

General Pyotr Nikolaevich Krasnov and Ataman Mikhail Karaulov: The Doctrine of Cossack National Socialism During the Russian Civil War

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

The Russian and Ukrainian people lived under a Judaic, faux-socialist government for many decades. The result is an anti-communist literature the establishment has been suppressing for years. Some of the best nationalist, national socialist and traditionalist ideas remain untranslated and even unknown to Russia specialists in the thought-control universities.

This article features some of the work of General Pyotr Nikolaevich Krasnov, the Ataman (warrior monarch) of the Don Cossack Host during the Russian Civil War. A firm social nationalist, his writings come from the heart of one whose life was on the line: not just his own, but civilization as a whole.

He was a veteran of World War I and was used by the Provisional Government to stop the Bolshevik coup that led to the Civil War. The Kerensky–Krasnov Uprising was an effort by Alexander Kerensky to regain political control after the infamous coup.

Once the coup was successful, Kerensky appointed Krasnov to destroy the Reds and retake Petrograd. Unsuccessful due to allied support for the Reds, the Provisional Government was no more. Kerensky went into exile and political oblivion.

For his part, Krasnov fled to Germany where he founded the Brotherhood of Russian Truth, serving as both a guerrilla network within Russia as well as a foreign publishing house telling the world about the nature of the Red forces. He wrote continually in both fictional and non-fictional styles for the rest of his life.

As World War II neared, Krasnov saw Germany as the last hope for Russia. Rejecting the organization of General Vlasov, he maintained his support for the German invaders acting as a guerrilla army against Soviet regulars and irregular partisans in the countryside. Operation Keelhaul, the single most egregious display of slavish support for Stalin by the Allies, sent Krasnov back to the USSR. He was sentenced to death by a military court for his actions, and he was executed in January of 1947.

Krasnov died a committed Orthodox Cossack and National Socialist. His legacy is one of cutting insight, his doctrine of resistance to the Reds and his defense of Old Russia. He was a literal martyr to Russian Orthodox civilization and fought to the death against the same forces that have destroyed western civilization as well.

His counterpart in the Terek Cossack camp was Ataman Mikhail Karaulov, whose doctrine difference slightly from Krasnov, but was substantially similar. The Terek Cossacks initially were Ossetians, but very Orthodox religiously. Both camps caused the Reds endless trouble. Their well known combat technique specializes in being always outnumbered, so guerrilla tactics, secrecy and surprise were and are a large part of their martial legacy.

Karaulov was from a wealthy family, making him quite different from Krasnov. He served as a royalist deputy in the last (or fourth) Duma under Emperor Nicholas II. His political views were more detailed, and his mission was more “party-oriented” than the more artistic Krasnov. Their similarities, however, far outweigh their differences.

Both men believed in a separate Cossack identity within Russia. They both saw Bolshevism as Jewish. Krasnov lived longer than his Terek counterpart, and was a full supporter of the Third Reich up until his death right after the war. On the other hand, Karaulov was killed by leftist assassins in 1917. It should surprise no one that not even specialists in this field have ever heard of these two writers and soldiers. Their political vision was fully social nationalist and, with Karaulov, strongly anarchist, which is a strong tendency among Cossacks in general. Orthodox Christian anarchism was important in the White war against the Reds, with Sts. Andrei, Bishop of Ufa and Valentin Sventsitsky developing such a view.

On General Krasnov

General Krasnov wrote the following in 1927:

The Bolsheviks, with the ideas of Karl Marx, seek to replace the national principle with the class struggle. They believe that class consciousness plays a far greater role in history than the national. To prove this, they shamelessly manipulate the data of experience. Detailed evidence of the falsity of such statements would lead us too far astray. Note one thing: economic materialism as a comprehensive interpretation of history and is the basis of Marx's teaching. It has failed to make sense out of the world; Marx takes one part of what is happening in human social life and makes it the entire process, thus excluding from its field of view of vast areas of life that are non-economic.

There is no doubt that in the modern era capitalism internationalized the world' class struggle becomes essential. But we can say with certainty that class is not enough incentive to move the masses to struggle against any external enemy. Bolsheviks themselves clearly demonstrated the inadequacy already in 1920 during the war with Poland. Lenin had to appeal to Patriarch Tikhon and General Brusilov to make this fight a national character. . . (Krasnov, 1927, all translations mine).

