

**Nationalism and Orthodoxy in Ukrainian
Political Thought:
The Ontology of Resistance**

Matthew Raphael Johnson

Introduction: Ukraine and “the Nation”

The Hetmanate as the Central Element
in Ukrainian Political Ideas: The Background to Ukrainian
Social Thought

From Pereslav to Andrusovo: The Horror of the 17th Century

Ivan Vyshenskii (d. 1620) and Gregory Skovoroda (d. 1794)

Taras Shevchenko (d. 1861)

Drahomanov (d. 1895) and Kostamarov (d. 1885)

Ivan Franko (d. 1916)

The UAOC under Patriarchs Dmitri and Volodymyr

The Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the 20th Century under
Vasyl Lypkivsky and the Poltava Movement

An Overview of Ukrainian Nationalism in the Second Half of the
20th Century

From the Second World to the Void, Ukraine's Second Ruin:
1990 to 2015

Conclusions

(c) Hromada Books, 2017
ISBN: 978-1-387-11207-4

Acknowledgments

The typical book on Ukrainian history is written in well funded universities by alienated, urban and cultureless professors. These privileged dons have an army of research assistants (sometimes called “students”) whose uncopyrighted research is no doubt valuable as raw material. High salaries, total job security, secretaries, graduate assistants, grant money and a host of other privileges make their job much easier. How much of their books is really their work is something that is not likely to be solved. Given that so much of this is written by others, with the assistance of so many others, and on university time generously funded by taxpayers (among other people), the claim to copyright is a sick joke. While their privileges are many, it does come at a price: their total lack of freedom.

This book was written without any of that. All the work, research, translations, copyreading and proofreading is – for better or worse – the responsibility of the author. If the reader finds a typo or an inadvertent mistake, let it slide – give me a break. Had I the resources of the typical author in this field, it would be less excusable.

In the process of writing this book my life has changed so radically I seem to be in some surrealist dream-state. So much of the work that went into this large tome was, to some extent, a means of distracting myself from it all. I guess this is a healthy approach.

My sons Gabriel and Michael deserve mention as my one true, real victory. They are assets to humanity.

My students, especially from my time as a professor at Mount St. Mary's University (2005-2008), a time cut short due to mismanagement and corruption, deserve a special thanks.

This book is dedicated to the memory of the late

Hieroschemamonk Brendan (Williams), who died in May of 2015 after 40 years of intense suffering from fibromyalgia, lupus and a host of other diseases I would not wish on anyone. Once he built up a tolerance to all pain medication, he felt the raw, grinding and acidic pain of his diseases. Fr. Brendan was my spiritual brother for many years and his death, at least to him, was a welcome relief. Though it all, he retained his sense of balance, his mood and occasionally, his sense of humor. He will be sorely missed.

Preface:
The Ukrainian Debacle

This work was written at a time when Ukraine and Ukrainian history was front page news. Throughout 2014 and 2015, the west was treated to Ukrainian identity, albeit mangled and misrepresented, that heretofore could not have been more foreign. Nothing has changed. The misinformation has made the educated public far less able to understand the situation than ever before. Ukraine at the end of 2015 is a tragic, pathetic farce. Her present misery is proof of the evil presently ruling our world.

Ukraine, from a Russian Orthodox nationalist like myself, has been hijacked by westerners who loathe all forms of national assertiveness. Faux-nationalist groups were used in the violent coup of 2014 and then cast aside as embarrassments later on. The fact is that the Ukrainian pantheon of nationalist writers, including Bandera himself, were philosophically no different than nationalists the world over. Bandera was many things, a “nazi” was not one. I've sympathized with the plight of Novorossiia from day one, but their condemnations of the Kiev government as “nazi” are laughable. Bandera would have condemned each and every aspect of that coup. He loathed and distrusted the west, capitalism and usury, precisely the forces that took over the country.

Since independence, the industry of Ukraine has been hollowed out and today, no longer exists. What little remains in Ukrainian hands is poorly maintained and produced extremely poor goods. All profitable industry has been liquidated and sold off to pay debts. Vladimir Dubrowski of The Ukrainian Center for Socioeconomic Research (CASE Украина), however, states the following:

The de-industrialization of Ukraine is

favorable. In the long run, the capital and labor of industry in Ukraine is unlikely to be competitive. . . In tropical and subtropical countries, there is no need to spend money on heating and warm clothes. Therefore, they can provide labor-intensive production of cheap labor and will have a greater competitive advantage. Thus, in Ukraine there is no cheap labor, nor a favorable economic climate. Its rapprochement with Europe will fix this problem, but it would not be under the countries of the EEA or the Customs Union.¹

One thing that cannot be denied is that Ukrainian independence has been a miserable failure. Yet within this failure, western banks continue to lend and prop up the Washington-backed Poroshenko state. There is no chance of even a partial repayment. Franklin-Templeton Funds has been one of the main underwriters of this failure. Between 2013-2014, this fund lent the Ukrainian state \$9 billion and charged a “moderate risk” 7.2% annual rate. It is fairly clear that “markets” have no role here, and politics has center stage. Further, they have agreed to write off 20% of Ukraine's previous debt only to justify lending them more money. There is no reason to believe that any accurate accounting of this money will ever be made, as is in the case of the \$1 billion loan to Moldova. At the moment, Ukraine remains generally useful to the west, though this usefulness is now running out of gas, so to speak.²

¹ Gorohov, Alexander. Украинская экономика: катастрофа идет по 2013 плану <http://pda.warandpeace.ru/ru/analysis/view/82598/>

² Швецов, Святослав (March, 2014) Между Майданом-2 и революцией: логика разрушения Второй украинской республики. Новости Днепропетровска и Украины за сегодня

Western banks, however, are not insane. The present agreements put these banks in full control of not only Ukraine's present, but its future too. Any future Ukrainian economic growth is promised as repayment to the west. Presently, the agreement states that if Ukraine's GDP grows more than 3% a year in 2021, creditors will receive a full 15% of all this equity. If it is only a single percentage point more, a full 40% will be taken.

Poroshenko has long ceded the Donbass to Russia, partly because Kiev cannot afford the region and mostly because it will never be reconciled to Kiev. 95% of Ukrainians claimed they have seen a radical drop in their well being as compared to 13% of Crimeans. According to the Kiev International Institute of Sociology, Yatsenyuk's approval rating is 3% while president Poroshenko's is less than 1%.

By contrast, the Crimea has seen a substantial rise in wages since it voted to be a part of Russia, with substantial Chinese and Russian investment already having broken ground there. Salaries have increased 300% over the last two years as confidence, sales, investment and construction have boomed since now, Crimea has privileged access to the Russian, Chinese and Indian markets. Its pensions have doubled. Since the vote for reunification, Russian and Chinese investment has radically modernized the health care system and over 3 billion rubles have already been spent. Of course, according to the Russian Public Opinion Research Center, 90% of Crimeans have a positive view of Russia.

Western provocations have done nothing but pushed Russia farther towards China. Few realized that the Russian

кризис и процессы системного разрушения – народный депутат.
«Корреспондент»

<http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/3367715-ekonomyka-ukrayny-perezhivaet-zhestochaishyi-kryzys-y-protsessy-systemnoho-razrusheniya-narodnyi-deputat>

energy sector had about a 25% stake owned by foreigners. That needed to be quickly liquidated under sanctions. Today, trade with China is well over \$100 billion and the proposed Siberian-Chinese gas system is a massive potential source of income.

From 1994 to 2013, Ukraine has received well over \$14 billion from the IMF. While many worthwhile investment projects go unfunded, the IMF knowingly gives this money without any regard to its use or repayment. It became essential for the west to overthrow Yanukovich in order to clear the legal route to absorb the country as repayment. As the debt sits at \$200 billion, it is repayable regardless of the performance of the Ukrainian economy. Between 2012-2013, tax payments fell by half and now, few taxes are paid at all. The present Ukrainian economy has a real value equal to that of the Russian Republic of Bashkortostan, and is lower than Cyprus, Luxembourg, and the Canary Islands.³

That the world's banking elite continue to “lend” money to Ukraine shows how economically untrustworthy they are. The IMF in particular continues to give money to Kiev without any real accounting or expectation of repayment. As investment has ground to a halt in the US, the world's banking elites are throwing away billions in Kiev.

Nicholas Gueorguiev, head of the Ukraine team at IMF headquarters in Washington, DC, and Jerome Vacher, the IMF representative in Ukraine, has rerouted IMF cash to banks owned by oligarchs Igor Kolomoisky and Victor Pinchuk. Christine Lagarde have long covered up this rank corruption and will answer no questions on the matter. Clearly, the rules change when a county is politically useful.

³ Katasonov, Valentin. «Экономику Юго-Востока Украины спасет рубль» Russian Spring, 2014
http://rusvesna.su/recent_opinions/1402321504

Citibank, Bank of America, and JP Morgan Chase are a huge part of the IMF. The Fund is merely a banking consortium. The US tries to prosecute only Russian companies in this respect, refusing to make cases against far more obvious Ukrainian acts. Regardless of the theft of IMF funds, no Justice department investigation is forthcoming on Pinchuk and other Jewish oligarchs. The US Justice Department has its own bureaucracy in Kiev since there is no independent Ukraine. All political offices, many held by foreigners, have no power or money save from the US.

The IMF claims to be supporting the “Ukrainian banking sector” while in their own publications admitting there is no such sector. Since the currency has no value, there cannot be a “bank” that deals in waste paper. The pseudo-intellectual pomposity is unreal: “A new wave of bank diagnostics, based on data as of March 2015, is underway with the aim to identify capital shortages as a result of losses associated with the recent macroeconomic shocks and the ongoing conflict in the East.” Gregoriev deliberately uses semi-technical jargon to mask the fact that there is no Ukrainian “banking sector” nor a functional currency. The fact that he was overseeing the misappropriations of billions of dollars at the time gives a reason why he needs to obfuscate.

Billions and billions of hryvnia have been sent to Ukrainian “banks” from the IMF without any actual value given to those bills. Even if they had value, here is no public confidence in them. Since all of it comes from the IMF, none of it is from the Ukrainian economy. This is the legacy of Ukrainian independence since 1991.

Ukrainian independence has been a travesty. The Orange revolution(s) have had no relation whatsoever with any school of Ukrainian nationalism. So to see their apologists in the west try to fit the round peg in the square whole is humorous and saddening at the same time. In no

way can any of this be permitted to sully the thought of Bandera, the OUN, Ivan Franko or Taras Shevchenko. Ukrainian nationalism cannot be associated with the cosmopolitan, oligarchic capitalist and nihilist morass that has reduced one of the world's industrial powerhouses to 5th world status. The Orthodox Church cannot be associated with the likes of the secular, materialist and opportunistic "Patriarch Filaret." Most of all, Ukrainian nationalism cannot be associated with the nihilists such as Poroshenko, Tymoshenko or Yushchenko.

This work is written mostly to keep this from happening. There is a strong argument for Ukrainian independence in alliance with Russia and the east. There is also a strong argument for an autocephalous Orthodox Church there as well. However, over the demagogic din of opportunistic politicians, the platitudes of "useful idiot" academics, the pompous errors of major media and the uninformed policy of the US State Department, few know it even exists.

Introduction: Ukraine and the “Nation”

God has created nations and peoples. The individual as a unit has no social meaning. Since the individual in isolation is doomed to extinction, the community is more important than the ego. The person is not the individual, but the specific manifestation of the community and its adherence to natural law. The individual is the willing ego while the person is a citizen, father, husband, worker, etc. The person begins his formation in the family, and through it, is educated such that he becomes a contributing member of the social whole. The whole does not negative the family, but continually manifests it on higher and higher planes until it reaches its apogee in the faith and nation.

The nation is the highest form of community because it is unified by a single language and a single faith. The Orthodox church explicitly enshrines the nation within its ecclesiastical life in the independence of national churches. The Forms of logos⁴ are manifest in a very powerful way in national life, its symbols and its language. Language is not merely words and syntax, but the entire social constitution of a people, mediated by history. Any socially significant action assumes and implies the nation, since these laws, spoken and unspoken, are present constantly. To ignore these is to be an “idiot” in the literal sense of an isolated beast, or alternatively, an exile.

The national family is a genetic unity in a limited way, but more so a cultural, religious and symbolic unity. The symbol in English has not only lost all meaning, but has taken a denotation completely at variance with its true

⁴ Nationalism is a part of the created order. While this book cannot get into detail, the Platonic image of the people is originated in God, or the logos as the second person of the trinity. Form and Archetype are identical for our purposes, and refer to the ideal image of a specific reality. My recent work on Plato gives a detained analysis of this.

meaning. The symbol is the closest man can get to a direct apprehension of the Form. It is the presence of logos in the created world.

The Tryzub symbol is a manifestation of the Ukrainian Archetype. It is both the cross and the trinity in a single symbol, and can be found on the most standards, etchings, carvings and coins of medieval Rus. The Tryzub is a weapon, as the Trinity and the cross are synthesized as the master-symbol of a people: it is often seen as the “spear” of the nation. The colors blue and gold were often found in ancient Slavic art forms in the region, and seem to have a regional foundation. Gold is associated with Galicia, while Blue is the color of Kiev. On ancient military banners, the blue and gold were also the meeting of heaven and earth, while red was the banner used specifically in combat.

In Ukrainian folk art, the Tryzub can also be associated with the tree, the “world tree” of pre-Christian peoples. In Ukraine, the oak, as is common elsewhere, is the “power vertical,” the unity of natural law and our daily lives, spirit and matter. It is the symbol of power and life, but his tempered by the lily, the feminine, delicate and temperamental moist earth.⁵

⁵ This field has earned a substantial literature, with almost nothing in English. A representative sample would include:
Биляшевский М.Ф. Археологическая летопись Южной России.- 1999
Городцов А.В. Бытовая археология.-М.,1907
Грушевський М.С. Історія України-Руси.
Гусева Н. “Арктическая родина в Ведах” Древность: Арьи. Славяне.-М., 1996
Николаева Н.А., Сафронов В.А. Истоки славянской и евразийской мифологии.-М.,1999
Залізняк Л.Л. Новітні міфи в індоєвропейстиці Східної Європи Археологія. 4.- 2002а.- С.88-98.
Залізняк Л.Л. "Свиня як критерій нордичних народів та семітів" Київська старовина, по 3
Залізняк Л.Л. Трипілля очима науковців і політиків Археологія,

In the work of GZ Smityovich and VV Striletsky, among many others, Ukraine absorbs the negative energy of empire and redistributes it to suffering people everywhere. This Archetype comes from the seed of Noah, as Japheth founded the first communities of Cimmerians, Scythians and Sarmatians. Sacred Tradition in the Middle East, North Africa and Europe (among many other places) depict “Cain” under various descriptions as being removed from the state of innocence and creating logic, civilization and technology. This was founded on the first human settlements when the nomadic life became uninteresting.⁶

“Rus” comes from the Hebrew “Rosh,” which in turn comes from the Sumerian “Ris” or those who have fair hair and are connected to the land. In Indo-European languages, “Rus” and its derivatives are those connected to the land, that is, settled agriculture and the small community. The Etruscans called themselves “Roshen,” as likely deriving from the Sanskrit “Ros” or “bright beauty” and in Slavonic, is the same word as “red.”

Yuri Lipa is one of the primary geopolitical theorists on Ukraine in the 20th century. His philosophy of history is based on the primordial connection of ancient Ukraine to the sons of Japheth, the ancient Trypillian culture and its

2004 no 3

Залізник Л.Л. Про трипільців, семітів та нардепів-трипільцязнавців Дзеркало тижня, 2004в, №18-19.

Кандиба-Ольжич О. Шипенці.-Прага,1937,Чернівці, 2004.-

с.9

Любар О.О., Федоренко Д.Т. Історія педагогічної думки і освіти в Україні.-Київ-1993.- 110 с.

Петров В. Походження українського народу.-К.,1992

Спицын А.А. Раскопки глиняных площадок близ с.Колодистого в Киевской губ. Известие арх. Комиссии.- М., 1904

Шилов Ю.О. Чого ми варті.- Київ, Арата. 2006

Щербаківський В. Формування української нації.-Прага, 1941

⁶ A valuable introduction to this view can be found in Videiko M. Yu. Trypillia Civilization in Prehistory of Europe. Kiev Domain Archaeological Museum, Kiev, 2005

connection with the Greek colonies on the Black Sea coast. This, along with the traditional ideas of sacred history, create a generally coherent picture of Ukraine's origins.

The antediluvian state reached its own demonic core in Cain's work in Atlantis, from which Aztec, Atlantic and Aztlan are derived.⁷ "Japheth," like the term "Ros" refers to purity, the color white, and beauty, and it was he who challenged the Babylonian civilization of Atlantis under its various guises. The connection between "Ros" or "Rosh" and "Japheth" are too close to be ignored. According to Josephus:

Japheth, the son of Noah, had seven sons: they inhabited so, that, beginning at the mountains Taurus and Amanus, they proceeded along Asia, as far as the river Tanais (Don), and along Europe to Cadiz; and settling themselves on the lands which they light upon, which none had inhabited before, they called the nations by their own names.⁸

The Don river is of course, one of the main arteries of Ukraine. This understanding of sacred history is common in the patristic writings, and, as both the Old and New Testament make clear, the "nation" is the cultural community of a people, their "Constitution" in its original sense. It bears no relation to states or governments.

The Chinese characters for "Ukraine" come from three words, "wu" or the "black crow," which is an ancient eastern reference to apophatic logic and the ascetic struggle; "kee" which is the verb "to overcome," and "lan," the orchid, the Chinese symbol for wisdom and virtue.

⁷ I am not committing myself to the legendary "Atlantis," but is using this as a symbol for the technical society destroyed by God in the flood.

⁸ Jewish Antiquities, sec I, part VI,c 94 AD

Confucius uses the the orchid as the symbol of the “righteous man.” The orchid was also used in Chinese medicine as an agent of equilibrium, to keep the contending forces in the human organism in balance.

The word “Ukraine” in the Sanskrit language derives from “Ukhsaiia,” normally translated as “mound” in the traditional sense of the primordial act of creation. It is closely associated with the egg, Eden and the fertility brought about in Wisdom. “Ukhsaiia” is the prototype of the world, the World-Soul. This fertility is found in the rivers that unify Ukraine on a north-south axis and in the famed “black earth” that made this nation a target for invaders. The north-south motion in the traditional understanding is the link between earth and heaven, the upper and the lower, spirit and matter.

The Trypillian culture of the Aryans on the Dniپر is that of the proto-Ukrainian peoples. These were “men of the earth” and in the third millennium BC, they were the “warrior” and “plowman” with the yoke as their most prominent symbol. The term “Trypillian” refers to the idea of “three fields,” presumably part of the rotation process and again, connecting it to the agrarian life.

The heavy Greek colonization of the Northern Black Sea coast led to their adoption of the Trypillian alphabet. This proto-Ukrainian people also influenced the Etruscans in this way, and soon drove them into Italy, taking this ancient alphabet with them.

Lipa's argument was that Greeks began to colonize much of the Black Sea coast as a way to avoid the rocky and infertile land of their ethnic home. The city-states founded on the Black Sea include Sinope, Trebizond, Amis, Istres, Tiras, Odysseus and Chalcedon, all major trading cities. The rivers in today's Ukraine were essential conduits for Greek grain and fuel. The Greek forests had been exhausted, so looking north to their Black Sea possessions, the rest of Greece imported wood, beef, fish, leather and

linen from Ukraine. The connection of the Ukrainian core lands and the Black Sea tightly connect that ancient country to the Greek city states.⁹

The Trypillian culture was, in Lipa's view, on the border of the Bronze-Iron age. It was founded on a river trading, agricultural people with a well developed legal and social system. The proto-Ukrainians in Galicia were a Dinaric, Adriatic people as descendants of the Black Sea Greeks. Hence, he concludes, Ukraine is a southern, Greco-Slavonic nation, more part of the Mediterranean culture than the northern Russian forests. These Dinaric types were taller, with a wider face and larger skull than the northern Russians.

