable as a bargaining chip if need be. And they cannot simply refuse to protect their own interests here; that is why they provide some kind of assistance. Besides, NATO, and in general everything referred to as Western capital, had not been completely united before. Now significant disunity in its ranks is made more evident by the way the heads of its member states react to the war in Ukraine (for example, Poland is eager to fight, while Germany had to be persuaded to introduce sanctions).

When giving the order to attack, the Russian leadership understood all this. And that is why it attacked. Russia is certainly among the ranks of imperialists, its place is among the predators, not the victims, but it is the weakest among the strongest. Today's Russia is a jackal imperialist that can only try to snatch a morsel for itself by balancing in a feud between more powerful imperialists. So, the war goes on. But, sooner or later, it will come to an end. A peace treaty will be signed, which will ensure not peace but a truce because whatever clauses it may contain, in any possible outcome, it will only consolidate the new balance of power in world politics and economy but will not undermine the principles of economic and political organization that lead to more and more wars being waged. And a new conflict of the same kind as the one we're observing right now will erupt. Many more of them, actually—maybe in another country or in time again in Ukraine once more—but they will erupt for sure.

It's easy to see that in the previous paragraphs, we were only talking about capital, hence, about its representatives, the capitalists, and above all, the owners of various kinds of enterprises. But every serious enterprise, run by an owner or even a dozen or a hundred of them (in the case of a joint-stock company), also consists of tens, hundreds,

---

thousands, or tens of thousands of people. They are workers hired by the enterprise, which essentially means working for the entrepreneur's benefit since it's the entrepreneur who controls the results of workers' labor, returning some of them as salaries and taking some for himself in the form of profit. This small minority of owners of capital constitutes the capitalist class (the bourgeoisie), while the vast majority of workers hired by them constitute the working class (the proletariat). The former is today the ruling class, the latter the subordinate class. Economically, this is expressed in the way we've mentioned already: most people don't have all the necessary means to create their own full-fledged business, and to survive, they have to work for some random people who have all the means required to set up an enterprise because they have the capital. By squeezing the profits from the workers and developing the business, growing capital to infinity, this capitalist becomes a real oligarch. And with the status comes control over the state carrot and the state stick. With their help, it is easy enough to ensure the obedience of the ordinary people to yourself, to your domination—this is how the subordination of the workers to the bourgeoisie is expressed politically.

And when two modern states (that is, two oligarchies) bump heads like sheep on a bridge, who gets sent to the battlefield? The sons of the rich and the rich themselves evade the draft in 90% of the cases, and the working class people serve in the army in 90% of the cases. So if you work for the capitalist class during peacetime, on the battlefield, also be prepared to work for its interests as the most powerful group in the state. And right now, it's primarily simple Ukrainian guys and men holding up the front, on the other side of which are the same ordinary guys and men, only Russian.

But war is not only on the enemy lines, but there's also a homefront, where it brings destruction in all its manifestations, and the frontline areas are the worst. Much more missiles burst into residential areas than luxury gated communities. And while the oligarchs left Ukraine on the eve of the war, not all in the rank-and-file population have the opportunity to leave the dangerous areas at this point. And to abandon one's home, even if it withstands, means to expose it to the

---

danger of being robbed. Most people have only one home, unlike the oligarchs who have villas abroad and for whom the loss of their Ukrainian palaces is not too devastating.

What will the people get at the end of the war? First of all, tens of thousands will not make it to see the end of the war. Those who do make it will try to return to their old lives by overcoming the problems created by the wartime. In short, people will gain nothing, but they will lose a great deal. The masters are fighting, but it's the proles who are sustaining the injuries.