This is an essential doctrinal statement. The point is that capitalism has forced the entire world to see reality through the prism of money. Everything is standardized under its rule. For this reason, the Marxists analysis is correct about modern oligarchs. The problem is that they refuse to see the ethnic and religious components of experience. Rather than being a "social science," leftism in general is a superstitious prejudice that makes an idol out of money's power.

He continues:

If we carefully Look at the course of world history, we easily see that the emergence of forms of human social collectives corresponds (in its highest development) with national social life. In the ancient and medieval eras we find civic associations. These societies certainly were created without the "masses" because only with the invention of printing could a broad communication among people exist without the need for close proximity. The full development of civil society was only possible from the time of the French Revolution, which caused an extraordinary growth of the press. The development of technology which has given the means of rapid and extensive communications such as railways, ships, cars, telegraph, mail, and now aircraft, has also given in the 19th and 20th centuries

the impetus to an intensive development of civic associations in all areas. The role and the penetration of this form of association in great cultural states can move the mass into a real society (Krasnov, 1927)

Here, Krasnov states that the truly national forms of life were only possible when modernity made mass communication and mass media a reality. While ethnic claims and nationalist discourse was common in Ukraine, Russia, Poland, Ireland and Scotland in the middle ages, the claim here is that its full political potential was only unleashed when technology developed such that communications among all nationals was made very easy. Hence, he argues eccentrically that nationalism, while always in existence, was only possible fully in the modern world. It is the end of history in terms of political ideas.

Krasnov, in this same vein, was interested in the creation of “crowds,” that is “masses” that can be manipulated. On the one hand, he saw its positive manifestation as the state mobilized the people for nationalist goals. On the other, it can be used to destroy peoples as well.

Typical signs of a psychological crowd is its susceptibility to suggestion and ease of imitation. To live and act under the influence of suggestion, as a hypnotic, does not require the direct influence of the hypnotist. Modern culture makes it possible to influence the feelings of people in myriad ways. Leaflets, newspapers, books, meetings, debates, theater, cinema, wireless telegraph – all this has expanded the concept of the mass and has “massified” human life. . .

Fashion enslaves man. Fashion makes him lose sight of true beauty, neglect social hygiene and acquire disease. Fashion owns humanity. Almost the whole world is dressed in the jacket and tie – representing the gallows – while they forget the beauty of the national costume. . . Fashion has captured the theater and the arts – fashion has become the disease of the century (Krasnov, 1927)

It is clear that he is not defending mass society, but rather condemns it. While mass communications has great potential, it is being misused to dumb-down western peoples. Solzhenitsyn was to make an identical claim several decades later.

Concerning Russian Cossacks in particular, he writes in 1922:

Today, Russia is not monolithic. It was, with nobles and peasants, all serving God, before the war of 1812. Today, next to the peasants has arisen a huge army of urban workers. This is a whole class of people who do not have any property; this is the proletariat. Modern peasants and workers, the proletariat, all have the usual characteristics of psychological crowds: imitative, easily suggestible, irritable and impulsive (Krasnov, 1922).

Modernity did not bring progress. Mass society showed that the existence of mass communication was, to say the least, a mixed blessing. When people are severed from the land and herded into the cities during industrialization, they lose themselves. The city is the destroyer: it recognizes only money and social pretense. They lose themselves ethnically and religiously because they are almost physically attached to inhuman factory conditions serving only for the profit of the elite. They become machines themselves.

The Cossacks were and are an antidote to this mechanization. He writes:

But never, throughout a little over four hundred years of its existence, the Cossacks did not consider themselves and not think otherwise than with undivided Russia. . . The Cossacks have always sought, however, to keep their old Russian customs, their ancient liberties. The heavy hand of Russian central power aspired to such an extent to centralize all that in places like Novocherkassk one could not put on the street lamps without permission from Petersburg. This they rejected. They are often riled up against rulers who were trying to curtail traditional Cossack liberties (Krasnov, 1922).

Cossacks are not strictly Russians. They are Russian royalists and nationalists, but remain a separate, autonomous political community within the empire. State centralization is the political form of mechanization. Just as the machine strips man of his humanity and identity, the state, when insisting that all social life be politicized, destroys both regional and national identities. It rules either in its own interests or those who finance it. In the above passage, he is referring to the destruction of the Cossack *Sich* (or a guarded and inaccessible fortress) by Catherine II (the Great) who sought to centralize the Russian empire in Petrograd. Unfortunately, the emperors of the 19th century did not undo this crime.