Between 650 BC and 300 BC roughly, the Trypillian culture featured settled agriculture, copper tools, homes of wood and clay (often two stories) with geometric patterns found on nearly all Ukrainian aesthetics. The largest settlement was about 15,000 people with strong class stratification.

As an Irishman, this author would be remiss if he did not mention that much of this ancient culture was Celtic. Yuri Lipa made a great deal out of this concept, using it to prove the foreign nature of Ukrainians was very different from Russians or Poles. In the village of Boshv, Celtic artifacts have been found in sufficient amounts to show it was not random travel. It was a fully Celtic civilization on Ukrainian soil. Celtic graves exist by the hundreds in Ukraine and tons of artifacts proving beyond any doubt that there is a strong Celtic connection with the Trypillians and the early proto-Ukrainian nation.

The ancient settlements deriving from the Black Sea Greeks show the Celtic sun, cross and swastika images as clear evidence of the ethnic connection. Lipa and others

⁹ The key work here is Yuri Lipa's *Призначення України*, Part I. The full Ukrainian text is available online at the Ukrainian Center: ukrcenter.com/Література/Юрій-Липа/19829/Частина-1

argue that the Ukrainian skull is larger, and Ukrainians have slightly bigger heads on average than Russians. Russians have flatter noses with a greater protrusion of the upper lip. There is a slightly greater upper eyelid crease as well. All of this shows a related, but very different people from those imperial agents who claim them as possessions.

Ukrainians are more Nordic and fit into the same phenotype as the Alpine and Carpathian. All human beings are mixes of the prototypical ancestors of Noah, but this mixture is what determines one group as distinct from the next. Languages unify these groups, and hence, intermarriage, following linguistic lines, create a primordial nation. Keep in mind that genetics is only part of the equation, and is not identical with culture or tradition.

The idea of the “nation” is one of the most abused, misunderstood, and manipulated words in the humanities. The nation is not the state, not the government, not the ruling class. These are often the most dogged opponents of the nation. The only usable concept of “Nationalism” that avoids contradiction is as the “ethnos” the ethnic group with a firm foundation in history that distinguishes itself from foreigners.

As hundreds of mutually-exclusive definitions of the nation have littered the literature in this field, this author has to be very specific about his use of the term “nation” and “nationalism.” Nationalism does not imply the conception of ethnic superiority. It implies the simple concept that in order to be rational and legitimate, law must come from below. It must come from the people. The “people” are not an abstraction: they are historically constituted by language and tradition, and this, in turn, derives from their topography and historical experiences such as colonialism, genocide and other traumatic events.

This author has defined the concept of “nationalism” in dozens of articles and books before, but in

general terms, he has called the development of ethnic tradition as “structures of survival,” that is, the mechanisms that people have developed to cope with difficult situations such as war or famine. The commune in Russia, armed resistance in Ireland, Cossacks in Ukraine all derive from trauma and struggle, and these have been ways where the tradition has been preserved under the worst possible circumstances.

Thus, the nation is that group of people who are united in a common language. However, a “language” is the same as a “constitution.” It is the forms of thought and action that have come into existence as a result of trauma: these are methods of survival in the building of solidarity. A “language” is all forms of communication, which becomes a synonym for all social life, which implies communication. In this case, the definition is broad enough to make it useful to different contexts while being specific enough to express a specific social object. It is cultural, not formal. It is organic, never a mechanical thing.

The problem is that so many in the west are alienated, fragmented, with no ethnic group, nation or faith at all. They look down on “cultures” and refer to others as acting from “cultural norms.” This implies that the speaker has no culture at all, since his is a neutral, ethereal position from which he can observe them all. In more practical terms, this neutrality is alienation. They belong to nothing, and hence, are ruled by self-interest and manipulation. These are the last people that should be “analyzing” nations, since they have not the foggiest clue what it is to belong to something.

The most ridiculous historical claim that is currently the official line of American academia is that the “nation” did not exist until the “French Revolution.” The levels of absurdity to this slogan could not fit into many volumes. How the French revolution, rationalist, individualist and

bourgeois, could ever have anything in common with the cultural and spiritual unity of a people remains a mystery that can only be exchanged by a good paycheck and tenure. This is nothing new, since a Jewish communist, E.J. Hobsbawm, is considered an “expert” on nationalism. Even more than an expert, he is the author of this official view and is treated with reverential awe.

His definition of nationalism is odd, it is “primarily a principle which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent.” This definition is self-serving, since it permits him to hold that “states” use ethnic arguments to make this the case. This means that forcing those within its borders that are not of the dominant nation is justified.

This definition is dishonest for other reasons. First, of all, it implies something he denies, namely that there is a “national unit” that must predate the political. Second, it permits him to focus on the state, and taking these elite opinions as identical with the “nation.” Third, since states are often the products of almost arbitrary historical events, treaties and war, there will always be a lack of congruence between the two entities, only one of which is admitted to exist. The error is a common one, showing that this is, in fact, the official view, and its connection with the continued prejudice that states are really “nations.”

Regardless of this official nonsense, the nation is usually at war with the state. States are products of modernity, nations are not. From Ireland to Japan, and from Kiev to Nigeria, ethnic groups, mostly animated by religion, have been defining themselves, their core ideas, their origins and their distinction to the outsider as long as human beings realized they needed each other to survive. This history is complex, but reducing it all to some quantifiable cause is inexcusable laziness.

The Hetmanate as the Central Element in Ukrainian Political Ideas: The Background to Ukrainian Social Thought

The struggle for an independent Ukrainian Orthodox church under the Cossack Host has been one of the main defining issues of Ukrainian history. But this struggle cannot be separated from the basic politics of the Cossack Hetmanate. The Cossack Host throughout its long history had several functions: to protect the Orthodox faith, to rescue Orthodox slaves and later, to fight for Ukrainian independence. All of these are tightly interwoven.

Ukraine from the 16th to the 18th century was a battle ground among the Cossack forces, the Cossack center, or the Sich, the Russian empire, Polish nobles, Turkey, the Crimeans (descendants of the Mongols), and on occasion, Sweden. The Hetmanate was in an alliance with any combination of these powers against the others, depending on circumstances. The Hetman state was founded after the rebellion of Khmelnytsky in 1648, but the Sich was quite a distance away in “Zaporozhya” or “beyond the rapids. The “Sich” is just “fortress” but its location was on several islands in the Dniپر river at inaccessible places. It differed ideologically from the Hetman state quite often.

The Moscow state, and to a lesser extent, the Polish one, sought to “buy off” the better off Cossack officers though grants of land and guarantees of political power. In other words, the larger landowners were convinced to accept the rule of a foreign force if they granted them land and protected it. Further, they were given noble titles that were recognized internationally. Both Poles and Russians engaged in this practice. It was this strategic use of landownership by the Cossack upper crust that eventually destroyed the Host and the possibility of Ukrainian

independence. It created a community of confidence between elites, and soon, their own lower classes were foreign.

Initially, the Cossack mission was the freeing of Christian slaves under Islamic control. Freedom and equality were the hallmarks of the Cossack Host as the Sich slowly came into being. Smaller fortresses were merged into the Sich complex. A clear national agenda was present by the 1620s, since the salient forms of discrimination were linguistic and religious.¹⁰

The religious issue was of central importance. The players at this time were the Uniates, the Orthodox Slavs who performed the eastern, or Slavo-Byzantine rite. Created out of the Union of Brest in 1595, most of their people had no idea that they were in communion with the bishop of Rome. This was considered a compromise, a way for Polish imperialists to bring the Ukrainian peasant into the Catholic orbit while still maintaining the ritual of Orthodoxy. It remains a theological and institutional failure to this day.

The Unia, or the forced unification of the Ukrainian Orthodox with the Polish Catholics, was wrong on many levels. The Polish church was purely an oligarchic institution and never failed to promote its interest. It was forced by the Polish army, though not without controversy from the Vatican: the oligarchs wanted a forced conversion to the Latin rite, while the Vatican wanted a gradual conversion via the Uniat Church. The “eastern rite Catholics” was never meant to be a church – the very concept is a contradiction. It is a contradiction because the theology of the eastern liturgy is rejected by the Roman

¹⁰ The Sich was a fortress in the lower rapids of the Dniper. It was the headquarters of the Host, even during the time of the Hetman state. It was egalitarian, nationalist, populist and very Orthodox. It was destroyed by the forces of Catherine II.

church. It was a political expedient to gradually bring the Ukrainians to the Latin rite and hence, the Polish nobility. The modern “Greek Catholic” church is a historical and theological absurdity; a relic of Polish oligarchic violence.

The Uniat Church here was a typical outgrowth of the Vatican ideology. Force, violence and fraud were perfectly legitimate means to spread the faith. No one is innocent of those kinds of offenses, but in this case, it became official policy. Scholasticism is a common boogey man for Orthodox intellectuals, yet few have read Thomas or Bonaventure in detail. Many do not have the Aristotelian background to even make sense of it. The problem is, for those who have made a detailed study of medieval Aristotelianism, Scholasticism had long abandoned Christianity, though it often used the rhetoric.

The other player in this regard was the Roman Catholic Church in Poland, using the Latin rite from the Council of Trent exclusively. Latin liturgical forms certainly penetrated into the Byzantine rite, creating a compelling and interesting synthesis of two ancient traditions. Hence, the Ukrainian church is usually more “western” than the Russian.

The second player was the Orthodox Church of Russia, while the third was the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. Without getting too detailed, the latter was more westernized, more Greek and a bit less ascetic than their eastern brothers. In terms of doctrine, however, the two churches were identical. The Orthodox Church of Ukraine (UOC) had the additional focus of being in the midst of Catholic imperialism from Poland, meaning many of the Orthodox reformers had been educated in Jesuit and Scholastic academies. The result is the adoption of many Latin and Scholastic methods in theology that did not penetrate into Russia until the later 18th century.

This is a massive issue. Many Orthodox see the Ukrainians as “Latinized” and hence suspect. What they

mean is that the use of Thomistic, Aristotelian methods of theology are illegitimate. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is merely a matter of method. The use of strict logical distinctions, so important to the scholastics, was also used by St. John of Damascus and other church fathers with the same level of very precise definitions and syllogisms as in the later western world. Reformers such as St. Peter Mohyla adopted western intellectual methods so as to defeat their Polish tormentors on their own ground. It had no effect on theology and one might cynically wonder if this unseasoned hostility has to do with a lack of philosophical education.

Possibly, a fourth player might be the Patriarch of Constantinople. While distant, the ecumenical patriarch could occasionally be seen as a counterweight to Moscow. The problem during this period is that the church was under the domination of the Turks and thus, was often deeply corrupt as the occupiers of Turkey and the Balkans ensured only the most compliant bishops took power, often through buying their way into office. After the fall of the eastern, second Roman empire in 1453, the Greek church went into a sharp decline.

In 1589, Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople granted full ecclesiastical independence to the Brotherhoods, or urban, Orthodox guilds. Further, he cursed anyone who rejected this model of church government. Thus, Sobornapravna is the canonical ecclesiastical structure in Ukraine. The urban middle class in Ukraine rejected the union, and this was the foundation of the Brotherhoods.

The Uniat chimera was fought by the few loyal bishops that remained, including Gideon Balaban, Michael Kopystensky and those consecrated by Theophanes of Jerusalem. In 1597, the Ecumenical Patriarchate Meletius condemned and anathematized the Unia. Two years later, the Polish crown guaranteed full religious freedom in the

empire, but the all powerful nobles mobilized several Confederations against him. Since the Turks were the main threat, Adam Kisyll presented Orthodox grievances to the crown, and by 1650, full legal equality existed between the Unia and the Orthodox, but since the crown had no real enforcement mechanism, it remained a paper promise.

The Orthodox and Cossack tradition relative to Poland by 1650 showed that the Confederations of noble Catholics were the problem, not Poland or the monarch as such. Thanks to St. Petro Mohyla, the Brotherhoods and the school at Ostrog, the Orthodox tradition was rebuilt on a very different basis than the Orthodox church elsewhere. Most importantly of all, the Cossacks were the sole protector of the Orthodox church and the only thing keeping the church from being destroyed entirely in Ukraine. This meant that Cossack revolutionaries, national liberation and the Orthodox church became the same thing.

The Treaty of Pereslav was the result of Khmelnytsky seeing Ukraine as a distinct nation, with the Uniat movement as excluded from it. Nations usually get their main marks of distinction from their faith, and because of this, the Uniat is not Ukrainian in that he was seen as a “semi-Pole.” that today the Uniat movement in western Ukraine is the core of this anti-Russian “national movement” is ironic in that it was created to serve two foreign powers, the Vatican and Poland. Since the Uniat was not Ukrainian in Khmelnytsky's view, only Russia would be acceptable to Orthodox people. Even more, the szlachta could in no way be trusted with even the pretense of justice or fairness, and when the Ottomans turned their backs on Kiev, the Host went to Russia.¹¹

¹¹ The English language literature here is actually helpful for once. These are some excellent introductions, once you get beyond the ritual condemnations of Cossack nationalism, etc.

Kohut, Z. Mazepa's Ukraine: Understanding Cossack Territorial Vistas. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1/4, 2010, pp. 1-28

Poland was a federation of small noble states, each with their own law, courts and financial policy. Calling this “Poland” is true ethnically, but had no political center that might unify the nation. The szlachta (the nobility as such) quite explicitly viewed the “nation” as themselves. Peasants, Jews, Orthodox and others were never a part of this “nation.”

Uprisings against Polish and Jewish rule began in earnest in the 1620s and 1630s. The problems were exacerbated by extremely violent reprisals. The Polish sejm (the legislature), not trusting an army under royal control, raised Islamic mercenaries to fight the Cossacks. The 1652 invasion of the Polish nobility's hired army would have destroyed Ukraine had not the Russians stepped in.

The rupture occurred during the rising of the great Hetman Bogdan Khmelnytsky in 1648. This uprising has been the subject of thousands of books and articles and will not be detailed here. Suffice it to say that the combination of religious repression, intense serfdom, slavery and usury created an alienated, suffering and angry Slavic Orthodox peasant class that just, prior to 1648, required a talented leader.

Khmelnytsky is quite possibly the most important single person in Ukrainian history after St. Vladimir himself. His early defeats of the Poles destroyed their usury and parasitism for a time, and created an independent

Sysyn, F. The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Neue Folge, Bd. 46, H. 4 (1998), pp. 531-545

Basarab, John Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study. Edmonton 1982;

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*. Vol. 8, pt. 2. Reprint New York 1956, pp. 21 1-224

Janusz Kaczmarczyk Bohdan Chmielnicki - Szatan czy mesjasz?, in: *Studia Historyczne* 34 (1991) no. 3, pp. 369-385

Cossack state that stood briefly as the very essence of Ukraine. After his death, the Ruin saw the slow dissolution of this state, as the Poles reasserted themselves, the Hetmanate was leaderless, and faction upon faction sought power.

The ideology of the 1648 uprising is the template for the Ukrainian Orthodox ethno-national ideal to this day. Its primary theoretical postulate was that ethnic belonging, that is, language and faith, form the boundaries of political units. In Ukraine's case, it was granted legitimacy to the extent it mirrored the institutional arrangement of Kievan Rus. Given new realities and the constant threat of a multi-front war, the Hetman needed to be a tightly centralized and authoritarian figure.

This was to be mirrored by a strong officer corps in strict hierarchical relations with the Hetman. The problem was that this nobility would act no differently than other European noble orders and end up the primary enemy of state centralization. To the extent that the Host could function as an army rather than a state, the situation could be placed under control.

This legal centralization also needed its parallel in the Orthodox church. In Rus' it was independent, with its own property and sphere of action off limits to the state. Since so much of the oppression in the Polish oligarchy was religious, it was essential that the church be able to fight the Catholic and Jewish mentality. The close alliance between the Polish elite and Jewish merchants was so close as to make them a single unit of exploitation. While the szlachta needed Jewish networks, capital and exclusive concern with urban trade to function, the reverse was not true. The Polish nobility was convenient for a time, but their indolence and general absurdity made them an unstable golem for the network's profits.

The main emphasis was the establishment of the Cossack state based on communitarian virtues that went

beyond the protests against serfdom and usury that motivated most, if not all, Cossack rebellions in the past. Khmelnytsky was a royalist, but the strength of the state was insufficient given the states seeking Ukrainian territory. Alliances were needed for the sake of independence. The criteria were distance and strength. The state needed to be strong enough to dissuade invaders while not being too close to interfere with political life. Sweden was in many cases the perfect candidate.

At the time of the Unia in the last decade of the 16th century, the first rebellions under Kosinski and Nalyvalko broke out. The Polish Confederations made matters worse by organizing the most violent of punitive raids on Ukrainians. The Confederation was a noble, private military order organized for a specific purpose. Since there was never any Polish “state” in the modern sense, these Confederations were the most powerful entities in Polish politics.

Cossack uprisings occurred regularly from at least 1591 to the end of Cossack independence upon the defeat of Pugachev in 1775. The Kosinski revolt of 1591-1592 was based largely on the rapid class distinctions between Cossack warriors and the Polish szlachta. It was the first widespread rebellion against the expansion of the Polish oligarchy after the Union of Lublin.

The Cossack registry was a significant issue because this registry conferred nobility. It offered many freedoms and immunities not available to others as well as freedom from taxation. Being on the register made it difficult to prosecute members because the entire order needed to be consulted as to guilt or sentence. Further, once a Cossack was removed from the registry, he became a peasant and was subject to enserfment. This registry was the cause of the second major rebellion of Nalyvalko's rebellion mentioned above.

The revolt of Ivan Bolotnikov was connected with

the Time of Troubles in Russia, but was a populist, communitarian and anarchist rebellion of the unregistered and very poor Cossacks and their allies. The condition of the knight once removed from the Registry was the cause of the Zhmalyo revolt in 1625.

While the early revolts usually numbered between 1,000 and 3,000 men, the rebellion of Kosinski had a rebel army of between 12,000 and 20,000 men. Five years later, the Fedorovych rebellion erupted, which was the first with a clear agenda, the first against the Union explicitly, and the first with an explicit condemnation of Jewish financial practices. The perfidy of Kahal finance at the time is admitted by all, so the facts of the matter are not essentially in dispute. The Jews pushed too hard, and overestimated the ability of Polish nobles to protect them. Though this revolt features only about 1500 men, their experience and superior martial skill put the entire szlachta into a panic.

In 1638, the Hunia revolt was aimed at the increasingly obnoxious practice of enserfing former Registered Cossacks and the increasingly violent forms of slavery the Orthodox peasantry was forced under by Catholic Poles and Jews. Few, if any, denied that the Cossacks had a just cause, the only problem was organization and the ability of Poland to buy off its more powerful enemies. The outpouring of support from monasteries, peasant huts, poor merchants and landless workers was such that calling it a “unanimous” uprising of a whole people is not inaccurate.

The role of the Jews in Poland deserves extended comment. Jews were deliberately imported by the szlachta for the sake of ensuring that merchant class would ever develop in the cities to challenge them. The Jews, organized into autonomous kahals, took advantage of their profitable role and had a free hand against the Orthodox. It was a brilliant plan that kept the Confederations and noble

power centers from ever being co-opted.

The anger the peasants had against Jews was based on the Confederations granting them power over indebted land and urban settlements. High rates of interest and a lack of common morality made certain that Jews (at least the elite) were hated by all. There was no incentive to establish good relations with the Orthodox, since the Catholic elite ensured their safety.