And what can the serfs do about it? You can continue to be a Ukrainian nationalist or a Russian jingoist; you can stay apolitical, saying, "This is no concern of mine." But then you shouldn't be surprised and dismayed when windows break in your apartment because of a nearby shell explosion or when you're sent to invade a foreign country for your bourgeoisie. It is partly due to your support or indifference that events are taking such a turn, so you share the responsibility for them and blame for what happened. You can try to prevent it all; you can declare war on the war itself. But you must stand firmly by the viewpoint of your own interests, the interests of the working class, and join the struggle to bring them to life consistently. It implies a fundamental change of the social order in the sense that the proletariat must wrest the economy away from the capitalists, along with the state, and rebuild it to meet its own needs. And the workers of one country need not fight the workers of another country because, unlike the bourgeoisie, they have nothing to divvy between themselves. This is the only way we see to finally establish perpetual peace and not a permanent truce.

The revolution in both Ukraine and Russia, schematically depicted in the illustration in the article, is the only probable outcome of the war that will make the world's people victorious. However, it is practically unlikely to occur in the current war: in neither Ukraine nor Russia is the working class, for several reasons, even a mere independent political force, much less a political force capable of carrying out a revolution. The weakness of the labor movement is reflected in the extreme

---

weakness of the communists. Should we now despair and wait for the grass to grow? No, because the price of detachment and inaction is too high—we are already paying it. Yes, the goal is remote, but the road will rise to meet the one who walks in; we just have to step forward.

What, then, are the main tasks for the organization of Ukrainian Marxists in connection with the current war, given their capabilities? First, it is necessary to resist and grow stronger, to withstand the pressure of the hardships of war, which includes the rampant repressive apparatus of the state. Secondly, it is necessary to conduct, wherever possible, our educational activities on issues related to the war. And to educate anyone, it is essential to educate oneself, that is, to devote proper attention to studying these issues. Thirdly, we must clearly distinguish ourselves from those who consider themselves friends of the people, that is, of the socialist movement, but call for unity with the enemies of the people—asking to express support for either of the two warring sides, to show solidarity with the Ukrainian or Russian government. Such comrades, who are not our comrades at all, are called social-chauvinists.

Representatives of Russian social-chauvinism are baited by the Putin regime's flirtation with the subject of the Great Patriotic War and the fight against Nazism, with the authorities' formal tolerance of communists, etc., etc. But this is the Great Patriotic War with a St. George ribbon in the foreground; this is the struggle against Nazism alongside glorification of the White Army; these are tame, loyal communists—all a lie, dust in the eyes, a manifestation of the rare talent of capitalists to parasitize on anything to consolidate their domination. And the Russian socialchauvinists help them in this as much as they can. In Russia, they do it directly, being, let's face it, nothing but red Putinism, and in neighboring countries indirectly, because it is convenient for the power to lump the real communists with these fake ones. For the real communists, their Marxist conscience does not allow them to call the current advance of capitalist Russian troops deep into capitalist Ukraine a liberation. If Russia were a socialist country, it would be a different story. But as things stand, the events unwrapping are nothing but vulgar

---

occupation.

Representatives of the Ukrainian social-chauvinism tend to fall for the rhetoric of the national liberation struggle of Ukraine against the imperialist aggression of Russia. Except that this is still Zelensky's Ukraine: a puppet regime of the West, the outlaw land of local oligarchs, the realm of forced Ukrainianization, the bode of right-wing radicals, the home of the strangled socialist movement, etc., etc. And it is for this, that they invite us to fight; they propose to us to rush to strengthen the current regime and all its disasters. If it were socialist Ukraine repelling the blow of capitalist Russia, there would be no question of standing to the death for it. But a sensible Marxist cannot afford to lead everyone in a united effort to stand up for today's capitalist Ukraine.

We can rightly denounce both sides of the conflict, but it does no good to look for the lesser evil among them, as they are inherently homogeneous. The only things we can endorse, and even then critically since the governments of Ukraine and Russia are not doing a very good job of this, are negotiations on an early cease-fire, initiatives for humanitarian aid to civilians, the introduction of all kinds of support measures for the ordinary population and all the rest in the same vein. It is true that even with the above, we will not be able to influence the negotiations and support measures. Still, as for the humanitarian aid, volunteering—especially carried out on the basis of civilian, not state, initiatives—must be done by all according to their abilities and time. In these harsh and cruel times, when people become beastly, the main thing is to remain human.