Before his death from the American Operation Keelhaul, Krasnov wrote his final letter from Lefortovo Prison. There, he was executed with Gen. AG Shkuro, Sultan Giray Klich and several other White military leaders. Krasnov's grandnephew Nicholas Krasnov preserved his final testament to the world. Nicholas Krasnov's papers contained a copy of this final Testament. Written just days before his execution from the dungeons of the KGB, the Cossack wrote:

. . . . If you survive, fulfill my will: describe all that you will experience; all you see, hear, and about all you meet. Describe how it was. . . Do not lie! Write the truth even if it will prick someone's eyes. The bitter truth is always more valuable than a sweet lie. . . Now, to deal with the Reds we need other means, and not only words. . . Whatever happens, do not dare hate Russia. No it is not the Russian people who are the perpetrators of this immense suffering. No it is not from the Russians this misfortune has spring. Treason was the cause. It is not enough to love your homeland, those who love her were also required to protect her. They can kill millions of us, millions more will replace us. They will not destroy us. . . The resurrection of Russia will take place gradually. Not right away. This vast body can not recover so quickly. . . Now, let's say goodbye, grandson . . . I am sorry, there is nothing here to bless you with; I have no cross, no icons. All were taken. Let me give you cross over in the Name of the Lord. Before it saves you ... Goodbye, Kolyunok! .. Do not think badly of me! Do not let this offend you. We are poor but still have a great responsibility. . . .Goodbye! (from Nazarov, 2006)

He ended his resistance, not with despair, but with hope. Truly, Russia bled for decades, but such a great people will not be destroyed thereby. Treason, the enemy within, is the eternal problem. The Reds and their allies in the west have nothing to do with Russia. Russia is an indestructible idea rather than a place, and she will recover. That prediction has certainly come true.

On Mikhail Karaulov

Mikhail Karaulov (1878-1917) laid out the “democratic royalist” idea of his own band of Cossacks. He was elected to the Fourth Duma in Petrograd where he defended the monarchy (Smele, 2015: 552). He formed the Cossack Party defending their own vision of the royalist state. He stated:

Russia should be both democratic and royalist (that is, a state in which all citizens are equal in their rights before the law are protected) and headed by a hereditary emperor. Managing the state needs to be on the basis of clear and certain laws and being bearing the idea of justice and reaffirming the state as its primary promoter. Laws should be passed by the emperor as well as Duma members and the State council. The cabinet should be appointed by the Emperor. . . The State Duma is to get control over foreign policy (Karaulov, 1907).

Basic democratic freedoms such as speech and religion are advocated. As far as national rights, he wrote that “each Russian nation has the right to national (but not political) independence: as the forced merger of nationalities (eg, Russification or Germanization) is unacceptable.”

National independence means that the regions of Russia (such as Ukraine or the Tartars) have full control over domestic policy, but in terms of foreign policy, they are part of the Russian empire. Empires are not nation-states. Empires are less centralized than states. Under the monarchy, Poland and Finland had their own constitutions. This is consistent with national independence, but in making alliances with foreign powers, that was far too high a risk to take.

In this vein, he writes: “Every area should have a broad self-government for the educational and economic issues (income, expenses, school, forestry, road building, etc). Organs of local government (regional or provincial, the Assembly of Representatives) shall have the right to budget due to local needs.”

In economics, he wrote that “all the natural wealth of Russia exist for the local population. They offer opportunities for Russians, not foreign capital. Russia for the Russians!” This approach to democracy is far more representative of the working people than free international trade.

In terms of landownership, his views are original:

The land should not be nationalized, but brought under regional control. The wide municipalization of landownership should be brought to the individual regions, that is, placed in the hands of the population related by common origin, a common history and common, of course, economic conditions. A farmer in Arkhangelsk has nothing to do with inhabitant of the southern Russian provinces; and this belief is evident in the population. The main thing is to guard against the destruction of the community, one with regional features but under the crown (Karaulov, 2007).

The democratic nature of the Cossacks was formed when all those who wanted get rid of the

tyranny of the nobles, those who longed for a free life joined the Cossack Host.

General equality prevailed based on a courageous brotherhood. . . We must also not forget that the 16th century centralization of the Russian state in the Northeast also destroyed the free assembly of the Russian land in Novgorod, Pskov and elsewhere. Of course, the residents of these areas sought in the Cossack communities that same order. . . neither the freedom nor equality of the Host changes the Cossack loyalty to the Russian monarch and does not change the Cossack defense of its natural sovereign (Karaulov, 2007).