The Polish form of serfdom was the worst in the world and differed little from slavery. The use of Jews as financiers and leaseholders meant that peasants can be destroyed without any consequences accruing to the Kahal. Heinrich Graetz, a German Jew who had largely rejected the Zohar and its ideology, writes on the pathetic dependency of the Polish elite:

The high nobility continued to be dependent on Jews, who in a measure counterbalanced the national defects. Polish flightiness, levity, unsteadiness, extravagance and recklessness were compensated for by Jewish prudence, sagacity, economy and cautiousness. The Jew was more than a financier to the Polish nobleman; he was his help in embarrassment, his prudent adviser, his all in all. (quoted from Jones, 2003)

These revolts were to rectify that. Instead of learning from the wars their policies caused, both the Kahal and the szlachta merely increased their repression. Then in 1648, the illegitimacy of the Polish elite became so vile, that a violent and ferocious reckoning was inevitable. Rather than the accession of the *mashiach*, as many had prophesied given the privileged position of Jews in eastern Europe, the Kahal got Khmelnytsky.

In one of the most powerful descriptions of the unique situation at the time, E. Michael Jones states,

Largely as a result of the concessions of the Polish crown which began with the Statute of Kalisz, Poland became known throughout Europe as the "paradisus Judeorum," the paradise of the Jews. When persecutions would flare up in the traditionally Jewish sections of Europe, in the German principalities, particularly in the urban centers of the Rhein valley, as they frequently did throughout the middle ages, the Jews who wished to escape persecution inevitably headed east toward Poland, taking their language, "juedische Deutsch," or Yiddish with them. . . . Jews did not assimilate in Poland; most of them did not learn the language of the Christian Poles, because, other than rudimentary commerce and illicit sexual activity, the Jews had virtually no contact with the Poles even though they had lived in their country for centuries. The Jews established their own state within a state there; they established their own legal system and courts there as well, and, if demographic evidence is conclusive in matters like this, the Polish paradise was the most successful *modus vivendi* Jews ever found in the West (Jones, 2003).

This section is so well crafted that it deserved to be quoted at length. No specialist in this technical and obscure area of history has so perfectly summarized the situation that so few even have the mental apparatus to grasp. Again,

this succinct description of the Khmelnytsky uprising is perfect:

Instead of wisdom, what followed was a classical case of cultural drift in which imperial expansion covered over internal decay until finally the contradictions and injustices which had become an integral part of the system became so insupportable that the bubble burst, and an orgy of violence followed, eventually dragging the Polish state into extinction (ibid).

Even this massive slaughter did not dissuade the Kahal. The szlachta merely regrouped. The Barabash, Razin and Paliy Rebellions were based on the same set of complaints. The Barabash uprising in 1658 is not well known as a separate event, since it was aimed at the pro-Polish policies of Hetman Vyhovsky, while the Razin revolt is quite famous. The Paliy rebellion was more traditional, ending in 1704, in that it was aimed at the Polish Sejm that demobilized the Host with the customary penalties associated with it. Note that the Polish crown had little power, though historians and amateurs like to personify power. The “king of England” had no power over the American colonies, as the Polish king, generally speaking, was barely a figurehead.

On occasion, a strong monarch such as Jan III Sobieski might have the income to hire foreigners, since Poland never had a centralized army. In his case, military victories were a sure route to increasing power, but the Sejm was quite willing to sacrifice their very security so as to keep a monarch from gaining any real power. According to the mentality of the szlachta, even the defeat of their enemies was a problem, since that increased the prestige, income and power of the crown. Hence, in this case, the Paliy rebellion was deliberately provoked rather than

permit the monarch to have a skilled standing army at his disposal. Even if it might secure the country, increase trade and improve internal markets, the Sejm fought it tooth and nail, showing the truth of the fact that this sort of power created a fantasy world.

Yet, these were not “Poland.” Polish apologists for empire are forced to defend the actions of these Confederations and associate them with “Poland” as such. Poland was a geographic region and a language, never a state. The aristocracy viewed itself as “Sarmatian,” something distinct from Poles of the lower orders, and hence were able to distance themselves from their serfs of both Polish and Ukrainian stock that they ruled over violently. Russian serfdom was quite mild by comparison.

Sobornapravna and the Constitution of the Hetmanate

For many, but far from all, Ukrainian nationalists, the Cossack Host was a model of libertarian, democratic and nationalist organization. Prior to the Russian takeover at the end of the 18th century, the Cossack Host was a fairly well organized political body. The Host sought, above all, to manifest the General Will of the army through the General Assembly, where all Cossacks could participate. It was the main authority for the Host, but was not the main source of power.

At the very least, all Cossacks with any power were elected. Cossacks with a great deal of experience and heroism had influence, even well into their old age. These men became the “council of elders” and assisted the Hetman, the chief executive. Becoming an “elder” was not a matter of birth but of experience and heroism in combat.

Class divisions, as is so often the case, destroyed the Host. Russians were able to bribe the wealthier veterans with more land and serfs. This property would then be protected by Russian arms, as the Ukrainian elite were given universally recognized noble titles. This is the main

way the Petersburg government¹² was to whittle away at this last bastion of Kievan Rus. The Cossack organization had no place in the modern, Enlightenment system of bureaucratic, rationalized rule.

The class divisions in Cossack society were based on the so-called high versus low Cossacks, sometimes the Sich versus the Hetmanate. The country gentry slowly developed the same aristocratic prejudice as nobles worldwide, and became more alienated from their “lower” brethren. The Cossack Host was originally a classless military order, combining monastic life with a love of righteous violence. Serf- and slave-owners were often their main targets, especially if the slaves were Orthodox. Soon enough, however, the gentry Cossacks were to forget these honorable roots.

The Host was decentralized. A “colonel” was a military leader that was elected to rule a local district. These men were known for their education as well as their combat experience. They were respected, not merely feared. The colonels were the chief arbiter in the court system, though the Hetman himself could decide cases of specific import. The local colonel was the main political functionary in the Cossack state in the 17th and 18th century.

The Colonel was the main influence in all the major towns such as Korsun, Bratislav or Podilla. He was elected, but could be appointed in times of emergency. They were fully independent of Hetman authority, and all local government served the will of the Colonel. Regional councils were occasionally summoned to assist in the administration of localities, and, more than anything else, the Russians sought to eliminate these local manifestations of Cossack power.

¹² Peter I used Cossacks to build his city St. Petersburg in the very late 17th century. It radically changed Russia into a semi-westernized, European state. It sought centralization above all and loathed any sign of independent action, especially from the Sich.

Dmytro Doroshenko, the great historian, goes to great lengths to show how the Russian bureaucracy would promise extra rights and freedoms to local merchants in exchange for refusing to obey the colonel of the region. As a matter of course, towns had their own Magdeburg law, and, through that, were independent and self-governing. On occasion, when the colonel was accused of violating this law, the Russians or Jews would use this as a means of bribing local merchants to reject Cossack government. In almost all cases, it was the promise of wealth and power that destroyed the Host.

The Oath of Orlyk (1710) included a promise to strengthen and protect the rights of Ukraine through its Swedish ally. Factions, in this oath, were seen as the problem and needed to be eliminated. For the Ukrainian idea, it was the Sich that comprised its essence. Further, in a theme to be taken up by Shevchenko later, rights are products of national experience and quite conventional. This was one of the essential tenets of the Cossack political idea.

The Bendery Constitution became the written abbreviation for Cossack political life, ratified by the Swedish King Charles XII in 1710. The Cossacks sought, through this document, above all, independence from both Poland and Russia. The rise of Peter I made it very clear that the days of Cossack independence or autonomy were numbered unless radical action was taken. The Hetman was considered a “monarch,” but was elected by the full Assembly. They viewed themselves as deriving from Kievan-Rus, and serving as the last real reminder of that medieval state.¹³

¹³ Basarab, John Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study. Edmonton 1982;

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. Vol. 8, pt. 2. Reprint New York 1956, pp. 21 1-224

Janusz Kaczmarczyk Bohdan Chmielnicki - Szatan czy mesjasz?, in: Studia Historyczne 34 (1991) no. 3, pp. 369-385

While the Bendery Constitution confirmed the army as the prime mover of society, it also stressed another key idea, Sobornapravna, in society as a whole. This idea is critical to understanding Ukrainian political thought. Briefly, it is based on the idea that everything comes from the *sobor*, a concept long misused, misapplied and mis-defined by Russian, Ukraine or Orthodox specialists. A sobor is not the “council,” and Sobornapravna is not the “rule of the council.” A sobor is a manifestation of the truth, the spiritual core of the people. This truth is absolute, but never separated from the specific tradition of a people. Bravery is universally celebrated as a virtue regardless of the people or language. Yet, being brave is different from one place to the next, depending on the political and military history of a people. This unity in diversity is the core of the “sobor” idea.

Sobornapravna is the central concept of Ukrainian philosophy, whether epidemiological or social. It lies at the root of Skovoroda's vision. It is not entirely definable, or at least expressible in language, since it is a lived unity. It is a social unity where the community and its organs of governance are expressions—not creators—of unity. In the strictest of formal and ontological terms, it is the manifestation of Logos within the social whole. It is the manifestation of the Reason that holds nature together. It is the “heart,” so to speak, of the cosmos. It is the expression of the uncreated light in natural objects; “encased” in matter, as it were.

Cultural and ethnic nationalism, held together by a common religion and the common moral code it implies, when it comes together as a social unit, manifests Sobornapravna. It is akin to Rousseau's General Will,

Doroshenko, Dmytro. A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography.
Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., 1957
Doroshenko, Dmytro. A Survey of Ukrainian History.
Humeniuk Publication Foundation, 1975

except it is not a secular idea. A small minority might have a clear vision of it, while the overwhelming majority might see it obscurely, or not at all. It is not essentially different from the Russian sobornost; it is grace and light as it unifies people into a unit under natural law. It is the spirit that perfects what has been brought together.

The Cossack tradition is a powerful expression of Sobornapravna. Its local and national organization is meant to manifest it as much as humanly possible under hostile circumstances. Institutions can only reflect it. Both the General Assembly and the Council of Elders had a voice in electing the Hetman, but the principle of the General Will—so to speak—was dominant, rather than mere majorities. In other words, only aspects of this system were “formal” in the western sense.

The Hetman was recognized as a monarchy, but, as is normally the case, the elders wanted to see it remain elective. In fact, these elders, the Cossack officer class, were prepared to ally with Moscow, and later Petrograd, to make sure that the Hetman remained in his bounds. Only in combat was the Hetman absolute.

The General Assembly was all inclusive. Since Cossacks alone fought in war, they alone were the ruling element. Townsmen and clergy were also represented. The procedures, as might be expected, were never formalized, and class control continued to exert its influence. The principle was clear however: those who declared war had to be those who would then fight it.

The Council of Elders was a class-influenced organization. The older Cossack veterans eventually took the Russian bait and used serf-labor in exchange for selling out their people. These men helped formulate foreign policy and would take over as executive if the Hetman was incompetent, killed or taken prisoner. This was balanced by the General Administration, which was the “government,” while, in Rousseau's terms, the Assembly was the

sovereign.

The General Administration was the “bureaucracy” of the Host. Though, by modern bureaucratic standards, it was little more than slightly regularized chaos. It was both a great strength and a great weakness of Cossack rule. There were no offices and no specialized work. It was based around military rank that corresponded to no specific portfolio. It was an ad hoc body and not a “government” in the modern sense.¹⁴

The Philosophy of the Hetman State

The Cossack mind focused on family, manifest in the nation and held together by Christian solidarity. The Sich had its own sense of the social and it was based on the willingness to die for its independence. Neither pain nor death was to be avoided and the martial code focused on endurance after torture (Sirko was flayed by the Poles for 14 days), making them very difficult to break. An enemy should never be killed unnecessarily, but the general feeling was that an enemy will always take mercy as weakness, not goodness. Converts are to be taken as one of the body, though only after a time, not everyone could understand or live the life of the Host.

Law was embedded in the folk song, art and myth. These are always encoded tradition and must be taken very seriously. The law of nature, in the Cossack mind, was manifest in nationalism, and alien teachings were to be rejected. The folk mind sees the Cossacks as a chosen race as well as the successors of Kievan Rus.

Russia and the church are the soul of the world; the apostates have diseased souls and these diseases are contagious. The evil of the world come to possess everything, since their way of life leads to domination. That is the life after the fall of man, but not after Christ's advent.

¹⁴ Doroshenko, Dmytro. *A Survey of Ukrainian History*. Humeniuk Publication Foundation, 1975

Legitimate profits were seen as a hedge against usury but never as an end in itself. The greatest evil is for someone to live at another's expense; the parasite is an evil without parallel. Usury was just this kind of “rent seeking” parasitism. Financial success destroys itself unless the spoils are divided justly, in accordance with need and contribution.

The Cossack Chronicles stress the difference between Rus and Ukraine, as well as between Ukraine and Poland. St. Peter Mohyla in his reform of education and monastic life created a social distance between Russia and Ukraine, and the view of the Host, the Brotherhoods and the Caves Academy were that Ukraine's rights are inviolable regardless of their alliances with foreign powers.

While Poland was so radically distinct from Ukraine, her problems were equally alien. The fact is that Moscow agreed in the Pereslav treaty (though abrogated in later revisions) that the salaries of those elected are to be paid from Moscow, hence eliminating a domestic source of corruption. In addition to Moscow's responsibility to protect Ukraine from outsiders, the Cossacks were to pursue an independent foreign policy. This was honored only in the breach.

The Sich reinforced its central position as Ukraine's chief ethnic marker during the Ruin. While treated far better in the original language than in English, there are many elements in common. Primarily, the Hetman was opposed to the Sich. The Hetman was part of the “registry” tradition, which exempted soldiers from taxes and offered a privileged position in return for loyalty. The Sich was repulsed by such displays. As the Sich was the ideal, the Hetmanate, for better or worse, was the real.

After the death of Khmelnytsky, society did not progress. There was no real state building and no institutional foundation from which the country can mobilize resources. Worse, rather than see the Great Sirko

as a threat, placing him in charge of the Host would have unified Sich and Hetman and would have disintegrated Turkey.

Many Hetmans came and went while Yuri Khmelnytsky, Bogdan's son, showed himself personally too gentle for the duties of Hetman. Petro Doroshenko went to the Ottomans and Tartars out of desperation, leaving Russia as the only option once the Turks began to slaughter the people they were called upon to protect. Pavel Teterya went to Poland, as did Vyhovsky and many others who saw Russia as too unpredictable. Contrary to myth, Teterya did not convert to the Roman church. Teterya was one of Khmelnytsky's most trusted lieutenants. Yet, Poland was seen as superior to Russia for numerous reasons, especially in that it was not a centralized machine as Moscow war. All these alliances failed, and soon, Russia was to destroy the left bank as Poland destroyed the right bank (of the Dniپر).

While interesting and useful, the “mechanics” of the Host is not philosophically challenging. These institutions might reflect certain underlying philosophical concepts, though more likely, they are, like all constitutions, a set of compromises. The “Constitution” is far more than the mechanics of government. One of the worst failures of a highly pockmarked discipline—American political science—is that they have long ceased being philosophers. Political science seems to be little more than administration. Statistical methods, econometrics and r-squares mean far more than serious criticism. Oddly, the introduction of the most mathematically sophisticated concepts such as vector auto-regression and its cognates has done nothing to settle arguments.

The Cossacks were, at their best, non-bureaucratic. The rejection of bureaucracy meant that “offices” were based exclusively on merit. The non-bureaucratic mind would define a “chief executive” as a person or small group

that exemplifies, de facto, the most important qualities of the executive command, especially under conditions of extreme stress. Under highly bureaucratized regimes, offices are units in themselves, and they are filled based on patronage, affirmative action or personal criteria. New hires are based on whether or not the person hired will rock the boat. The maintenance of the administrative structure is an end in itself, and the mentality generated is a-critical and stagnant. For such a person, a “chief executive” is one who holds the office. It has nothing to do with the qualities of the occupant. In modern “liberal democracies,” politicians simply do not matter. The bureaucracy, the judiciary and private sector elites run the show.

The Cossacks rejected bureaucracy because they were always on the move. Like the Mongols, as soon as they settled down, decay set in. “Settling down” means a slow death – it means that a careerist bureaucracy will take over and alter the criteria of office and the stream of tradition.

In Valery Shevchuk's work on Cossack Utopian political thought, paradise begins where the state ends. There is work, but it is not toil. Paradise is associated with good air, green fields and light that comes not from any human source. It is the proper, theological idea that nature reaches its full potential, while it is stunted given the imperfections of our world.¹⁵

Still other utopias hold that good kings rule and that the monastic life, more or less, is the norm. Integrity and simplicity are the main virtues. Hetman Ivan Vyshensky's concept of paradise is one of simplicity, education in divine things and a lack of classes. Equality rules as the new Jerusalem comes to be based on truth. Most of all no parasites exist.

In his *Mirror of Theology*, Cyril Trankvillion argues

¹⁵ cf. Shevchuk, V. Етюди до історії українського державотворення. Аbris, 1995

that paradise is opposed by dystopia, Babylon. There it is luxury that oppresses people coming from the pride of the ruling class. Skovoroda sees the rule of Melchizedek where only the few live in bliss.

S. Orihovskyy stresses the monarchy, who lives by truth and justice; people are united, and ruled by a moral council of advisers to the crown.

In his utopia, Orihovskyy sees the Senate, a true nobility based on merit and without faction. Subordinates exist, but are treated well and have this position based on fair rules. Tyrants are never happy, since law is merely punitive. The tyrant acts arbitrarily, and the ignorant make policy; those who have weaseled their way into power. In reality, law is medicinal, and elites rule by example over force. To act this way, the elite must be ascetic and such examples must be known.

All church offices are elected and close to the people. Bishops serve under the mantle of the monarchy because there can be only one truth. The king lives ascetically and does not seek fame. He works humbly at any needed task. Freedom is something difficult to achieve and is available to the most sensitive people without luxury. Even there, only the few can really enjoy freedom without internal, passionate domination.

The Hetman state is seen as Spartan. In the work of Joseph Vereschysko and Kasiyana Sakovitch, the state is based on honor, shown to enemies. Punishments must be just, but swift. Pain is not an evil, and is a part of life, the Host and the building of strength and solidarity.

Ivan Maximovich emphasizes the fleeting nature of power. It is not something to be sought, since power attracts the lowest sorts of people. War, income and conquests never satisfy, since the lusts for power, like all others, simply seeks more. Similarly, Simeon Klymov sees the ideal Hetmanate as a royal society based on justice, with a single source of law in nature and God. Faith and

justice are the same, and classes do not exist. Sine there is one law and one truth, there is one faith. The crown is an invitation to martyrdom, as power crushes even the best of man

The same might be said of Nalyvalko who, economically, leaned towards the Poles, but the Uniat issue forced him to engage in open warfare with his former masters.

But this tendency found its final synthesis in the brilliant reign of the recently canonized Peter Sahaidachny (d. 1622), who took the decentralist agenda of Vyshnevetsky and used it to create the first autonomous and regular military formations of the Host itself – bringing the Hetmanate into world politics as an organized military force.

Again, the idea of the Orthodox identity of the Host was central, and continued the policies of his predecessors. His main concern was the protection of the Orthodox schools against their incorporation into the Jesuit Uniat orbit. But in the process of doing so, he invited, in an event of global historical proportions, the Patriarch Theophanes III of Jerusalem to Ukraine to consecrate a new hierarchy independent of both the Uniats and the Russians. Hence, the circle had been complete: Ukraine was now an independent country, with its Cossack military formations and independent church. However, once these issues were resolved, the class-issue was then provoked by the enemies of Ukraine.