---

# **Workers' Front of Ukraine: Different Mottos—One Truth**

Bombed out cities in former Yugoslavia, destroyed and mutilated Iraq and Afghanistan, previously prosperous Libya driven to absolute poverty, thousands and millions of tragic deaths in Algiers, Vietnam, Korea. What does this list of facts from the bitter war history tell us? It tells us only one thing: Ukraine is following in these countries' footsteps in full.

Like the other wretched countries on this list, we have become casualties of the imperialist war, victims of a war that has already claimed thousands of lives, brought tears to women and children, destroyed cities, produced poverty, made people fight over bread. Wars are humanity's most tragic phenomenon; wars are the death of people as creators, the death of humanity, the loss of all signs of belonging to humankind. Only genetic traits remain, as survival reflexes had been lost in the peaceful time. And one would want to use loud mottos to talk about the value of a nation, the war to protect the Motherland, the Ukrainians' right to our culture, but let's leave this for the end, and for now, cite the words that are pretty popular among the left:

“There is no crime that the capitalist would not commit for the sake of 300% profit”. Why these words? When watching media, we constantly encounter populist explanations for wars, such as “The war started because Russia is an empire, which has it in its interests to conquer lands,” “Today Ukraine, tomorrow—Poland,” “Russia is trying to take over our free people and to destroy the civilized world,”—a layperson will find such explanations quite meaningful and logical. It's sad when people are looking for a reason while it already exists, and it had already been formulated in the works of a man whose name must not be uttered. To put it simply, we have become the eyewitness to the redistribution of markets. No matter how much our favorite liberals howl, war is a market tool for settling competition.

---

To quote Mao:

“Politics is war without bloodshed while war is politics with bloodshed.”

We’re getting used to the fact that contemporary politics and the market are tightly intertwined concepts, or maybe even identical. The market competition can be carried out through diplomatic methods and economic manipulation—but also through a coercive war. It’s interesting that in both cases of “competition,” ordinary people suffer. A prominent example: Russians feel all the economic and bloodless competition results as they lose jobs and material goods and fall into poverty. At the same time, Ukrainians have become the victims of coerced competition through a military invasion—a war, in short. But one mustn’t think that the competition is between the Russian and the Ukrainian capitals, even though Ukraine is feeling its repercussions.

After the collapse of The Soviet Union, the world has changed; it’s not bipolar anymore and doesn’t have ideological camps. However, it has not led to peace, as naive liberals had thought, and communists were not the earthly threat, an antichrist (I apologize for the Biblical terminology). Instead, capitalism was the antichrist that cemented his hegemony, leading to more conflicts. And today, we’re in the theatre of operations of the BIG MARKET WAR. The Ukrainian-Russian war is another battle on the chessboard of the economic war, which is waged by the leading capitalist countries. If people think that economic wars are better than real ones, they’re wrong because it’s a double-edged sword. In our world, wars have never stopped; they just shapeshifted. An economic war always results in a real bloodbath, and a bloodbath ends with the advent of an economic war; such is the vicious circle.

In our earlier article, you can read more about how the economic war between capitalist countries has led to a real war in Ukraine. Meanwhile, let’s sort out the approximate reasons for Russia to bare its teeth in Ukraine. And I want to say right away that we’re not talking about protecting the Russian-speaking population or liberating Ukraine from nazism—no, the truth follows Marxist thought and is all in the spirit of capitalism.