This sort of regional identity is essential to the notion of Russia as a broad civilization rather than as a nation state. Orthodox royalism and regionalism is the specific political nature of this civilization that was in the process of being destroyed long before the reds. This regional identity of the southern Cossacks, the Terek Host, to be exact, is summarized by Karaulov in an earlier essay, *The Russian Cossack*:

In front of soldiers who rebelled against the Tatar yoke, as the Falcons, broke free, flew the next heirs and direct descendants of the glorious once great heroes of Holy Russia - Cossacks. And all his subsequent activity Cossacks proved that they are firmly and steadfastly stand for the Faith, Tsar and Fatherland, for the honor and glory of the Cossacks, not yielding an inch of occupied land, not knowing the fear of the formidable enemy, undeterred flow rained blood. And around the world thundered Cossack glory, and to this day it has not faded, and one only the name of the Cossack, as is clearly proved by the example of the last days, makes the hearts of the enemies of the land tremble and Russian Orthodox King (karaulov, 1916).

In December 1917, Karaulov arrived in Pyatigorsk on army business with a small entourage. A group of soldiers of the 106th Ufa Infantry Regiment (Bolshevik) led by one Zotov, were returning from the Caucasian front. Learning that one of the cars contained the Ataman, they demanded he come out. He refused. A shootout resulted and Zotov's people dragged Karaulov from the car. They smashed in his head. In typical red fashion, they sang and danced around his corpse like a trophy.

The legacy of these two men are precisely that of the Cossacks in general: sacrificial public service, strong religious devotion, incredible combat ability, personal inner strength and a devotion to the Russian crown. Like all Cossacks, they did not trust the bureaucracy in Petrograd, and rightly saw the monarch as stymied constantly by this professionalized corps of middle class functionaries.

Unfortunately for some Russian nationalists, most of the Cossack life had been fighting for its independence against Russia. Its main enemy had been the Catholic west, especially Poland, but demanding its autonomous life was a central pillar of the Cossack organization. Both men here pledge loyalty to the Russian crown on the condition that it respect Cossack independence. As a non-state organization with a strict law, they are a nightmare for any state system or empire. Unfortunately, one of the Russian crown's great mistakes was to mistreat Cossack independence over the centuries, especially in the 18th.

Nevertheless, as Russia's existence was at stake during the Civil War, the Cossacks became the very core of the anti-Red forces. The White armies lost precisely because they did

not have the ideological unity of the Cossacks. The Whites ranged from the very liberal to the very royalist, and everything in between. The Cossacks, as this paper has shown, were very similar in their national-anarchist and socialist vision of life, one that had been lived successfully for centuries.

Bibliography

Krasnov, PN (1927) The Soul of the Army: Essays on Military Psychology. Village Krasnaya and the Bronze Horseman Press (in Russian)

Krasnov, PN (1922) Cossack Independence. The Double Headed Eagle, 1-9 (in Russian)

Krasnov, P. (1919). The Edge of the Neva. The Cossack Collective, 1 (1922) number 1, 1922. Lihtengorstkoy Cossack Village Press, Germany (in Russian)

Karaulov, M. (2007) Terek Cossacks: Past and Present. Veche (Originally Published in 1912) (in Russian)

Karaulov, M. (1916) The Russian Cossack. Worldview, no. 47 (in Russian)
<http://14-18.ru/?p=3442>

Maslowski, V (2001) Ataman of the Terek Cossack Host: Major-General MA Karaulov. The Cossack Circle

Smele, Jonathan (2015) Historical Dictionary of the Russian Civil Wars, 1916-1926. Rowman and Littlefield

Chemakin, AA (2016) The “Democratic Monarchist” – The Views of MA Karaulov on Politics in the IV Duma. Moscow State University Press. This was based on his dissertation at the Lomonosov College of Moscow State University entitled The Imperial and Independent People's Party in the IV Duma: Russian Nationalist Democracy 1913-1917 (in Russian)
<http://hist.msu.ru/Science/Disser/Chemakin.pdf>

Nazarov, MZ (2006) Ataman Krasnov of the Don: Fidelity to the Royal Russia. Russian Idea (in Russian)
<http://rusidea.org/?a=25011609>