The historical cycle of Ukraine is often based on a burst of revolutionary activity that is soon crushed by military might, domestic compromises, or the co-option of the elites so needed for political leadership. The cycle continues even in 2015. This background, as cursory as it is, must be understood prior to the philosophical ideas that it influenced and even created. There is no distinction between history and philosophy in the Ukrainian state, and

hence, approaching it from one discipline over another leads to distorted results.

Zachariah Kopystensky (d. 1627), abbot of the Caves Lavra, was one of the more educated polemicists against the Unia. His *Against the Union* and *Book of Apologetics* together are called the *Palinodia*, written and compiled between 1617 and 1630. Many of these articles are responses to the pro-Uniat work by L. Krevzy A Defense of the Church Union.

Firstly, these works are strongly ethnic in tone and again, use a very modern vocabulary to describe the rights of the Ukrainian and Rusyn ethnos. He describes Ukrainians as a freedom-loving people. This derives from the historical experience of the Galician and Volhynian state to which the Poles have no claim. This polity is the successor of Kievan-Rus, and have the Cossack Host as the elite needed to build an independent nation.

His historical schema is that Galicia-Volhynia are the successors of St. Vladimir at Kiev, and they in turn, along with the very Russian Grand Duchy of Lithuania, lead to the Ukrainian role in the Polish empire. For better or worse, this is the scheme that makes Ukraine quite foreign to Moscow.

Secondly, he uses the term “Ukraine” almost exclusively. Relative to the cultural damage of the Union, he states that the Ukrainian identity will be diluted because the Union will introduce hostile and alien Catholic ideas into the Ukrainian mind.

Third, Kopystensky argued that there was a possibility of a Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian federation. This will be manifest under the Hetmanate of Ivan Vyhovsky during the Ruin. What this seems to mean is that the idea of Orthodox Ukraine was a clear ideological and philosophical conception in the early 17th century. There is much evidence that it was common earlier as well. The school at Ostrog, the Kievan Academy and the monastery

of Pochayev – as well as Manjava – all used a very modern conception of national and ethnic sovereignty in their religious arguments.

In addition, Kopstensky argues largely from a cultural point of view, in that the Unia introduces a new life into Ukraine that is hostile, like a bacterial infection designed to weaken the body. The healthy Ukraine needed to be unified in religion and language, so as to produce a general moral consensus needed for any significant political action at all.

He also strongly suggests that the Cossacks are both an ethnic and religious phenomenon who have their mission to primarily defend the folk from the elites of both domestic and foreign extraction. The idea of looking to Moscow as absurd, as he hardly mentions it. Rather, he sees the Russian Orthodox tradition of Old Lithuania as the main protector of the Orthodox ethnos.

St. Petro Mohyla (d. 1646), the abbot of the Kiev Caves and Metropolitan of Kiev, while not a Ukrainian nationalist per se, is too significant a figure of this era to ignore. His noble background made him a target of Cossack criticism, but his adoption of the Scholastic system was a means of challenging the arrogant Jesuits on their own turf.

Placing his entire personal fortune at the feet of the church, the Ukrainian Orthodox would not have survived intellectually without him. It is occasionally forgotten that Pope Urban VIII declared a Crusade against the Orthodox, something else that makes the Unia a mockery of Ukrainian “nationalism.”

While the Russian Church criticized him, his work against the Unia was far more significant than anything that Moscow or Petrograd did in that regard. Like many in the Ukrainian movement, Mohyla saw Ukraine as a Slavo-Greek state with close ties to the Byzantine empire. Stressing free will and the ascetic struggle, St. Petro revitalized the monastic life and placed the houses under a

strict rule from the Studion. The monarchy and any state exists solely due to natural law, and hence, with the consensus of all social orders, functions only within its limits.

As the Petrogradian state banned all Ukrainian folk-songs and decimated the church, that present Russian Orthodox churchmen dare criticize the desperate work of St. Peter is an outrage, one that this writer will speak of no further. St. Peter was part of the revitalization of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church as an Exarch of the Byzantine patriarch. While this seems paradoxical, it is nonetheless consistent since the empire itself was a dead letter, and this Exarchate guaranteed the de facto autonomous status of the Kievan church.

In the same era, St. Job Boretsky and Christopher Filayeta, closer to the Cossacks than St. Peter, had been directly consecrated by Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem. These two figures spoke quite clearly, and in very modern terms, of the ethnic rights of Ukrainians. For Christopher, all Christians should be politically and legally equal and freedom of religion needs to be the rule in a multi-confessional state. Like St. Peter, Christopher believed in a single civil law for all, since ranks and noble orders based on birth are artificial, and not real, distinctions. True to the Sobornapravna tradition, both wanted the restoration of elected clergy, something that the Russian empire will soon ban.

From Pereslav to Andrusovo: The Horror of the 17th Century

In 1686, about 40 years after the Cossack uprising and the foundation of the Hetman state, Hetman Samoylovych sent several conditions to Moscow as to his continued participation in the now rewritten and reinterpreted Pereslav Union. Primarily, it focused on the Kievan Metropolitan being an exarch of Constantinople, which also implied the full nationalization of the church and its independence in all aspects of church life. Moscow accepted all these conditions except the “Exarch” title, only to nullify all of these in 1686, when the Tsar bought the Kievan metropolitanate from a prostrate Ecumenical Patriarch.

Vyhovsky and the Rise of Ivan Sirko and Petro Doroshenko

From an economic point of view, the Ukrainian Orthodox were the peasants, and many of the non-Cossack elite went over to the Uniats, even changing their names in the process. In inviting the patriarch, Sahaidachny solved that problem, creating an independent Ukrainian church from the succession of the Apostle James. In protecting his new state, this brilliant Hetman was a bit too soft on the Poles for his lower class compatriots, and this began a rebellion against Sahaidachny by the lower orders, already seeing a self-satisfied Cossack elite that will become the weakest link in this fledgling state and new Orthodox jurisdiction.

By the middle of the 17th century the problems became more acute. After the great victories of Khmelnytsky against Polish landlordism, his former lieutenants, including Vyhovsky and Teterya, slowly split the Host along class lines. On the one hand, Ivan Vyhovsky leaned towards Poland as a reaction to the

Russian presence in Ukraine after the infamous treaty of Pereslav. But by his death in 1664, the Russians in the “Pereslavian” mold, created a new Cossack noble class, complete with serfs, that separated the formerly populist Cossack idea of Sahaidachny and created instead a Russianized noble class.

Many Cossacks were pro-Moscow and fomented a major rebellion against Vyhovsky and his pro-Polish policies. Writers such as Doroshenko claim that Moscow was deliberately spreading myths to the effect that the Hetman was going to hand Ukraine over to the Poles. Both class and ethnicity now split the Cossack Host, and more or less, this became the norm from this era onward.

The Brotherhoods involved in all spheres: nationalist, fought RCC, contact with Athos, simplicity, world as totally evil. Their organization will be put to the test as Khmelnytsky's rebellion fell apart through the treachery of the Crimeans. The result was the Zboriv agreement of 1649-1650. It stipulated the following:

1. Cossack Ukraine was to include Kiev, Chernigov and Bratslav.
2. In Ukrainian areas, only Orthodox people could hold office.
3. The Uniat Church was dissolved and all property granted to the Orthodox.
4. The metropolitan was to have a seat in the Polish senate.
5. All were under amnesty for their part in the 1648 rebellion.
6. The Jews and Polish landlords will be prevented from returning.

In 1632, the UOC legal. Polish crown fought the magnates, and this permitted Peter Mohyla what he needed. Poles destroyed Ukrainian cities and imposed serfdom after 1600. 17th century: 40% peasants landless; average holdings

fall; one decade earlier, only 10% landless. Magnates controlled 80%. This was the lowest point in Polish life until the partitions. She was diplomatically isolated. Turkey, Moldova, Transylvania and Sweden all broke relations with Poland.

The church in the Sich (1734-1775), in the work of Alexander Moisenkov, shows a Cossack Host whose devotion to the church was powerful and sincere. No military action could occur without a blessing. By 1700, the Sich had 4 parishes, and priests were supplied from the Motronynsky Monastery and lived outside the Sich. Clergy served only for one year. Patriarch Joakim made the institution stavropegic. Catherine closed the monastery. This monastery, dedicated to the transfiguration served as a bulwark against interference from bishops. Many converts from the Jews and Muslims.

Shevchuk argues that, after the revolution petered out, there was no stability. This is because the Cossack oligarchs would not agree to anything; the state, while a structure existed, was not defensible and finally, the idea of shared power was no longer a part of life. The reality is that the Russian governors and troops made the Russian state seem barbaric. Vyhovsky sought the example of the Greek polis. The Hadiach Treaty made some cultural sense, since the Uniat Church was eliminated and the Russians avoided. If Poland could not be trusted, Russia had proven that it would violate any treaty.¹⁶

Vyhovsky did not waver in his support for Poland and the Treaty, and was the first Cossack figure to approach Krakow with a “trilateralist” solution to Ukrainian independence: for Ukraine to create the third entity in the Polish-Lithuanian union with a great deal of independence and religious freedom. This became the anti-treaty of Pereslav, the treaty of Hadiach. This was

¹⁶ Shevchuk, V. Етюди до історії українського державотворення. Аbris 1995

the specific cause of the Russian revolt among the Cossacks. Even more, the hapless but well meaning son of Khmelnytsky, Yuri, also maintained a close alliance with the Poles, only to become the puppet Hetman of the Turks. The 1658 Hadiach treaty saw the metropolitan of Kiev in the Polish Senate and all Protestants and heretics removed. Amnesty and taxes for local use.

One year later, the new treaty with Russia was forced, the Zherdevsky Articles. Doroshenko negotiated the following: local rule, Russian troops under Hetman, unified Ukraine, UOC under Greeks – this was rejected. By 1665, the position of the Host was so poor that Moscow restricted all Cossack rights and place high taxes.

Briukhovetsky initially came under the Tsar's protection. His single demand was that Ukrainian common law remain in force. Loyalty will be to the tsar and his interests. This single demand was a complex one. Primarily, it meant the retention of Cossack tradition on the one hand, the retention of the Magdeburg law in cities. Elections to urban offices, as well as the Hetmanate itself, should be free and done according to local tradition.

His justification for going to Russia was convincing. Primarily, that the Turks needed to be fought. Their empire coveted much more than the Black Sea, and Ukraine's famed fertility made her a target. On the other hand, the Poles cannot be trusted. Agreements that they make today will be nullified tomorrow. Further, agreements with the crown, often pro-Ukrainian, are overthrown by the szlachta, the only actual power in the nation. Hence, without Russia, the Poles, Turks and Tartars could easily combine to take Ukraine. Domestically, the Hetmanate needed to be firmly grounded and single. The Ruin is given that name primarily because there were so many rival claimants to that office. Russia could provide this stability..

There is no reason to hold that a Russian policy that reflected these reasonable demands would have created a

loyal and pro-Russian Ukraine. Unfortunately, the noble lords who commanded their armies had other ideas.

The new Hetman was soon perceived as dependent on Russian forces. These same military units in Ukraine had free passage and lodging at local expense. In 1668, an uprising against the pro-Russian faction broke out, since the Russian nobles in Cossack territory treated natives harshly and spared no expense in their extortionate taxes. Rather than correcting these abuses, the result was ultimately the execrable Treaty of Andrusovo in 1667.

This treaty was to negate the Cossack state and divide Ukraine between Poland and Russia. This was the ultimate betrayal, since it handed over many Orthodox to Polish and Jewish usurers. Poland and Russia were now bound by treaty as equals.

Russia took the Left-Bank as well as Smolensk while Poland took the Right and the entirety of present day Belarus, including the ancient Orthodox city of Polotsk. It was an immense insult and condemned thousands of Orthodox Russians to torment, expropriation and genocide. Poland would soon pay an indemnity for Russian occupation of Kiev and both sides agreed to combine forces against Turkey.

Worse, the Cossack Host was considered null and void, power over them was to be shared between Russia and Poland. Their gradual destruction was assured. "Free trade" was code for the Polish colonization and dispossession of thousands of Orthodox families. It meant massive interest rates without any countervailing power. It was not in Russia's interest, since the Jewish capital structure in Poland was far more experienced and far larger than the Russian merchant class.

After Cossack independence was nullified by this treaty, in 1672 the Kontap Articles imposed an appointed Hetman on Ukraine. Any sort of independence was rejected, as was Orthodox brotherhood and common

decency. This is part of the Reason why Russia is unpopular in some Ukrainian circles. On the bright side, this disaster led to the Great Ivan Sirko.

Ivan Sirko remains the unsung hero of the era. Ruling the Sich, this popular Hetman backed the rebellion of Stenka Razin. He unified Ukraine through the defeat of both Polish and Turkish forces. The oligarchy had him arrested and sent to Siberia, but Turkish victories forced his return. In 1674, a massive Turkish invasion was repelled by Sirko, while Samoylovych refused to budge. One year later, 15,000 Janissaries, auxiliaries and regulars again invaded Ukraine. Sirko again defeated the cream of the Ottoman fighting force. Doroshenko then invited them back in.

1678 saw another substantial Turkish invasion. Again, Russia and Samoylovych refused to repel. This pattern suggests that Moscow was interested in dealing with Turkey rather than the wild Cossacks. The coalition force under Sirko grew to large numbers, and one more time, Turkey was defeated. This time, the Hetman saw Turkey crumbling. Its best fighting men were destroyed, and the road seemed open to take Turkey. Seeing this, Russia destroyed the Sich; Sirko, with the possibility of destroying Turkey forever, was forced to retreat. To add insult to injury, the corrupt Samoylovych called Sirko a Turkish spy.

Sirko died a broken man. Doroshenko and Russia negated all his victories. After his death, Russia then went on to found the “Holy League” against Turkey. The saga of Sirko might be explained by the fact that Russian Ukraine was an oligarchy where both Cossack and Russian nobles, the upper crust being about 1%, owned about 50% of all land. Commerce remained sluggish because, like their Polish counterparts, Cossack grandees controlled towns.. Russia corrupted the elite. The destruction of the Sich was a means of stopping Sirko, who was a firm agrarian anarchist.

Like Sirko, Semen Palii a generation later rebelled against its policy, one that both the Cossack nobility and Russia saved Turkey for. National anarchist, Palii used Poland against Russia and vice versa. Defeated by Mazepa, but Peter then went on to exhaust Ukraine's economy.

In the Kohut article, we read in a wild understatement:

Sirko's relations with Hetman Samoylovych were strained. Nevertheless, he endorsed Samoylovych's consistent pro-Muscovite stance and recognized his authority as Hetman. In a letter dated 14 December 1677, Sirko assures Samoylovych: "We all do not separate ourselves from you, for this would do great harm to our beloved fatherland, but rather seek unity and your guidance, which under the present circumstances we find necessary for the entire Zaporozhian Host, and to this we truly vouch." Sirko also recognized that the Sich Cossacks were linked to a Ukrainian fatherland. In July 1677 Sirko wrote to Samoylovych, informing him that "it is well known to your lordship that we are waging war, our only craft, where it is necessary for the protection and unity of our bewailed fatherland Ukraine." He did not hesitate to express similar views either to the tsar or to Muscovite officials. In one of his letters to Prince Grigorii Romodanovskii, Sirko writes: "Beseeching Your Princely lordship, our benevolent patron and His Majesty, I am asking for your kindness to our fatherland, Little Rus', and to us, the

Zaporozhian Host." On 14 December 1677 Sirko wrote a letter to the Muscovite tsar, saying: "Even though we concluded this truce during the infidels' attack on Ukraine, our fatherland, we believe that we have done no harm to anyone by taking this step, for it was a necessary one."¹⁷

But the 1658 treaty needs further discussion. Here, the Polish parliament would have had to accept Ukrainian bishops as members on an equal footing. The church would have been proclaimed as an independent and autocephalous church if only because it was the only official Orthodox church within this proposed huge and powerful federation. This treaty, had it been ratified by the Poles, would well have created a new Ukrainian Orthodox identity outside of a Russian fold, complete with its own publicly funded seminaries and institutions of translation and scholarship. It may well have solved the problem of the Old Rite in bringing the Old Believers into the Ukrainian communion as a mode of controlling the imperialism of Moscow (as the Austrians were to do later). However, the poorer Cossacks saw Vyhovsky's negotiations with Poland as tantamount to the creation of a Cossack aristocracy with Polish rather than Russian titles. Hence, the class war develops again.

Vyhovsky dealt with 5 major principles: the rule of Hetman must be clear and strong; UOC legalized; all must be based on military rule for the time being; sovereignty must be real and the Cossacks as the new state elite.

Vyhovsky was seen by many as too pro-Polish. Poland was seen as the lesser evil to Russia, who was dedicated to absorbing the area into the empire. Trained as a lawyer, Vyhovsky created financial reserves, a balanced budget, and laid the groundwork for functional institutions.

¹⁷ Cf. Kohut, 21

Ukraine was a small but independent state. For a time.

Nevertheless, under the reign of Paul Teterya (d. 1670) these tensions exploded into what Ukrainian historians call “The Ruin” – the era where the victories of Sahaidachny and Khmelnytsky were negated and overthrow of both the Treaty of Hadiach and the Russian elders on the left bank. Class dominated over everything, and the rank and file revolted on both banks. Teterya, himself also a veteran of the Khmelnytsky campaigns against Poland, saw the development of a major civil war that destroyed the infrastructure of the country and destroyed the autocephalous Church of Ukraine.

Teterya responded to this by his ruthless purging of the officer corps of the Host.

But the Ruin, while it negated the victories of previous Hetmans did not destroy the ideas. The successor to the Ruin was Petro Doroshenko, a true follower of both Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny and Khmelnytsky. Doroshenko blamed the upper classes of the Cossack Host on both banks (but especially the right, or pro-Russian bank), for the Ruin, and sought to continue the state building policies of Sahaidachny. He created two councils: first, the supreme military council which was open also to junior officers. He created, in addition, a Cossack parliament where class was not a barrier to participation.

To protect these reforms against the upper classes, Doroshenko created a personal guard completely loyal to him and appointed by him alone. While the Treaty of Hadiach was a dead letter, Doroshenko maintained his anti-Moscow position and fought the armies of Russia on a regular basis. The Russian state helped elect his right bank rival, Samoylovych, to lead the landowning rivals against Doroshenko in the west. Knowing full well that Doroshenko was also fighting Poland, another major fratricidal war broke out.

Finally Doroshenko, facing rebellion both at home

and abroad, went to the Turks for support. The Turks took much of Doroshenko's old lands and plundered them. The common folk loathed this move by their Hetman and rebelled against him. Eventually, the Russian supported Samoylovych captured him and sent him into exile. The Ukrainian state was dead.

Concerning the legacy of Doroshenko, one authority writes:

Throughout his strenuous tenure as Hetman (1665-76), Petro Doroshenko never wavered from the goal of uniting the Zaporozhian Host within the territory that was rightfully its own- the territory of the Zbořiv Agreement. However, he also consistently made claims on behalf of the Orthodox faith and the Ruthenian nation residing in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The Hetman also had ambitions of carving out a specific Ruthenian/Ukrainian political entity that would include a united Hetmanate and all the Ruthenian areas of the Polish Crown. This vision was similar to Bogdan Khmelnytsky's original Ruthenian project and the Cossack proposals for Hadiach.¹⁸

Turkey was now the main enemy and a list of pro-Russian Cossacks ruled much of Ukraine. Ivan Briukhovetsky on the left bank asked the Russian synod to send a metropolitan to Ukraine to take over for the moribund Ukrainian autocephalous church. In 1666, at the same time the Old Believers were anathematized in Russia, the Russian church also took over the Ukrainian lands. Even more, the so called Moscow Articles of 1665 were

¹⁸ Cf. Kohut, 10

signed, that led to the complete domination of Moscow over Ukraine. From then on, the Old Rite and the Ukrainians were allies, seeking independent church structures from the Moscow synod, now (at least in part) a department of the Muscovite state.