---

Let's go back to 2010, when Ukraine was still without war and relatively peaceful, and we were buying Russia's natural gas and quite dependent on that fuel. By 1999, Ukraine was importing over 80% of its consumption. Natural gas imports shrunk with each passing year, primarily due to deindustrialization. By 2019, Ukraine was producing 20.7 billion cubic meters of natural gas, and its annual internal demand was at 26 billion cubic meters. What happened in 2010? Two large deposits of shale gas were discovered: the Oleske field, located between Lviv, Carpathian, and Ternopil regions, and Yuzivske, situated in the Eastern part of Ukraine, between Kharkiv and Donetsk regions.

Before that, no one paid much attention to shale gas. In the USSR, it was not produced because the procedure of extraction was deemed too costly. In the US, extraction began in the 1980s in Texas. In time, the US became the largest gas producer globally, and it was the production of shale gas that helped the States recover from the 2009 economic crisis. But at the beginning of 2012, prices for natural gas in the US fell to a level much below the production cost of shale gas, which made the companies limit their production to avoid losing money.

Production of shale gas also challenges the ecological conditions of the area. Ecological activists are radically opposed to the extraction of shale gas, which, in their opinion, destroys the area and can cause earthquakes. Vyacheslav Voloshin, the Pryazovskyi State Technical University president, who heads its Labor Protection and Environment department, does not share such a radical approach. According to Voloshin, extraction can be conducted safely, but this demands additional research into extraction methods. In many European countries, shale gas extraction has been banned because it may harm the environment, but such countries as China and the US are undeterred: they keep opening up new gas fields and extracting from them.

And suppose we believe more or less realistic data. In that case, Ukraine has approximately 7.55 trillion cubic meters of potential gas in these fields (4.05 trillion cubic meters in the Yuzivske field and 3.5 in

---



the Oleske field). If we add the 0.2 trillion of gas from the Black Sea-Crimea oil and gas region, the sum expected gas reserves of Ukraine (as of 2013) will be 7.75 trillion cubic meters, which makes it seventh in the world after Saudi Arabia. However, we're speculating with the hypothetical reserves, and the rating is based on "proven" ones.

For the first time, Ukraine had a chance to become an energetically-independent country, had an opportunity to export gas abroad, road blocking Russia that is used to having only one competitor in Europe—Norway. Experts noted that the gas reserves in Ukraine might cardinaly change the energy situation not only in Ukraine but in the whole of Europe.

"According to the latest substantiated data issued by the Americans—they can clearly see 3.6 trillion cubic meters that could be extracted. It's a substantial amount because if Ukraine increases its production by 15-20 billion cubic meters, it will become an exporter," Oleksander Kharchenko, managing director at the Energy Industry Research center, pointed out in 2014.

The Ukrainian elites saw the Ukrainian gas fields first and foremost as an opportunity to sign billion-dollar deals. As a result, Viktor Yanukovich signed an agreement allowing the exploitation of gas fields, and the direct involvement was carried out by his minister of power generation, Eduard Stavytskyi. On the 25th January 2013, Ukraine signed an agreement with Royal Dutch Shell, which allowed the company to exploit the Yuzivske oil field for 50 years. The 10 billion dollar agreement became the most significant direct foreign investment in Ukrainian history. The shale gas extraction depended on the successful drilling of 15 test holes. The gas field was supposed to start working properly by 2017. The company started drilling two test holes in 2014. However, all work in the project folded once military activity in the Donbas region began.

In November 2013, the American company Chevron signed an agreement with the Ukrainian company Nadra Oleska to exploit the Oleske gas field. Chevron planned to invest over 12 billion dollars in

---

geological exploration and gas extraction. However, in 2014, Chevron decided to leave Ukraine and closed its office in Kyiv in 2015. Philp Vorobyev, the commercial director for JKC Oil & Gas, which is the parent structure of Poltava Petroleum Company, has announced that the price for drilling holes to extract shale gas is \$3.5 million in Texas and \$15 million in Ukraine. Meanwhile, as the head engineer for Sibneft, Iskander Diyashev, pointed out at the same conference, the Ukrainian resource base is much better than the American one. However, the well capacity is only a tenth of the American average.

