



**Kamil Galeev** @kamilkazani

Jan 20 · 13 tweets · [kamilkazani/status/1616469658307276803](#)

Moscow liberal's logic:

1. There were (allegedly) hundreds of thousands Chechens willing to be a part of Russia
2. Yeltsin bombed them to ashes Mariupol-style
3. "Not clear what was an alternative"

How exactly are these guys different from Putin? Same crazy, murderous mindset

**Konstantin Sonin** ✓ @k\_sonin · Dec 6, 2022  
Replying to @kasparomuls and @tvrain  
Yeltsin faced a terrible choice with Chechnya; he tried, and failed, many approaches. Not clear, even in the hindsight, what was an alternative. Anyways, no question that any liberal might be a closet imperialist, but what @tvrain has been doing was always for peace and freedom.

2 1

**Kaspars Omuls** @kasparomuls · Dec 6, 2022  
Replying to @k\_sonin and @tvrain  
What if this liberal leader has such terrible choice with Baltic states?

1 1

**Konstantin Sonin** ✓ @k\_sonin  
Replying to @kasparomuls and @tvrain  
Chechnya was was a part of Russia in 1991. Yeltsin was as much the president of hundreds of thousands of people living in Chechnya who were willing to be a part of Russia as the president of hundreds of thousands who wanted to be independent. Baltic states were foreign countries.

5:32 PM · Dec 6, 2022

2 Quote Tweets

## Fact

Modern Russia is more of a product of Chechen Wars than of Putin's personality. Remilitarization, buildup of security state, they all started due to the First War. By the late 1990s Yeltsin was actively looking for a KGB heir. All his three last PMs were from state security



Moscow liberals want to portray Putin as an "accident". He was not. The system chose Putin, not the other way around. Yeltsin elevated Putin from nothing, started another war to facilitate his succession and used the lowkey nuclear blackmail when Clinton tried to argue



Putin's brand became too toxic. He made too many mistakes and continuation of his rule puts the entire system under risk. So [@navalny](#)'s succession became the hill to die on for the entire little Moscow race of overlords: "liberals"/nationalists who benefit from empire's existence



[@navalny](#) Moscow liberals and nationalists do not support [@navalny](#) because they see him as a "candidate for change". It's the other way around. They stand for him because they see his succession as a "return to normality". Pretty disgusting normality I must say



Facts:

1. Global narrative on Russia is shaped by the major Western media/scholars
2. Both journos and scholars are (mostly) clueless. Most have no other sources in Russia other than the Moscow establishment
3. The Moscow establishment is interested in minimal, cosmetic changes
4. Moscow establishment is mortally terrified of the system being dismantled. It would undermine their privilege
5. They provide Western media/academia with facts selected and interpretations constructed to justify the minimal change narrative. They must be cosmetic, they argue
6. Since most of the Western media/academia have no other sources than the Moscow establishment they form their opinion based on facts selected and interpretations constructed by the latter. Respectable Western institutions do perspective laundering for the Moscow establishment
7. Since the narrative promoted by the mainstream Western media largely amounts to the laundered perspective of the Moscow establishment, the Westerners are genuinely astonished with either Ukrainians/Russian minorities/regionalists questioning the said "objective" narrative
8. Hence the differing views on [@navalny](#)'s imperial succession. Those who see the imperial system as an asset will fight for him till the last breath. That's their only chance, realistically speaking. Those who see it as a liability or threat tend to hold very different opinions
9. [@navalny](#)'st platform is the platform of the cosmetic changes. Since the Moscow establishment interested in only cosmetic changes hold the monopoly of representation, their perspective becomes the mainstream Western perspective. Nobody else is given voice, for the most part

[@navalny](#) 10. The question of [@navalny](#)'s succession is the question of cosmetic vs fundamental changes of the Russian sociopolitical system. If you don't get it, you won't get why so many Ukrainians/Russian minorities stand against it while the Moscow "liberals" - for it

11. In my next thread I'll show how [@navalny](#) and his team are weaponising the "anti-corruption" rhetorics (mixed with factual lies and the wildest claims) to buttress the imperial system. I will also show their strategy of putting the blame for Putinism on minorities

Cheers

...