To say that going to Turkey was inherently a problem is to forget that Khmelnytsky also did this as a way to balance Poland. Allies near the end of Khmelnytsky's reign were Transylvania and Brandenburg.

Hetman Briukhovetsky stated concerning his break with Moscow:

It was not only because of our own decision, but after the advice, taken from the Cossack officers of the Zaporozhian Host, that we broke the allegiance and friendship with Moscow. There were good reasons for doing so: ...the Muscovite envoys and the Polish commissars negotiated peace between them, and swore to plunder and depredate our beloved fatherland, Ukraine, from both sides, Polish and Muscovite.¹⁹

Dmytro Dontsov, the 20th century philosopher and historian, argues concerning Mazepa that he was driven by two ideas: first, to prevent Peter from building an empire, and second, to show the world that the ruse of Russia is counterproductive. Beyond that, his insistence on the distinction of Ukrainian culture, partly shown by the Baroque, brings out the fact that Ukraine is an Orthodox nation. He was also forced to realize that a new ruling class needed to be created. Without it, a state cannot be founded.

Dontsov also holds that Russians kidnapped Ukrainian children and brought them up in Russia, while, at the end of the 18th century, Catherine gave rewards for

¹⁹ Cf. Kohut, 9

intermarriage between the two groups. In Mazepa's Letter to the Cossacks and "All the People of Ukraine," he argues that the Peace of Andrusovo was the worst possible nightmare for Ukraine. In that respect he was absolutely correct. Neither power had done anything but exploit Ukraine and reduce her population in constant warfare.

However, one hope for Ukraine was Sweden. She is both powerful and distant. Peter I was a lunatic, which is certainly the case, and the first totally non-Orthodox tsar. Being a Freemason and occultist (and probably a satanist), he had no political legitimacy. Peter had no respect for human life and had exhausted and tormented Ukraine. Thousands of Cossacks perished in the White Sea building project, part of which was to become the foundation of Petersburg. This is iconic for the city itself. Mazepa's fate is well known.

Throughout the beginning of the 18th century Ukraine had become part of the Muscovite empire after the defeat of Ivan Mazepa, the last rebel against Peter (though this time, supporting the Swedes against Peter I). From this point until Orlyk (the Mazepist Hetman in Exile) the likes of Mikhail Khanenko ran Ukraine, huge landowners benefiting from a strong Moscow and a weak Poland. The defeat of Sweden by Peter meant that there was no where else for the Hetmanate to go but in exile. This defeat, as bad as the Ruin, created a remarkable document that finally laid out in systematic form the political ideology of the Cossack Host – the Orlyk Constitution of 1710. It is also called the Bendery Constitution, but it seems to this writer that its main drafter, Hetman Philip Orlyk, should be honored here.

As part of the draft constitution during the final negotiations at Andrusovo, the famed historian Dmytro Doroshenko wrote:

The Ruthenian nation is now divided into

different countries (lands), but shares the common faith with the Greeks, and not only among themselves in those countries, but also in the borderlands, first, from the country where Przemyśl, Sambir, and the city of Kyiv are located and then twenty miles to the second country, from the river Vistula, and from the third one, i.e., Memn [Nemunas], and from the fourth country, where Sevsk and Putyvl are, all of them are Cossacks, we hope that they will join us in our decision and will be in agreement with us... and will be freed from their bondage... [for they are currently] subjects of the Poles and the Muscovites, and are enslaved by their rulers with persuasions and, even more, with punishments.²⁰

First of all, it holds that Orthodoxy should be the official religion of Ukraine, and that it should be an Autocephalous church. It holds that all Russians are to be expelled from Ukraine and that a Cossack parliament should be founded. A military council of Cossack officers was proposed, as well as very low taxes and independent towns. It is a decentralist and nationalist constitution, diametrically opposite the elite financed and highly cynical US-Ukraine Foundation. Nevertheless, this program became the center of the Cossack and nationalist movement in Ukraine. It was never put in force.

The final act of the Cossacks was also the final act for the church. The autocephalous movement was dead, suppressed by Cossack wars and the violence of the Petrine state. Hetman Ivan Skoropadsky (d. 1722) sought to negotiate with Peter I and to gain the trust that Mazepa once had with Petrograd. Skoropadsky thought that

²⁰ Cf Kohut, 14-15

negotiations would work better than fighting with Peter, since both Mazepa and Charles of Sweden both ended up in exile in Turkey for a time. But it was the poor judgment of Daniel Apostol, a large pro-Russian landowner, that finally put the final touches on the Repression of Ukraine and the end of Cossack autonomy.²¹

Both Skoropadsky and Apostol fought against Mazepa and sought an alliance with Peter I. With this leadership and a demoralized Cossack Host, it was just a matter of time before Ukraine was subsumed into the Russian empire and, with the destruction of Poland and the increasing irrelevance of Turkey, there was no where left to run. The total state of the modern world destroyed both Ukraine and her church. She could only be reborn at the final

destruction of the USSR, only to be thrown into the arms of a power no less imperialistic than the USSR, the USA and her bankers, who engineered the Orange Revolution with Soros money (and not a little cash from the US-Ukraine Foundation) so as bring Ukraine under the umbrella of the American banks.

Class warfare, the arrogance of elites on all sides and the desperate alliances of Doroshenko and Mazepa destroyed any hope of Ukrainian independence. The Treaty of Hadiach was the closest that the people of Rus' will ever have to develop into an autonomous and autocephalous Orthodox presence in Central Europe.

The war against the Uniats helped forge the Ukrainian identity as an Orthodox nation. Prior to the

²¹ Kohut, Z. Mazepa's Ukraine: Understanding Cossack Territorial Vistas. Harvard Ukrainian Studies, Vol. 31, No. 1/4, 2010, pp. 1-28
Sysyn, F. The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising. Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, Neue Folge, Bd. 46, H. 4 (1998), pp. 531-545

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. Vol. 8, pt. 2. Reprint New York 1956, pp. 21 1-224

destruction of the Hetman state and the Sich, the Kievan church was made up of 22 dioceses, 20 male monasteries and 12 convents. However, by 1799, the Kievan metropolitan had 8 dioceses and a handful of clergy. Catherine eliminated the Hetmanate, introduced serfdom upon a free people, and shut down hundreds of Orthodox churches. In her ignorance, she believed that, since the Sich had few parishes, that meant the Cossacks were “secular.” It merely meant that Cossacks had very large churches. Few institutions are normal for a nomadic people.

St. Petersburg destroyed the sacred tradition of the Ukrainian Orthodox church. Under the empire, Ukraine's literacy rate fell and few clergy remained. It was identical to the Soviet destruction of the church. Upon taking office in Rostov, St. Arseny stated that there were only a handful of priests in Ukraine.

In 1797, the masonic, Enlightened regime in St. Petersburg claimed the title “Supreme Guardian of Doctrine.” The attack on the Kievan church led to an exodus to the Unia such that they had, according to the 1771 census, 12 million people. Given the massive purging and institutional instability of the Orthodox church in Kiev, relations between clergy and people were declining, and anti-clerical groups formed. The clergy were increasingly seen as functionaries, which added yet another blow to the church in the region. These men were appointed from Petrograd, not elected, and were often Russian speakers.

Ivan Vyshenskii, Hyhorii Skovoroda and the Philosophy of the Ukrainian Baroque

The Baroque in Ukraine is one of the more significant reasons why it is different from the churches of Russia or Greece. Russian hostility to this movement is based largely on ignorance, and radically changed to praise when the Petrograd state adopted a decrepit version of this in the early 19th century. In a very real way, the Cossack importation of the Baroque idea to Orthodoxy is a reflection of her existential condition by the time of Mazepa.

Any summary of the Baroque in Ukraine will be fragmentary and radically incomplete, but to understand the era, and then to apply that to grasping the world of Vyshenskii and Skovoroda, is needed for a holistic comprehension of the philosophy of the Host. Without proper context, philosophy is illegible, and becomes a series of stale debates about abstract topics.

The Baroque sees man existentially as a fallen, pathetic creature. His ego leads to delusion and this, artistically speaking, leads to the ugly and deformed. The ego imposes and projects itself upon “external” nature, radically altering its presence and meaning. There is no neat relation between inner sense and outer reality, since the latter is very much determined and distorted by the former. One's moral condition is projected outwardly as “reality.”

Man yearns lustfully for understanding and control, only to learn that this “reality” he seeks to dominate is part of his own internal drives. Passion creates a false world that is corrosively superimposed on God's creation, always hidden just beneath the surface.

The Baroque stressed holism in morals and philosophy. This holism took the local landscape as a

character in its own right, and the Steppe began to be depicted as a uniformitarian, unlimited flux that needed to be tamed. Symbols of the garden became popular as a way to point to Eden, where Wisdom ruled rather than abstract and fragmented logic. The sea too was similar to the Steppe, where movement seemed chaotic, but the flux, when understood, had the same order as our own internal chaos.

The qualities of the world are symptoms of this. The human experience is the constant conceptual dissonance of clashing antinomies. The discovery of love and intuition is what transcends these purely ontological ideas. Symbols were used copiously, along with metaphor and simile, all piled one atop another. Death under this environment is inevitable as earthly life is unhappy and short.

The history of political ideas is organized around a “canon.” it seems arbitrary, since it eliminates many, many figures who wrote voluminously on political topics. The Slavophiles, J. Fitzjames Stephens, W.H. Mallock are just a handful. These men, from a strictly formal point of view, were the equal to their liberal opponents in the structure of their arguments and the marshaling of evidence against the liberalism they detested. “Conservatism” is officially represented only by one man in the “canon,” Edmund Burke.

The organization of this “canon” is a potent form of political control. The American university system—a sequestered place of initiation and manipulation—is saturated with “professors of political theory” whose knowledge of their field is largely based on the official slogans that are always attached to the main players: Plato, Lock, Mill and the rest. But the point is that the “canon” is based on a philosophy of history: the gradual, Evolution of political ideas from the “chaos” of Christianity to the “order” of the modern state. The “canon” is constructed

with this historical view in mind. Out of the middle ages comes Hobbes and Locke, ending with the utilitarianism of Marx. Marx and Nietzsche, speaking generally, are the telos of the “canon.” All political thought, so the canon implies, is a giant intellectual machine whose purpose is to product Marx and Nietzsche.

University classes, like nearly all university classes, in political theory is a fairly radical and extreme form of intellectual manipulation – “brainwashing” – to use a slightly less technical term. Its purpose is to use the canon, often artlessly, to convince students that Marx and Nietzsche are the final word of “the west.” The constant harping on a tiny handful of men destroys the massive fabric of political writing in the west, that is, in Europe as a whole. Men are eliminated from consideration solely and precisely because they do not “fit” the pattern.

There could have been no nationalists before “the 19th century,” so the significant nationalist thinking in 17th century Ukraine, Therefore, must be ignored. The Enlightenment was a period of “progress” and “reform” against the “stagnant” and “dogma-ridden” Middle Ages, and therefore, the physics of Robert Grossesste or St. Basil's Hexameron are ignored. The very fact that it is called “the middle ages” suggest that it is not a real period in itself, but a mere purging of the west so as to make way for capitalism, secularism, socialism, materialism, the state and nominalism. Graduate students in political theory come out less knowledgeable then they went in.

Ivan Vyshenskii was born sometime in the late 16th century and died around 1640. He was an Athonite monk and an extremely radical social critic. This is at a time when the “canon” asserts a) there was no radical through on Athos, b) there was no nationalism in Ukraine, or anywhere else, and c) the Orthodox countries were “languishing” in ignorance. Vyshenskii was inconvenient not just for the

Polish overlords of Ukraine, but for the “professional historians and political scientists” who claim that no such thing could have existed. The result – he is ignored.

Vyshenskii sets his rhetoric against the general regime of “feudalism.” In very general terms, this is defined as that set of both economic and legal institutions that keep peasants under the direct and personal control of a landlord. Like any much later Ukrainian nationalist, he realized that foreign rule and feudalism, especially in Ukraine, went hand in hand. Feudalism in Ukraine was justified—in this case—by the Polish Sarmatian myth. In Russia, since the serfs were of the same ethnic group and religion as the serf-owners, justifying serfdom was an exercise in mental gymnastics. In Poland, the Ukrainian serf had no other function.

For Vyshenskii, feudalism was inherently unjust. It was not unjust because it had bad results, but in that it rests on a moral lie: that people, based on the offices they hold, are inherently unequal. Its negative consequences were not just merely the enslavement of peasants and the bestialization of owners. Importantly, the oligarchic control of society meant the oligarchic control of the church. Therefore, because of this captivity, the church could not be the populist institution it was meant to be. It had become, at least in its leadership, a tool of the system as it stood. This was the greatest evil of Polish serfdom.

Bishops except in the most formal of senses, were not “bishops.” They were secular lords, often without faith, elected by the state to fill what amounted to a “political” office. The Ukrainian church was underground. Only Polish bishops were permitted in their sees. Vyshenskii did not live to see the explosion of Khmelnytsky. The church is meant, at its best, to be a fountain of culture and morality. It had become a tool of the Catholic and Jewish oligarchs and their servants.²²

²² Citations here from Іван Вишенський. Твори. Переклад з

The real opposition to this pagan rule was monasticism. The opposite of modern materialism and capitalist bureaucratization is the monastic life of self denial. It is a self-denial not merely for its own sake (which would make no sense), but as a means to see the world clearly. To remove the temptation of material things in order to focus on liberating the Spirit from the body, or more accurately, the “flesh” as the negative element of the body. Liberating the spirit is a result of decades of labor.

The only justification of “rule,” in all of its many senses, is based only on service and sacrifice. The opposite of this is modern rule: government (broadly speaking) based on economic and class self interest. Christ is the “wise simpleton” who was able to cut to ribbons the very academic and self-righteous Judaic rhetorical traps. The intellectual successors to the Pharisees were the Talmudic Khazars who ruled the Polish state through their total lack of scruples: interest can be charged against the goyim, and it is possible to manipulate the goyim in any way possible for the sake of destroying him.

The Talmud, the man sacred text of the rabbis states: “The Jews are human beings, but the nations of the world are not human beings but beasts. . .”²³ And again, “A Jew may rob a goy - that is, he may cheat him in a bill, if unlikely to be perceived by him.”²⁴ And again, “If a goy wants a Jew to stand witness against a Jew in a Court of Law, and if the Jew could give fair evidence, he is forbidden to do it; but if a Jew wants a Jew to be a witness in a similar case against a goy, he may do it.”²⁵ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, “If a Jew be called upon to explain any part of the rabbinic books, he ought to give

книжної української мови Валерія Шевчука. Київ: Дніпро, 1986

The introduction is from Vasily Shevchuk

²³ Saba Mecia 114, 6; Michael Hoffman's work *Judiasm Discovered*. (Independent History and Research2010), was essential here.

²⁴ Schalchan Arach, Choszen Hamiszpat 348)

²⁵ Schalchan; Choszen Hasiszpat 28, Art. 3 and 4

only a false explanation. Who ever will violate this order shall be put to death.”²⁶

From the Jewish, Talmudic point of view, the Polish aristocracy was a mere means to enslave the agrarian goyim they had been taught from birth to hate. They had no love for the Poles, but, for the moment, they were useful. The complete opposite of the Talmud, and the radically materialist and race-supremacist doctrine it contains in huge numbers, is the simplicity of Christ. He never hid behind academic verbiage, titles or an arbitrarily interpreted law. He condemned the Pharisees, and their response, to oversimplify a bit, is the Talmud. The role of the monk, Therefore, was to take over the role of the prophet – the very prophets who condemned apostate Israel (typified by the Pharisees and their allies) and were, as a result, murdered by them.

Pravda is the nature of all true relationships. *Pravda* is one of the most complex words in the Slavonic language. *Sobornapravna* is a compound variation on the same. In Vyshenskii's reading, it is a relationship. It is a relationship based on truth. But truth and justice are not distinct, especially in action. Truth leads to justice, and just relations must be based on truth. The opposite of truth here is self-interest. The enslaved will that takes its own desires as the sine qua non of its existence. It is based on a lie because self-interest will distort reality so as to present it more conveniently for the willer. Therefore, truth is a matter of freedom. It is the will unencumbered by the demands of the soul's lower nature. It is no accident that, with the exception of Kant, the Enlightenment rejected this concept of the will.

Greed has brought Ukraine to national ruin. Nationalism is the organization of *Pravda*. *Pravda* can only be grasped in a relationship. A nation is a group of people united by socially significant markers, and an eternal threat

²⁶ Libbre David 37

to tyrants everywhere. Language, religion, basic morals, general political outlook and many other objects serve as markers that separate one nation from another. The nation, in a sense, becomes an actual “person” with a will and a set of interests. Internally, however, the main concern is solidarity—service and love in its true, non-maudlin sense. While nations have an inherent right to defend themselves (the right based on mere self-preservation), their internal organization should be based on solidarity, not self-interest or any other form of competition.

Vyshenskii, in his social criticism, makes a profound point that is one of the reasons he is largely ignored: paganism is not the worship of carved images. Christians who own serfs and merely follow their self interest at all times might convince themselves that they are not pagans because they don't believe in Zeus. But this is such a poor and puerile definition of “paganism” as to make it a useless concept. The idea of the “pagan” is anyone who takes the “work of men's hands” and treats it as the telos of creation. Capitalism and socialism—the veritable worship of technology—is the essence of paganism in the modern world. The man who buys a set of expensive rims for the SUV or yet another silly tattoo is a pagan. The human sacrifice that must be engaged is the sacrifice of the interests of his wife, family and those around him that might actually need that money.

All paganism is about sacrifice, though never self sacrifice. The ultimate pagan is the vampire: those who murder others so as to live forever. Capitalist speculation, whether on currency or commodities, is the institutionalization of vampirism and the apogee of an ancient Gnostic paganism that only communicated these things in symbols. Their fulfillment is the 20th century. Vyshenskii saw this clearly in the 1630s.

Monasticism is not a way of life for monks. They might live it at its highest level of sacrifice and

development, but it is not just for them. Sobornapravna is a “political monasticism.” Simplicity and directness is the “highest social truth.” He wrote in common Ukrainian – the Ukrainian of the common farmer. He was not addressing the nobility, he was speaking to the ordinary (though not the average) for the sake of education.

Modern Regimes use and manipulate abstract concepts like law. Law, it often seems, especially from the positivists, exists because it exists. A millionaire can convince himself that his money and power is “legitimate” because he “followed the law” in his accumulation. Serious and useful critical theory is being pioneered by this now forgotten Athonite who spared no one (including the academics of his day) in his contempt.

Law is a manifestation of justice. It is the “physical” manifestation of *Pravda*. If a set of laws, written down and passed “by the competent authorities” is based on falsehood, then it is not a law. Truth, when it is not written down or even accepted by most, remains a law in the highest and most useful sense of the word.

There is no distinction between justice, truth, freedom and law. They all imply one another. They are based on the “free will” in the patristic—and later Kanitan—concept of it. The will is not born free. The free will must be struggled for. It's part of what makes the monastic life so attractive. The free will is one based on no self-interest or other passion. Such a will then can only see the General Will in Rousseau's sense.

The General Will is precisely that “which is left over” when all personal interests and egocentric attachments are eliminated. Yet, Kant writes as if this is in the grasp of just anyone. The reality is that this is one of the most difficult tasks to accomplish. It is based solely on grace, working in connection with ascetic labors. The free will, in other words, can never be experienced by a man with a full stomach.

In his criticism of Kant, Vladimir Ern argues that, since the external world is phenomenal and the inner world is noumenal, two conclusions emerge: that no noumenon can be experienced and second, no divinity can be internally manifest. Fichte removed the noumenon from Kant, and from there, Ern states, atheism and, eventually insanity, is an easy step. Fichte took Kant to his proper conclusion, completely destroying the object. Meaning can only exist in internal categories; will alone remains.