The non-traditional gas itself is not as attractive as the traditional one due to its low-profit margins, which made investors leave Ukraine and neighboring Poland.

In an interview with the foreign press, Oleg Prokhorenko, head of UkrGasVydobuvannya, opined that hope to extract from traditional and non-traditional gas fields will emerge in Ukraine once the cost of fuel reaches a commercially attractive level. As per his words, the extraction of cabled methane makes economic sense when it's priced at \$300 per thousand cubic meters. Shale gas is economically attractive when priced over \$265-350. Meanwhile, the number is \$180-260 per thousand cubic meters for offshore gas. "Meanwhile, traditional gas extraction is already economically viable when it's priced at \$150,"—Prokhorenko noted.

Even before the Maidan, the Russian government was quite perturbed by the possibility of Ukraine becoming energetically independent and competitive. And after the Maidan, Russia began the so-called "Russian spring," while it was in the regions richest in gas and other resources that separatist action started in the so-called "people's republics."

It's not a secret to anyone that Russia would have loved to see even more people's republics than currently exist. But unfortunately, all Russian actions signified not the liberation of the Russian population from the nazis but the cunning liquidation of a potential competitor by taking over its resources. As a result of the "Russian spring," Russia did

---

not just inflict blows on the Eastern fields rich in gas and other fossil fuels—it also “nationalized” (not to the benefit of the people, though) Chornomornaftogaz and took away Ukraine’s ability to extract gas in the Black Sea-Crimea oil and gas region.

Therefore, as a result of the military action in Donbas, the annexation of Crimea, and the foreign investors leaving, Ukraine did not only lose the opportunity to become energetically independent but also suffered significant losses in its deposits and their potential development. Hiding under the motto of just liberation of the Russians, Russia landed a blow at its potential competitor. One could say that this is why the people of Donbas have been dying throughout the past eight years, and the people of Ukraine are dying right now.

As to the current situation, in one of the earliest days of the war, Russia aimed to take over Zmiinyi Island, which might have been an attempt to capture more gas deposits.

The endeavor to create a new Russia-controlled people’s republic in Kherson (and similar potential plans for Odesa and Mykolayiv) indicates Russia’s plans to take total control over the Black Sea-Crimea oil and gas region. Therefore, it’s entirely possible that the Russian aggression toward Ukraine is not based on the oppression of the Russian population under Ukrainian fascism and Western imperialism but on the desire to redistribute the market to its advantage. The above data also explains why the Ukrainian government is grasping Crimea and Donbas so firmly, even though they’re full of separatist and Ukrainophobic attitudes. These lands can bring a lot of profit to the golden elites of Ukraine.

Moscow’s capture of the Black Sea-Crimea oil and gas region, the coerced admission of Crimea by Ukraine as part of the Russian Federation, and the independence of L/DPR will allow Russia to shake off many sanctions and actively exploit the new deposits, making billions from them.

And even though contemporary nationalists insist that Ukraine

---

defends itself against barbarity and protects the civilization, we have another barbarian to the West—who has as much of a stake in starting this war as Russia is interested in our deposits.



It's pretty unpleasant to grasp the full injustice of the situation in which thousands of people die due to economic wars, waged by a small bunch of individuals with big pockets and maniacal ambitions. They're not interested in culture, language, religion, nationhood, freedom; they're not interested in our lives. And indeed, what can we call it if not an era of the antichrist? We would also very much like to see the second advent of Christ if this is the case.

Although this war was not started by us and is part of the quarrel between Mammon's servants, this war does affect the proletariat, and the only way to fight it—is the good old unity of the proletarians. And the only way to accomplish this unity is on the foundation of enlightenment because, as one man who tended to mispronounce his "r" said:

...People always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learned to seek out the interests of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political, and social phrases, declarations, and promises."

[www.redmachete.org](http://www.redmachete.org)  
[redmachete@protonmail.com](mailto:redmachete@protonmail.com)