German science is the very height of sophistication, says Ern in the early 20th century, and is in the process of creating a totally militarized state. The Germanic race and the state create a single whole. The guns created by Krupp's firm were immense and required tremendous cooperation; concentrated effort. They represent self-confidence, pride and the state as pure will. These are the Critique of Pure Reason on a global scale: no truth, mere will, albeit socialized and centralized.

Hierarchy and serfdom—in any respect—are inherently incompatible with Christianity. It is the negation of Christianity. A serf-owner cannot be a Christian. This includes the serf-owner of old, or the modern usurer who makes a profit on the sufferings of others. Paying workers the “going market rate,” even if that rate can suffice only for poverty, is also serfdom in a very real sense. The mere—and convenient—fact that this serfdom is not based on legal order means nothing. Capitalism, in its tendency to lead to larger and larger concentrations of power, negates choice, even in the simplest of senses.

The secular world—even by its own self-definition—is pagan. Modernity is organized and rationalized paganism because it is based on the manipulation of matter for the interests of the elite: money, power, reputation, imagery, machinery, control, sex – all of these about satisfying lusts. They never satisfy these lusts because their very nature is to never become satisfied. They always want

more. The modern world, Therefore, is chaotic elite, regardless of their origin, use universalist phrases like “human rights” to justify their control over property. The concept of “right” is used as an assertion to destroy any debate on a topic. If I have a “right” to something, then nothing can be said. The origin of these vaunted “rights,” however, has yet to be established. Kant's derived concept of “free will” might make some sense, but this too, is incompatible with modern capitalism and socialism.

Asceticism is inherently political. In social life, spirit and matter are forever at war. Rulers need to be tamed so their power does not become a fetish. This is a harsh and thankless task, yet, it is required. The removal of self-interest—especially among people and groups who always talk about “removing self interest”—is essential, and is almost an impossible task. Unfortunately, the alternative is oligarchy. Happiness is the end of social life. Its ingredients are primarily the suppression—or transformation—of bodily desires into spiritual ones. Christ was a homeless wanderer, Constantly attacked, forever hunted. He is the example of what the true prophet is. The university professor is the opposite – lauded, well paid, under worked, and self-centered.

The final purpose of aestheticism is the final purpose of human life regardless of our vocation – the participation in the divine energies. Grace is uncreated; it is the presence of God on earth, specifically the Holy Spirit. Asceticism purifies the mind and heart (in the hesychastic sense) so it can grasp what is already present.

But the Uniat Church was, for Vyshenskii, just another symptom of the disease of feudal oligarchy. It made no theological sense, but this was not its purpose. The Vatican was for Vyshenskii what it later was for Dostoevsky – a secular institution. It is a commonplace in textbooks of this era to assert that the “Greeks” “poisoned the minds” of the Ukrainians against the Latin west. This is

silly for numerous reasons: the Ukrainians had plenty of experience with the Latin's first hand, they needed no commentary. And second, Latin theology was fairly well known among Ukrainian intellectuals, few though they were. This assertion assumes that the Ruthenes were totally ignorant about the Latins. That was far from the case.

The concept of Logos and the presence of the Spirit as identical to the church were long abandoned by the Scholastics. Scholasticism led to the final denial of the Spirit in nature in the writings of William of Ockham, himself an eccentric scholastic. William was an important dividing line in western metaphysics, and he destroyed the rational basis for the church's power. Without William, there is no Protestantism – William, because of his extreme nominalism, was led to the conclusion that x is good if God commands it. X is never good in itself. In fact, nothing is, since nominalism rejects all necessary categories in nature.

William was a revolutionary and has yet to get the recognition that he deserves in this regard. The Latin west had diverted so far from their own ancient tradition that William was able to spend a career saying that God is not present in nature, and exists as an isolated being in the heavens. Making the claim that nature is “dead” is an ancient occult belief, since it implies that the elite then have the right and power to make it into whatever they want. The obsession with necromancy and death in general derive from this basic proposition.

Vyshenskii's concept here is that when grace is seen as created, and not present in nature (in one form or another), then God becomes irrelevant – at best, the “cosmic general” of Islam, isolated from nature and maintained except by an emotional subordination. Scholasticism created (or manifested) a concept of the church in Rome that God is power, not right. The slow decay into nominalism is easy enough to trace, but what is more important philosophically is that God was banished from

human life and put back to heaven.

The Athonite, hesychastic ideal was a direct and vehement attack on that concept. Logos is present and therefore, under certain extreme circumstances, heaven can be experienced on earth. From a political point of view, this means that theology becomes a method of control, not revelation.²⁷

Abstract theory can never be theology in any useful sense. Theology is little more than the experience of uncreated grace in the process of good deeds: prayer, struggle, instruction, service. Outside of this, theology has no real competence. Philosophy has an important role, and it can use logical categories to make sense out of certain actions of God. This can never, however, go into the “mechanics” of how Logos functions in nature, but it can make the idea clearer to those who do not believe or understand.

Valery Shevchuk, in his *Social and Political Thought in Ukraine in Late XVI and Early XVII Centuries* sums up Vyshenskii this way (translation mine):

1. Roman Catholicism is the union of a threat to the life of the Ukrainian people.
2. Higher classes of Ukrainian society (gentry and clergy) have cut themselves off from the common good; it is the nation that remains as the main bearer of the people's moral and religious ideal.
3. He rejected all forms of class rule, and therefore, a basic social democracy should be followed.
4. Ukraine has its own traditional system of education based on its medieval heritage.
5. The idea of the Ukrainian Church was

²⁷ For the above, see Shevchuk's introduction to Vyshenskii's Works.

proclaimed as Rus-Zion, or the new
Israel, based on spiritual union and
truly Christian principles.

6. Ukraine is inherently Orthodoxy, and
those who betray her are schismatic.²⁸

Meletios Smotritskii (d. 1633), prior to his own
“conversion” had said basically the same. Significantly,
both writers stress the social and political foundation of the
union; the dogmatic debates were well known. Smotritskii
was soon to go over to the union in desperation, but just
prior, he stated that it was Ukrainian people abandoning
their poor, sick mother for a rich stepmother. He wrote,
concerning both the Orthodox church and Ukraine as a
nation:

Woe is me, poor, miserable grief;
On all sides robbed ... hands in chains, yokes;
the neck shackles on their feet, the chain on his hips,
a double-edged sword above his head;
deep water underfoot on the sides of the unquenchable;
fire ... everywhere fear of persecution from all sides.²⁹

Meletios advocated elective princes and strict
educational requirements for clergy. His social ideas are not
that different from Vyshenskii the Athonite, as he sees the
Union gaining ground not of its own merit, but due to the
corruption and ignorance of the Orthodox clergy. He saw
new technologies and economic forms as coming into
existence only for the sake of gaining riches or reputation.
He stated that before any real science can be understood,

²⁸ *ibid*

²⁹ My translation, from Бабич Сергій. Творчість Мелетія
Смотрицького у контексті раннього українського бароко.
Монографія. За редакцією проф. Богдани Криси. Львів:
Свічадо, 2008

our own selves need to be ruthlessly examined. The evils and obsessions of the fallen soul inevitably project that onto the world as “reality.” This has come up before, and will come up again.

Most of the Orthodox writers of the era agreed that the Union was based almost exclusively on force, whether it be open coercion or access to greater social prestige. For even the best of intentions need to be scrutinized when considering motives for conversion, including Meletios' own. For apostates like Ipatii Potii or Michael Ragoza, their general tenor was condescending, since the obvious superiority of Scholastic thought could never be understood by the bumpkins in the fields. Given the condition of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and many of the Ukrainians, they were not too far off. Just as bad was the penetration of Gnostic and Judiazing sects into Ukraine that were filling the vacuum of spiritual life that the Orthodox church had left given its subject status. Hence, the role of Mohyla or Smotriskii has immense significance.

Cyril Trankvilion-Stavrovets'kyi referred to the Polish noble class as Babylon. In his “Mirror of Divinity” (1618), it is luxury and power that corrupt. The faith is found in the common people. To resist Babylon, there is “radiant Zion, the beautiful city, the heavenly Jerusalem, the Orthodox Church” (quoted from Shevchuk). But the church is not an establishment, “but is comprised of the chosen people from among the sinners.” Its role is to defeat Babylon through faith, not force. Given the state of the clergy at the time, Cyril makes it clear that bishops are legitimate only to the extent they do battle with Antichrist. Otherwise they are useless and hence, not bishops in any but a formal sense.³⁰

A real education, is not what the Jesuits had

³⁰ Кралюк. П. Мелетій Смотрицький і українське духовно-культурне відродження кінця XVI. початку XVII ст. Острог, 2007

imposed on Poland. Real education is based on three specific ideas. First, the concept of nature and morality in Scripture. The psalms, proverbs and the prophets are central here, since they are assumed by Christ's own work much later on. Second, the church as an institution that guides men to the presence of the eternally present uncreated grace. Third, finally, the life of our society, including what we would call today the "social sciences."

Vyshenskii also adds that, under the specific conditions of Polish oppression, Ukraine needs a "national" church. Ukraine's history is that of the Orthodox church. The oppression of Ukraine by Polish and Jewish oligarchy requires, therefore, a reevaluation of Ukrainian history and its contribution to the church as a whole. Therefore, the gradual readjustment back to the Orthodox faith requires a very specifically national focus.

Skovoroda: Metaphysics and Justice

Skovoroda, writing later, was less polemical, but fulfilled the views of Vyshenskii.

The universe consists of two natures: one visible, the other invisible. The invisible is called God. This invisible nature or God penetrates and sustains all creation and is and will be present everywhere and at all times—
Skovoroda

Skovoroda is not read by Orthodox people. They usually have no specific reason for this, but the Russian church went out of their way to repress his memory. Philosophers do not read or study him. Literary critics, unless they specialize in Ukrainian work, do not read him. When Ukrainian specialists mention him, it is usually philosophically uninteresting, since they are dealing with his influence. His system, one of the most profound in

European history, is largely a void.

Skovoroda synthesized Plato, Spinoza and Hegel within a Christian framework. This is his abiding achievement, and he is ignored for it. Like Nietzsche, he wrote in aphorisms and poems, rarely in direct expository prose.

Ultimately his system is based on the constant interplay between Logos and appearance. Logos is reality. It is falsely described as “Sophia” by the trendy, but Logos is the Form of Forms, Christ himself as he is manifest in his creation. Logos is Truth, yet it is generative of appearances that the world considers truth. It is relatively false. He writes:

All three worlds consist of two natures in one, named matter and form. In Plato these forms are named idea, that is, presentations, appearances, images. These forms are the original worlds, the primal secret threads penetrating and sustaining matter or shadows. In the great and small worlds the material appearance indicates a form or an eternal image hidden under it.³¹

³¹ From, Zakydalsky, Taras. *The Theory of Man in the Philosophy of Skovoroda*. (MA Thesis, 1965);

Also cf.

Marshall, Richard H., Thomas E. Bird. *Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles*. (Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1994)

Ciapalo, Roman T. *The Neoplatonic Dimensions of Skovoroda's Aesthetic Theory*. *Neoplatonism and Western Aesthetics*. Aphrodite Alexandrakis, Nicholas J. Moutafakis (eds). SUNY Press, pps 165-186, 2002

Klein, George. “Skovoroda's Metaphysics” *Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles*. Marshall, Richard H. and Thomas E. Bird, (eds). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, pps 223-239, 1994

In all Orthodox theology, God is present in creation. He is not “up.” Logos is the lawfulness in creation, and no Christian theology worthy of the name can dispense with it. The western church eliminated Logos from its vocabulary during the Gothic era, and only rediscovered it when the east made its reappearance in the western world in the 19th century. The protestant sects hold that nature, by and large, is mere dead matter. They are the prophets for gnostic industrialism and the recreation of nature in the image of capitalist elites.

“Matter” is actually nothing. It is not a substance in its own right, but only has the quality of appearing, that is, antagonizing the senses. Since there can be no proof that the senses pick up what is actually there, or, even more, that our will does not manipulate what we see, “appearance” is “nonsense,” in the vocabulary of positivism.

“Matter” in this state, is a symbol of our fallenness. Our estrangement from Logos, “original sin,” means that appearances are more vivid than Logos, and, much of the time, appearance becomes all that is. Regimes realize this and use pictures and picture-thinking (with their requisite emotional attachments) to create a reality that exists only in the minds of their servants and consumers. If anything, matter, in this state, is only a symbolic doorway to reality. It provides a tiny and incomplete glimpse into Logos. It is a set of codes that must be grasped so that Logos can show

Zakydalsky, Taras “Skovoroda's Moral Philosophy” Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles. Marshall, Richard H. and Thomas E. Bird, (eds). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, pps 239-250.1994

Zakydalsky, Taras. The Theory of Man in the Philosophy of Skovoroda. Master's Thesis, Bryn Mawr University, 1965 (<http://www.ditext.com/zakydalsky/skovoroda.html>)

Shubin, Daniel. 2005 History of Russian Christianity. Algoria Publishing.

itself, or be manifest to the simple, not the pseudo-intellectual of the modern age, who will never see it.

Appearance is not itself evil, but is normally a disruptive force for the majority of humanity, the veritable “swarm of locusts in stretch pants” that only know their will and passionate drives. The mediocre are content to live and die in appearance, in untruth, in living death. Logos is the reality of things, their common origin, source and telos. It is, in a sense, a partial revelation of Truth, but only for those who can see it. It requires true belief, a rejection of the world and ascetic struggle.

Man is the end and purpose of the natural world in the sense that his deification returns him to his proper place and role. Like any other created thing, man contains Logos, but the realization of that is impossible without grace. Logos is fleeting under the best of circumstances, and there is nothing easier than to let the flux of appearances flow over the soul, drowning it in meaninglessness. The natural world is a book of symbols, but so is man. Logos in man is found in the “heart.” In general terms, Skovoroda is the only orthodox writer to build an entire, central theory around this important idea after St. Gregory Palamas.

The heart is the center of man both in the qualitative and quantitative sense. It contains the mark of the creator, though buried under millennia of genetic error, habit and passionate stimulation. The heart is the ultimate ontological principle since it synthesizes all manifestations of Logos in non-human nature, but recapitulates it in man. It is the very core of human existence and, for that very reason, ignored by the bulk of humanity, including its religious leaders. It sustains the entire human composite, and, if rightly understood and activated, the entire cosmos, since it is the temple of Christ himself. Concerning the heart, Skovoroda writes in his *Conversation among Five Travelers*:

What does it strive toward? It seeks its

sweetness and peace but it does not find peace in standing still, or in being extended, like a dead body. This is alien and contrary to its living nature.

Thought, like a traveler on the road, seeks its own likeness among the dead elements. Its thirst is not slaked, but rather intensified, by ignoble diversions. It moves the more rapidly from perishing material nature toward the supreme divine nature, the beginningless beginning or principle, which is akin to it, so that having been purified by its radiance and by the flame of its secret vision, it may free itself from its bodily earth and earthly body. And this is to enter into the peace of God, to purge oneself of all corruption, to move in complete freedom and without obstruction, flying from the narrow limits of matter to the freedom of the spirit, as it is written: "Thou hast enlarged my steps under me . . . I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself." And David exclaims: "Oh that I had wings like a dove! For then would I fly away, and be at rest."³²

This statement is as Orthodox as one can get. Sweetness and peace are the forms of Plato, synthesized in logos as its generating principle. When it seeks after appearances, its thirst for truth is never slaked, but only when it reaches logos himself. Complete freedom can only be found in the immaterial, since the material world is

³² Skovoroda, Hryhorii: *Tvory v Dvokh Tomakh* (Gregory Skovoroda's Works, Vol I and II)

determined. This is the philosopher's approach to theology.

The depths of the heart, as St. Augustine writes, are not fully known. It is the receptacle of the divine Energies always present in nature, but only able to be experienced under grace and ascetic practice. It is the ground of both reason and will, as Logos is the synthesis of both as well as its final telos. One has no precedence over the other. Fallen man will place one or the other as the dominant principle, but grace alone can show how both entities imply each other and, in fact, become one object. The heart can either lean to the world of appearance or to Logos. This is a matter of will. He writes in *Travelers*:

Receiving this secret glory of the dark kingdom from one another, men, led by a spirit infected with worldly appetites, wander from the glory of the Light Divine which leads to true happiness. They have not entered into the heart of the sweetest truth, and their sinful wandering, in the words of Jeremiah, "is written . . . with the point of a diamond: it is graven . . . upon the horns of your altars." Whatever they say or do follows from this, since this primordial script cannot be rubbed out, or cut away, or destroyed, unless a man tries with all his heart, as God says to Paul: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood. . . ."

Gird up your loins, oh man, and arm yourself against your own wicked opinion. Why do you esteem the ways of the world? For you know that truth always resides and will reside in the few men enlightened by God; truth cannot accept the world. Bring before you the best painters and architects, and you will discover that truth in the

plastic arts is not spread abroad, but that the crowd is marked by ignorance and lack of taste.³³

Thought has one goal: to see the world of forms, synthesized in Logos, throughout all creation. Logos, in its various manifestations, is the blueprint of nature, its “plan.” This, under grace, is the same as experiencing the divine energies of the Spirit, the full grace of Eden and the resurrection all in one. It is the recreation of creation according to grace rather than will.

Skovoroda's metaphysics is one of the more interesting in the history of Ukrainian philosophy. Like so many others, he is misunderstood by historians who have no training in philosophy. He is mutilated by philosophers who have no training in history. Having neither of those handicaps, this writer will summarize Skovoroda's metaphysics as a firmly Orthodox vision of the world, and one quite convincing.

All that exists is in dual form. All is form (in Plato's sense), which generates the matter which appears. Form is Spirit, while at the same time being Energy. These are terms in the Orthodox lexicon, but not well known outside it. This is yet another reason why western historians fail miserably in dealing with such writers. Energy and grace are the same, it is the presence of Logos in nature. Logos is Christ in his divine nature, and contains the Forms within himself as divine archetypes that are imposed on the material world (which is also created and not *sui generis*). It might do translators some good to know these distinctions. “Spiritual” means “energetic” and is the manifestation and presence of the divine in the created world. This is not “pantheism,” since that would imply that the material world is God. It is not. It just means that the laws one observes in nature (as well as its manifest beauty

³³ *ibid*

and utility), exist because it is a partial manifestation of Logos. God is present in nature in the same way that nature herself is present in the human body. This does not imply that human nature is hence just another part of creation or identical to it.³⁴

Three worlds exist, interpenetrating each other. This can be oversimplified, but is merely an understanding of three ways that an object can be experienced and perceived. The three are the world of nature, the world of man and the world of Scripture. Scripture is the world of the church and its Symbols. It is not “the Bible” as many commentators suggest. His cultural milieu would have long taught him that there are no Scriptures without the church, and the church is the product of God's sacrifice on the Cross, but in more human terms, the writings of the church fathers and great ascetics. This is what is meant by “Scriptures.”

All three worlds are dual in that they made up of matter and form. Matter, in its “rough,” obtuse form, exists only because of the fall of Adam. “Matter” is that which appears., that is, that which is available to the bodily senses. Spirit of Energy is that which is comprehended or experienced by the whole man, not merely the body or mind. Spirit alone is real. Matter is the realm of illusion, especially when it is taken as self-existing.

Spirit is Logos. It is the second Person of the Trinity as an aspect of created nature, its Formal aspect. Spirit is Logos, and Logos is identical with itself. Therefore, as matter is multiple, Spirit is unity. Matter in Creation can take on practically any form, but it also can conceal form and act as just a provocation of the passions.

God, Logos, is the creator of appearances in that He is the Logos which generates them. This is part of natural law and hence is the indirect work of God. The traces of Energy and grace are in nature in that the logic – the

³⁴ From, Zakydalsky, Taras. *The Theory of Man in the Philosophy of Skovoroda*. (MA Thesis, 1965);

substantial form – is discernible in each object and their many relations. Matter is what is denoted upon perceiving anything. One does not “perceive” substantial form, but only experiences it. Matter is a Symbol—in the true sense—of God's presence in things. Its importance lies in appearing. Appearing is the communication of divine content to men, but matter is a vehicle in this case only. Matter is in the mind of God and is an aspect of his action. It is the lowest, however, of these aspects. It is not evil.

Form and Spirit can be distinguished not in essence, but in function. The Form is the formal, quantitative nature of the thing. Logos or Spirit is its vitality. These are not really distinct, but are separable in the same sense that nature's beauty is separable from the laws of its reproduction or generation.

Vladimir Ern writes in his book on Skovoroda that vocational life is the human version of the organic's place for each being. Nature is the expression of logos in that each object has its form, that is, its function. In a similar way, the inner heart can generate vocation. Symbols are guides for the mind because man is fallen, and the sheer amount of labor it takes to extract the spiritual principle in each thing is prohibitively difficult for day to day living.

When Skovoroda claims that all knowledge is based on faith, he does not mean “blind” faith, which is the default definition today in English. Faith is the attitude of the will, leaning towards appearance or essence. One's heart begins its development at this point. Happiness is the end of all knowledge or action. However, falsity leads to misery, as all thought is desire. Thought only exists because the will wants something. The highest desire is for Truth.

Objects never exist in and of themselves. Nominalism is false. They are all part of a greater system that essentially includes them all. The nominalist system

holds that they only accidentally interact. The Realist view of Skovoroda holds that objects in the world imply one another in an ordered system. Nominalism is the worst conception of reality – it deals only with appearances. Nominalism is the raising of falsehood to a science. Rather, for each of the six days of creation, there is a corresponding Platonic form.

The desire for Truth is a specific desire that comes from our natural constitution, but can be satisfied only through the divine energies. The desire for Truth (as such, rather than utility as a cheap substitute) as such cannot be a “natural” desire in the fallen world. Yet, grace is necessary. Outside of grace—that is, the church—people see only what they want, or what those in power generate as “reality.” There is no clear connection between what is “out there” and what people think they see. The life of falsehood knows no stability even at that rudimentary level. To lean towards appearance and matter is to encapsulate oneself in the lie.

Laws of nature have a purpose beyond themselves. They are symbols in the proper sense of the term. In English, “symbol” is almost synonymous with “without substance.” Not too long ago, this word has the very opposite definition. In Skovoroda's ontology, there are three logical elements to the symbol: The first is mere representation. This is not a symbol at all. The next step is the depiction of the essence of the object. Humans see attributes first, but for the object to be an object at all, it must have a purpose in the whole. This is its essence. Finally, the symbol is to discover and manifest the hidden meanings in objects.

Human reason can only be happy with Truth, at least because it does not change. Technology is a perversion of the natural order. It is twice removed from spirit, since it takes matter and creates a “new world” with it. It can only come with sacrifice and death.

Materialism never satisfied. Men always want something above and beyond the material.

Self-consciousness demands higher things. Things in accordance with its non-material nature.

Self-consciousness proves the spiritual foundation of life and knowledge.³⁵

Self-consciousness contains, in itself the natural law. Being “born again” is to be “initiated” into the Spirit. Striving for the Truth, Logos, that remains unchanging. Striving for Logos requires asceticism. Suffering has the purpose of permitting us to see the evil in the material world. Forces the will to consider the Spirit.

None of this matters unless it is connected to his ethics, his “doctrine of man.” Like Spinoza, Skovoroda spends quite a long time on other issues so as to properly ground the ethics, the real purpose of his writing. Like everything else, of course, ethics is tightly bound to his view of the world. Will comes before all. The will can “lean” to appearance, or it can lean to reality, or Logos. His is a strongly existentialist and libertarian concept of freedom not shared by Spinoza, from which Skovoroda borrowed much. The disordered soul is projected onto the world.

Skovoroda stresses that freedom and unfreedom are both inherent in nature, as spirit and matter are equally so. The former is Logos, or the presence of God in nature, acting as its essence, its form and final end. On the other hand, matter exists. Matter is not free. It is not evil in itself, but is the source of all evil when the human will identifies with it. This is the very definition of a “passion.” A drive towards an object that is not controlled by reason. A passion can be the drive for domination or physical

³⁵ Ciapalo, Roman T. *The Neoplatonic Dimensions of Skovoroda's Aesthetic Theory. Neoplatonism and Western Aesthetics.* Aphrodite Alexandrakis, Nicholas J. Moutafakis (eds). SUNY Press, pps 165-186, 2002

pleasure. Rationality, or that which is attached to the spirit, views objects as immaterial, as manifesting freedom rather than necessity.

The worldview presented here is about what derives from these two deductions of the “cogito,” both freedom and unfreedom. It implies that the human will is paramount – the intellect will interpret the world in accordance to its loves. Pleasure and control are passions, it leads to a worldview based on cause and effect, the necessity of the materialists. Leaning towards freedom is that of the spirit, or the will that sees nature as reflecting Logos, or the eternal archetypes of being immersed in matter. Matter here does little than act as a symbol that brings the intellect deeper and deeper into what unites all appearance. The intellect then seeks to penetrate appearance to grasp the essence. This is truth.

Right and wrong here are based on the will. Matter, if taken as the ultimate principle of the world, leads to a life of passion without end. The passions of hunger or lust are never satisfied. These pleasures are mingled with pain since the adept of this lifestyle realizes that the satisfaction of one appetite leads to another. Truth is the spirit – the constant struggle to rip the appearances and masks off objects to see them in the light of eternity. Right and wrong then are integrated closely with ontology.³⁶

The world of the Spirit is also, in Skovoroda's work, tightly connected with the concept of vocation. In fact, vocation is at the root of Skovoroda's thought and the main reason his work is so morally agreeable. The concept of a vocation is the “destiny” of the human heart. It is the purpose of the person in the broader society. The “heart” in Skovoroda is actually an ontological idea that integrates

³⁶ Ciapalo, Roman T. *The Neoplatonic Dimensions of Skovoroda's Aesthetic Theory. Neoplatonism and Western Aesthetics.* Aphrodite Alexandrakis, Nicholas J. Moutafakis (eds). SUNY Press, pps 165-186, 2002

thought, reason and will within each person. Like everything else, it is dual – it can reflect the life of passionate attachments or the life of spiritual reason.

Intellect is never isolated from the body and its affections. The intellect and will are so tightly bound as to be indistinguishable. If every object in the natural order has its place in the whole, then the place of each human being too can be grasped. A vocation is the internal destiny of the person in society. It is a combination of aptitude, attitude and social situation where a specific discipline becomes appealing. Vocations can include law enforcement, scholarship, the clergy, public service, education, or medicine. It is a general discipline that can insert the citizen into society as a contributing member. Justice is then a society where each person has the freedom to understand and act upon the internal inclination to work in the discipline appropriate to him or her. The greatest evil is coercion – where labor is forced.

When someone becomes a lawyer because it is prestigious or lucrative, then his is tantamount to forced labor. It reflects not the internal yearning of the soul or heart, but instead reflects the arbitrary bias of society. Alienation is the condition of this kind of coerced labor (Shubin, 2005). This is the day to day application – following the desire of the heart is the means to health. Coercion leads to misery and neurosis. In our daily labor, we are either following our internal destiny, our vocation, or we are being coerced by the market, family demands or an unjust economic system. This is how the rarefied metaphysics of Skovoroda or Plato can be easily injected into our daily decisions. Careers and work that are imposed from the outside are the very essence of injustice and depression.

Even more than this, the entire purpose of nature is to guide man. It is a forest of symbols that constantly remind man of his destiny and purpose. Philosophy must

constantly remain close to the world of actual living; actual decisions. In Skovoroda's case, its about the heart, that which maintains the entire person as a unity.

Logos appears in the heart in a different manner than he appears in nature. For most, Logos appears in nature as a merely quantitative thing. An object that can be measured as a matter of living law. The heart contains Logos as a person – an individual who “pushes” one to “lean” to the right direction. For the most part, this is dismissed as a psychological aberration and the will becomes focused on more prosaic, practical concerns.

Man is the “image and likeness” of God. The patristic consensus holds that this means, respectively, that free will and Logos are present in man in a unique way. Free will assumes and implies immateriality. Yet, that is insufficient to exhaust the Biblical idea. Logos must become present in a real way in the heart. This is a matter of struggle. It is not merely given.

The heart directs the composite, but it is not reducible to mere will. Will is only part of it. The “calling” is important. For Skovoroda, the heart contains a customized purpose for each man – a desire and ability for a specific vocation in the world. Following this calling is one of the most fundamental paths to happiness. God gives each man this path, though there is nothing necessary about it. It can be ignored completely.

Justice is defined simply: it is the system of economics and social life where each man is doing that for which he was called. This is deceptively simple. This does not imply a placid and peaceful society – since the critic is called to help the society dissolve itself. It is a constant war against necessity. It is a war against the prosaic. The evil in society comes for bureaucracy (in the broad sense). The constant drive to make society into a machine—rather than an organism—seem to be a built in destroy-mechanism in social life. The recreation of life into a machine is creating

the world in the image of demons.

The will and heart are the image for God in man. The machine is the image of Satan. For Skovoroda, the fate worth than death is being made into a machine, which is done through forcing people into a bureaucratic mechanism. Labor is not just about producing things, but also about living out a vocation. Men would work even if they had everything. They work not just to create necessities, but they work so as to explore their vocation. The refusal to work is a sign of intense alienation, since the implication of man's inherent sociality is that man works. But work for a man and a bee are very different things.

In his poetry and dialogues, Skovoroda saw the Enlightenment as “the Beast” prophesied in Daniel and Revelations. It is only in Christ that the true purpose of living is preserved, since the fetishization of technics will destroy man's relationship with the natural world, of which he is a part. The machine is the Judaic “tikkun olam,” or the fixing of the earth. Since the Talmudist is God (or higher than God since God is the mere chaos of non-being), he (re)creates the planet in his image. The Enlightenment, in many significant respects, is precisely this Luceferian and Promethean doctrine in action. The “machine” was brought everywhere: the state, the army, the church, the man. All was seen as a large machine that can be tinkered with in order to make it work better.

“Tikkun olam” should never be confused with the idea of moral reform or the “fixing” of the world by grace. Grace and the demands of human power are opposites. Christ reconstituted Eden by his resurrection. Skovoroda cannot even be approached unless that central doctrine is understood. The grace of Eden is present on earth, only to be approached by humility, repentance and asceticism (in a broad sense). This is the purpose of philosophy. This approach to philosophy cannot be more opposed to the

enlightenment and its Talmudic roots.

Above, the Kahal had begun to think in terms of the coming *mashiach*. That the *Olam Ha-Ba* was not too far off came from the immense wealth and power of the Jews connected to an ignorant and savage Polish elite. That the *mashiach* will be violent and a military leader of great skill and ferocity is a commonplace, but not universal among Jews. The *Olam-Ha_Ba* is a strictly Jewish world. Their enemies are defeated, impoverished and reduced to utter dependence. In very deceptive wording, the argument has been made that there will be no force used to destroy the *goyim*, though this is probably because there is no spirit left to coerce. That the surviving *goy* will merely “know” the truth is just to say that only one option will be available to them. This is the route to peace, in fact, the only one.

That this view began to gain currency in the secret life of the Kahal structure in Poland shows the level of degradation the Polish oligarchy had forced upon the orthodox peasantry. That the uprisings of the Cossack forces did nothing to alter this view of both Poles and Jews might suggest a strange obsession or neurosis of some kind that kept simple information from being processed, but the general trajectory of the idea is easily seen. *Khmelnysky*, the avenging angel, is the proper and just response to such delusions.

Christ's life was based on the rejection of such worldly delusions. You can not fix nature, since it is only grace that can fix the man. Nature is to be approached with humility, not with the implied superiority of the “*tikkun olam*.” In fact, it might even be the “foolishness” that is to confront the wise and powerful of the world. The Pharisees were arrogant, proud and self-absorbed. The “Law” was a mere means to worldly power and prestige. Christ's condemnation of this brood in the harshest of language should eliminate the popular concept of the long-haired hippie. Christ was harsh, difficult and unbending. Today,

He would be in a mental institution. In the Roman world, that institution was the cross.

The Jews at the time of Christ looked to Shimeon ben Kosiba as their version of a deliverer. No one denies his violence, martial skill, or utter loathing of the goyim. That this is a prototype of the Jewish *mashiach* should cause alarm and suggest and even greater argument supporting the Cossack resistance to this evil. That the 613th Commandment is to “destroy the seed of Amalek” is the proof text here. The Orthodox (really, all the idolaters in the Jewish mind, including Catholics but not Muslims) are this seed, and should be treated like any other enemy or idolater.

Since “antithesis” lies at the heart of the Baroque, Skovoroda loved playing with the concept of confrontation. The world was confronted by the fool. Christ confronted the Pharisees as the homeless, wandering prophet with a handful of followers, all of whom abandoned him at his arrest. Christ acted as a constant confrontation with the Regime: that unity of “private” and “public” capital for the sake of control and manipulation. The Regime is the same then as today: that eternal cooperation of Talmudic race-supremacy with pagan materialism. It knows no national bonds, rejects nationalism as such (except for its own) and holds to an onto,logy of nominalism: the state controls the isolated individuals in a Hobbesian sense. Individuals, of themselves, are powerless. Hence, the state has an interest in eliminating the (inconvenient) ties among people. Nations are the primary ones.

Freedom only exists in the realm of Substance. Reading the excommunicated Sephardim makes Skovoroda much easier to grasp. Spinoza's immense profundity has been deliberately misread to force him into an Enlightenment role. Yet, freedom alone can be found in Substance, not in the demands of the state, organized capital or currency. Substance confronts multiplicity, at

least from the point of view of man. Spinoza has confounded many, but his message was disarmingly simple: freedom is unity; death is multiplicity.

Multiplicity derives from our expulsion from Eden. It is at the root of nominalism, a concept Spinoza vehemently opposed. Spinoza found Substance (God, but only in the most extremely formal description) to be the sole source of Truth, and more importantly, happiness and satisfaction. Unhappiness is in the realm of appearance. In Spinoza's term, the error of taking the finite modes as "real." They are not. They are the nature of Substance in the "form" of appearance. Nevertheless, the truth of the finite mode is that it serves as a gateway to the underlying spirit that is All Things.

Substance, no matter how one tries to manipulate it, is not a physical thing. It is the spiritual source of all that is later interpreted (by us) as physical. Appearance is a symbol of a deeper reality. In the Realist (that is, anti-nominalist) approach, a symbol is the very nature of appearance. Appearance is a gateway that gives some hints about what reality is. When symbols are taken for reality, error, multiplicity and nominalism develop. Skovoroda's inner heart alone can grasp the presence of Substance, for it alone is akin to it (as it is in itself, not in manifestation).

Labor for Skovoroda was the link between the personal and the social. Vocation is essential to happiness: military, theology and farm life were the three categories of vocation. For the peasant life, the child sees the beauty of nature and family: this suggest a vocation. For the military, a desire to defend, to suffer for truth, a strong nature and tolerance for pain.

Labor based ob: personal qualities, work cannot be alien, labor brings joy, benefit the self and the whole, high quality. Hence, self-knowledge is needed. The social is mediate by labor; vocations merge with the general will. The guilds are the hypostasis of these vocations. Vladimir

Ern argues that love connects the heart to logos through labor. Scripture is Logos in written form.

Taras Shevchenko: The Prophet of Ukrainian Nationalism

When I am dead, bury me
In my beloved Ukraine,
My tomb upon a grave mound high
Amid the spreading plain,
So that the fields, the boundless steppes,
The Dniper's plunging shore
My eyes could see, my ears could hear
The mighty river roar.
When from Ukraine the Dniper bears
Into the deep blue sea
The blood of foes ... then will I leave
These hills and fertile fields --
I'll leave them all and fly away
To the abode of God,
And then I'll pray But till that day
I nothing know of God.
Oh bury me, then rise ye up
And break your heavy chains
And water with the tyrants' blood
The freedom you have gained.
And in the great new family,
The family of the free,
With softly spoken, kindly word
Remember also me.³⁷

This section does not pretend to give anything

³⁷ "My Testament" (1845) Shevchenko, Taras. Poetical Works. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1964; also Taras Shevchenko Museum. Shevchenko's Poetry (Online Anthology).
<http://www.infoukes.com/shevchenkomuseum/poetry.htm>

approaching a comprehensive analysis of the all-important Shevchenko, the most significant poet in Ukrainian history and one of the giants of the history of nationalist thought. It merely poses as a summary of his basic ideas as to what made him the “national poet” of Ukraine. The concern here is political, rather than literary, ideas. Shevchenko laid the groundwork for the remainder of the 19th and early 20th century in Eastern Europe: *Sobornapravna* and the agrarian nationalism that was to become the “Ukrainian idea.”

Like all important and outstanding writers, Shevchenko cannot be summarized within the gaggle of western, liberal clichés and labels. Such things are signs of amateurism. Phrases like “national-democrat” and “ethnic-socialist” go far, but they only serve as symbols – the gateway to a much broader and richer idea. Words like “national” and “socialist,” in themselves, mean nothing. They must be contextualized in the living experience of a people.

Shevchenko should be read in and from the backdrop of empire. Colonialism is one of the worst forms of social oppression because it creates a dichotomy between the rulers and the ruled that go beyond social status since the differences in language and appearance make it easier to treat subjects like animals. Exploitation is justified under the most trite of phrases and buzzwords like “progress” and “expanding market potential.” Serfdom, in the broadest, non-legal sense, is the economic correlate to colonialism. It is the treatment of human beings as a means, never as an end.

Shevchenko knew something profound about political history, something learned from his years as a serf – empires destroy the governed, not the colonized. If anything, empires create the conditions for a truly nationalist and socialist (in the best, idealist sense) rebirth of society. The empire, on the other hand, usually thrashes about for identity. Once the empire falls, the rump of the former

ruling *ethnos* then has no sense of themselves at all. Britain, Russia and Turkey, long after their empires have shattered, still have yet to articulate anything approaching a national idea.

The colonized, on the other hand, use their suffering in the construction of identity. One of the central concepts of Shevchenko's social thought was that the colonizer suffers as much as their victim – their very identity is bound up not with internal structures, but external forms of domination. Without the empire, the ethnic core must totally redefine itself completely, and that is a long and painful process of introspection.

Ukraine, similar to the “flight of the earls” in Ireland, saw its native aristocracy destroyed by the dawn of the 18th century. This destruction—if done today—would be cast under the overused rubric of “genocide.” The Polish and Russian aristocracy absorbed the Ukrainian upper classes and recast them. They changed their names and sometimes, their religion.

The loss of a native nobility can be understood in one of two ways: first, as a gift, as Drahomanov would say, since populism is already built into a society with few native aristocrats. The society can be remade upon independence as an agrarian and peasant state without a native aristocracy to distort the national idea. It can be seen as the populist dream since everything will be from the bottom up with no mediators acting in their self interest.

Second, it can be seen as a brake on independence, as Lypynsky would argue. It is a society with no real leadership. Peasants, for all their virtues, cannot run a state. Their work is hard and intense, leaving little time for political reflection. Shevchenko took the first of these, seeing poetry as a superior substitute for nobility.

Shevchenko believed in democracy, though not the liberal, atomistic variety. His phrase was a “national-

democracy” where representation exists because rulers and ruled subscribe to the same moral code. This is a broad idea that, at a minimum, implies that national opinion and legislation cannot be arrived at unless there is already a broad consensus. Law presupposes a consensus rather than creates it. Law derives from the polity and hence, cannot be strange or alien to it. This agreement cannot be “built,” but can be understood primarily of an explicit and detailed manifestation of the national idea, used to protect that same notion. It is articulated through the process of ethnic solidarity.

“Small-state” nationalism has a tendency to create national-anarchists, those who reject the state, or at least, a state that is disconnected from the ethnic group that created and financed it. People who claim to be “anarchists” have no concept of the “small state” nationalists who have developed in an anarchist direction such as Pearse in Ireland, Aksakov in Russia, or Herder in Prussia. The state, in these areas, does not create the nation, since nationalist writers and ideas were commonplace before the local state even developed in any modern sense. The *ethnos* comes first.

This means that the state is a late-comer than must do the bidding of those people who have suffered for its own independence – the *narod* in the true, non-western sense as a “people,” a community speaking the same language and acting in accordance with a basic moral consensus in a national religion. Without that, there is no community unless it is artificially created for and by the use of the elite.

Like some Ukrainian nationalists, the Cossacks were a “germ” of an ideal community – Shevchenko saw them as all that was left of Kievan-Rus. In a sense, the Cossacks too, might be considered a substitute for an aristocracy. They after all, called themselves “knights.” Like most writers in that tradition, what matters is

solidarity. Solidarity is the only efficient way to both create and enforce laws. Police and “structures” of coercion in general try crimes after they have been committed. They do not “protect” the population, but come into play only after a crime has done its damage. This implies that it is the community itself that is in charge of keeping the peace, not a professional security *apparat*. Peace assumes the existence of a strong community that can, informally, enforce basic norms of behavior. The *apparat* is a last resort. Once it ceases to be that, the society is already in an advanced state of decay.

The only “revolution” worth considering for Shevchenko is the peasant, “anarchist” and communitarian idea expressing itself in a legal order. Community rule and medium-sized peasant ownership is the only worthy economic goal. Revolution (in its normal usage) is always a problem. While always romantic and always forgetful of the death and dislocation it leaves in its wake, revolutions often have nothing to do with the causes they are formally based upon. Revolutionists are professional political leaders, not idealists. Revolutionaries, thinking that “history” is backing them and hence, they can never be wrong or excessive, can easily justify all their actions as they move into the mansions of the managers they have just overthrown.

Peasants, however, seem incapable of “revolution” in its modern, urban sense. The Soviet revolutionists' utter contempt of the peasantry is such that, when they take the capital city, they believe the revolution “accomplished” politically. The remainder of the country is presumed to be a mere appendage of the city bureaucracy. Revolutions are exercises in psychology and self-justification (if not self-idealization), far more than they are strictly exercises in political economy.

The concepts of “Liberty, Equality and Fraternity” are interpreted by Shevchenko as a manifestation of the real

Trinity. They are real, but not in the way that the revolutionaries see it. God the Father is the Substance (so to speak) the Ground of all grounds – the foundation of all Being. The Son is a manifestation of the Thought of the Father, and the Spirit the active love between Father and Son. Like the actual trinity, liberty and equality both derive from Fraternity in the same way. They are meaningless without their derivation from the Father and become “persons” only in relation. As most professional revolutionists refuse to define these terms except in the most vague and evasive of ways—which is part of their own revolutionary training—Shevchenko would not permit them to remain undefined or used without the consensus in which they developed. .

The Father of this trinity is “Fraternity.” It is the source of the other two, contextualized, goods. They are real only because the culture creates and develops them. Brotherhood comes first, and only within it can one discover a real, practical liberty and equality. None of these three entities are abstract and none are vague, but there must be a ground, and that ground is the nation. It is similar to the *narod*, or the simple, peasant population. They are a “people” only if they bear its marks: language, morals, religion, custom, experience shared over a long period of time. Without it, they are just a random assemblage of meaningless faces. A mass. Professional revolutionaries deal with masses, never people. The masses are seen by the revolutionist the primeval chaos upon which he places his label, which, always, turns out to be the party which controls the state. Ideals are gone except as justifications.

The Soviets rewrote and reinterpreted Shevchenko to make him into a Bolshevik. This is common, for both east and west, to take figures so legendary and important that their integrity cannot be impugned, and craft an argument that justifies the observer's own mentality. In the

west, Shevchenko is often seen as a “liberal” or “revolutionary humanist” without context or definition. For the western academic, every great writer is necessarily a liberal, since it's what made them great. This circularity is common in this scheme, but it is dishonest.

The village, in many ways, is both the “liberty” and the “equality” part of that trinity. There is no abstract freedom: only liberty, the ordering of the mind and “heart” according to the virtues necessary to build a thriving society. It is not ideological, but comes from the tradition of the village, a tradition that has maintained this long suffering people under the harshest of circumstances. This tradition has proven itself for centuries and is infinitely superior to any words or labels that emanate from the bureaucrats and parasites in the cities. This, again, is why the liberal academic will never grasp Shevchenko. Shevchenko writes in (1845) “My Friendly Epistle”:

Come to your senses, ruthless ones,
O stupid children, Folly's sons!
And bring that peaceful paradise,
Your own Ukraine, before your eyes;
Then let your heart, in love sincere,
Embrace her mighty ruin here!
Break then your chains, in love unite,
Nor seek in foreign lands the sight
Of things not even found above,
Still less in lands that strangers love...
Then in your own house you will see
True justice, strength, and liberty!³⁸

In the nation's experience can the goods of liberty be found. “Liberty” and “equality” are apolitical. They have existed in traditional form long before political theory.

³⁸ “Friendly Epistle” (1845) Shevchenko, Taras. Poetical Works. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1964

They are, simply, pre-political . But the pre-political resists labels and therefore, cannot be understood to be “anything.” It is literal “nonsense” in the ideology of the alienated positivist. The village takes its solace from its safety, its warmth; the “metaphysics of place” that permeates the poetry of Shevchenko that also resists easy labeling. Merely calling the villagers “ignorant” and “superstitious” makes it easier to dismiss and hence exploit them.

Social division – division of any kind – is the sin of sins. Liberty and equality admit of no division. Liberty is not freedom in the abstract sense. It is not the mere following of desire. Shevchenko was Orthodox enough to realize that this is little more than slavery, with reason trailing behind as a justification machine to be used well after an action has been committed. Rousseau's General Will, though not in an abstract sense, is everywhere in both Shevchenko and the best of the Ukrainian nationalist tradition. The General Will is the ancient concept of *sobornost*, but just not in the abstract guise of modern writing. The General Will is based on self limitation and humility. One is bowing not before the majority or even the unanimous will of all (a concept that Rousseau rejects clearly), but rather the *sobor*; a word that Rousseau knew because of his studies on Poland, the manifestation of the Spirit.

The *sobor* is an infinitely better concept of the “General Will” than Rousseau was prepared to give. It is not the majority demand, not less the will of everyone. Those were morally and philosophically meaningless realities. The General Will is the full unification of heart, mind, history, love, art, tradition, language, God, reason, history and poetry experienced as a single, Realistic entity that language cannot exhaust. Only those who are pathologically alienated or simply incapable of experiencing the Realism is this nexus will call it

“irrational.” The easiest and radically over-simplified way to grasp it is the warmth that derives from stability. The ontology and aesthetics of place. It is the unity of all personal and social faculties.

“Independence,” no different from Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, is also not abstract. It is very definable and so saturated with content that it too, falls under the rubric of *sobornost* or General Will. Independence is the destruction of empire, but it is not merely the absence of foreign rule. In the most general sense, it is the destruction, too, of dependence in all forms. Today, this would be smugly condemned as “autarkic” and, with that emotion-laden label, dismissed. But the elimination of dependence in Kant's sense (which, in that particular area, is in agreement with the patristic consensus) means the elimination of the passions in the intellect. Will cannot be said to be free unless it is denuded of all external drives and passionate desires. These things enslave the will, with the result being that the will demands, and reason then justifies that demand after the fact. Dependence is the perversion of the will. It has economic implications, such as greed above and beyond the basic necessities, but it remains a perversion of will.

Dependence is, on the macro- and micro-level, the manipulation of the will by passionate desires. “Passionate” here is in the Kantian and patristic sense: that which distorts reason and logic so as to pull the will away from anything that will keep it from its desire. Hence, it not merely distorts the will, but also the senses and the logical faculty itself. It will distort nature so as to force it into the form of its own demands. In a highly formal way, this is precisely the method of political and economic imperialism. Passions distort the reason and hence, the will. They are destructive unless kept in check. This is autonomy in an internal sense.

The obverse is community self reliance. The

“community” like all terms in modern academia, is perverted beyond even elementary recognition. The actually real, functional “community” is what the typical professor would call “hopelessly barbaric and reactionary.” What they mean by “community” is the state, staffed hopefully by themselves and their friends. Community self reliance is a central concept—at least its idea—in Ukrainian philosophy. It is a metaphysical as well as an ethical idea. A political institution in the neoliberal west cannot be an ontology – it is a utilitarian Panopticon for the sake of social control. In the east, these are manifestations of spiritual realities. Institutions mean nothing unless they conform to the cosmic presence in human nature. Shevchenko writes in his (1847) “It Makes No Difference to Me,” written while in prison in Russia:

In slavery I grew 'mid strangers,
Unwept by any kin of mine;
In slavery I now will die
And vanish without any sign.
I shall not leave the slightest trace
Upon our glorious Ukraine,
Our land, but not as ours known.
No father will remind his son
Or say to him, 'Repeat one prayer,
One prayer for him; for our Ukraine
They tortured him in their foul lair.³⁹

Independence is not just external independence, but internal independence, one made by a solid ethnic tradition binding all citizens together as one whole. Our personal desires as transfigured into the General Will, the unity of mind and heart so essential to *sobornost'* and its ancient pedigree.

³⁹ “It Makes No Difference to me” (1847) Shevchenko, Taras. Poetical Works. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1964

The community cannot be bureaucratic. Revolutions always, without exception, quickly develop routinized coercive institutions that have as their only purpose to justify and execute the misbehavior of the revolutionary elite, the new System and Regime, always imposing and displacing onto their opponents all the vices they themselves exemplify. If the community cannot govern itself, then it is not a community. Only a mass needs a state, since it has no internal standards except force. Community, in its true sense, contains all the moral virtues necessary for a rational, thriving life. It alone serves as the foundation of true civic virtue.

Rank and privilege are the utmost expression of alienation and the inability to love. The assumption that all human beings, by virtue of their appearing to be human, have the innate capacity to reason abstractly or love is an unscientific fallacy. It is completely arbitrary and unprovable. In this case, the Positivists will nod their assent to such twaddle though it falls under their selectively used concept of “nonsense.” Yet another meaningless label designed to humiliate and intimidate opponents rather than engage them. Bureaucracy, as Gogol spent his Petersburg years proving, is the final death of truth. There is no lower state. Anarchy will at least force people to take the reins into their own hands and forge some order. Bureaucracy atrophies human abilities to such an extent that only external rank and privilege remain – based on no objective ability whatsoever. Therefore, universities, legislatures, corporations and church bodies usually favor their worst members. As bureaucracies, they favor those who are not intelligent, but rather, those who are devious. These are what rises to the top and dares to speak in the name of “the people,” or “education” to justify their self-exaltation. Shevchenko writes on the concept of rank in his (1845) poem “Don't Envy:

Don't envy, friend, a wealthy man:
A rich man's life is spent
Without a friend or faithful love --
Those things he has to rent.
Don't envy, friend, a man of rank,
His power's based on force.
Don't envy, too, a famous man:
The man of note well knows
The crowd's acclaim is not for him,
But for that thorny fame
He wrought with labor and with tears
So they'd be entertained.
But then, when young folk gather 'round,
So fine they are and fair
You'd think it's heaven, -- ah, but look:
See evil stirring there ... ⁴⁰

Rank is artificial; fame is fleeting, and wealth does not speak to character. Yet, the empire values these things above all. Shevchenko, happy that Ukraine does not have its own aristocracy, sees ethnic membership and poetry reflecting that, taking its place and providing the society with its philosophical underpinning.

For Shevchenko, all precedes from Fraternity. But Fraternity is maternity and paternity. It is the family, the village, the nation. All three essentially feminine qualities stressing nurturing, warmth and security. The male, Cossack element is present primarily as a mode of protection, but never, in itself, as a mode of rule. Each nation is unique, with its own language (in the broad sense) and historical experience that has left its brand on the population. The mass *abuila* that might grip a society does not speak to the truth or falsity of its national idea, but the exhaustion of its people; its subjective state. Shevchenko

⁴⁰ "Don't Envy" (1845) Shevchenko, Taras. Poetical Works. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1964

saw that among Ukrainians, and, while understandable, is inexcusable. Ukraine is a colony because its people are too lazy to fight back. Yet, Ukraine is far from alone in that regard. The “official nationalists” of the “approved rebellion” are singled out for specific vituperation. Every unjust social arrangement contains far more false and showy “rebels” than they do true patriots and idealists.

Nations are mothers. States are step-fathers. Empires are step-mothers that have no love for their charges. Nations are collections of “linguistic units” that hold together its essential functions. The will of a single people can be manifest in its Singular self awareness. Not merely in relation to others, but also to their own vices and problems. There is never a nation of victims, no matter how hard some modern ethnic groups try to make that their (public) personage. The alternative is empire. The Regime speaks incessantly about “international fraternity” and the denial of “evil nationalism” without bothering to mention that, if there are no nations, then there is no imperialism. An empire is built not on the subjugation of nations, but on the “liberation” of “individuals.” Empires cannot withstand nations, so they create the “individual.” A gaggle of “individuals” is “the mass” and is, by this fact, alienated and weak. A true “people” is a nation; the *narod*, the *sobor*.

In his “My Friendly Epistle” (1845) and “My Thoughts” (1839) Shevchenko argues that nationalism alone can produce freedom in the true sense – the will as unencumbered by individual demands. It is the collectivity, the extended family of the *narod*, that provides the basis for solidarity. The result is that self-interest is constantly confronted by the objective needs of the ethnic collective; that every collective that has created the individual in the first place. The true prophet must favor his own people above all others. Solidarity can never be created by a vapid “universalism” (which is merely an abstraction), but through the suffering of one's own people. While the

nationalist always empathizes with the suffering of other nations, especially those who are colonies, he can only focus on that which he knows – his own. Love can only be to those close – friends, neighbors, compatriots.

Thinking is a powerful form of rebellion. Thought, as governments and conglomerates the world over have proven, is a weapon that under-girds all other, more physical, weapons. Truth, however, is an eternal problem. This is because Truth is almost always uncomfortable. The unfree will recreates the universe in front of him so as to more convenience justify the will's demands. In fact, this is the sole role of the intellect. When this universe is confronted and challenged, the truth of the matter can lead one to insanity. Cognitive dissonance is one of the main roots of mental illness.

In 1970, George Luckyj wrote a paper on the idea of the “Bastard” in Shevchenko's thought. Thinking on aspects of family make sense here, since the family unit serves as the archetype and blueprint for social justice in general. “Mother” for example is the village, the nation and the church, yet, at the same time, under colonialism and exploitation, this mother is raped and defiled.⁴¹

In Shevchenko's thought, the family is the archetype of all poetry. It is the archetype of all thought in general, since, following Herder, all thought must exist in language (language is a term that has a broader connotation in German than English). For him, there are two concepts of the nation: one as an external reality manufactured by historical experience and the other, the second, as an internal state of mind. This is a feeling of “home” when considering the life and struggle of a (your) people. Like any nationalist, there is no clear line of demarcation, as is

⁴¹ Luckyj, George S.N. “The Archetype of the Bastard in Shevchenko's Poetry.” *Slavic and East European Journal*. vol.14 no. 3; Fall 1970, p. 277-83.

normal and natural.

The mother, at one time, was a girl. In Orthodox Ukraine, this girl was innocent, brought up under the watchful eye of the church, the village and the family. Once these institutions have been harmed by ideology, poverty or colonialism, the girl is now vulnerable. In liberal modernity, public policy has explicitly been aimed to “liberate” the “individual” from the shackles of family and church. The consequent—intended or not—is that the girl now becomes an object for the desire of man, and has few protections against that well known predatory drive. Formerly protected by a complex, organic web of authority, she now, in her naiveté, turns out to be the plaything of the sexual revolution and those devious enough to use it to their advantage.

The mother, or the feminine is mother earth, mother Ukraine and mother Church. Industry, colonialism, the state, power, and economic slavery and dislocation do damage to, more than anything else, those interacting conceptions of motherhood. It leads to, for lack of a better phrase, violated innocence. The lead in to the “Bastard” is not difficult to deduce. Rape of various kinds (including economic and political) usually leads to Bastard children. Shevchenko himself remarks that illegitimacy on Ukraine under both Polish and Russian rule has developed into a serious social problem. This should not be surprising, because, once the social institutions that organically are connected to the farmstead, the church and the village have broken down, rape, and bastardy seem the normal conclusion. Rape here is the conclusion (along with illegitimacy) of alien, foreign rule. It is easier to dehumanize the foreigner, especially one you have been told is ignorant and illiterate, than anyone else. Ukraine, under colonialism, is a raped woman. A raped woman can only but produce bastards.

Shevchenko saw himself as a preacher of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. This was his own basis, one with its essential life (in an earthly sense) as a critical expression of the *narod*. Occasionally, a Soviet-era writer or American liberal will argue that Shevchenko was anti-clerical in his harsh words against the Russian church. This vituperation is not anti-clericalism, but an attack on the church serving the imperial, rather than the national, ideal.

Scripture (or more broadly “the divine writings”) were his essential source of reference. He focused himself on the prophetic message, inconvenient for the rulers but giving hope to the oppressed. This prophet will sacrifice his life and liberty for the sake of showing the truth to others. Another example is that of the Holy Family, sons of David that cannot even find a place to have their divine child. Worse, the evil of imperial power in Herod, fearful of his own authority, slaughtered thousands of children in hopes that one will be Jesus. The parallels are perfect.

Shevchenko saw St. John the Baptist as a symbol of Ukraine. The story of his murder is loaded with political and imperial imagery. Herod, another member of that pro-Roman, Jewish royal line, feared St. John as the possible leader of the people in the sense of one of the older prophets. Always worried about their legitimacy, stopping any coherent and realistic alternative to their rule was essential.

Herod Antipas was the son of Herod “the Great.” Herod The Great is known from the ancient Hebrew writings as the “mad genius” of Judea. From a family of converts from Central Asia, his legitimacy was in doubt due to his lack of Jewish ancestry. His colossal building program was part of this. The Jewish writings of the era confirm the Bible story of Herod's bloodlust, as he slaughtered members of his own family for the privilege of serving the Roman senate. The evangelists would be insane to make historical claims in areas that can be easily

referenced.

Given the above, his view of St. John as a revolutionary leader is founded on his own well known obsession about legitimacy. However, he did respect John. Rather than servile flattery, John was willing to confront the leader of the Herodian Kingdom, Antipas. Having married into the Arabic Nabataean kingdom, he soon fell in love with Herodias, the wife of his half-brother and mother to Salome. In Jewish law, even an “in-law” relationship is considered incest. He planned to divorce Phasaelis and marry Herodias. Salome used her figure and well played attentions to the Tetrarch to pursue her mothers dream of a placid royal rule. Without being reminded that both abandoned their spouses.

The banquet at which Salome danced for the king is a symbol of power: food in abundance, drink that eliminates inhibition, and its decadence were luxuries available only to the upper classes. As Salome got the drunk king to agree to whatever she wanted, Salome said, at her mother's bidding, that John should be executed. Reluctantly, he did so. Herodias had enough of John's claim of incest (after all, she was Herod's niece and granddaughter to Herod the Great) and wanted this prophet out of the way.

The symbolism here is tremendous: the powerful, following their lust in all things, became putty in the hands of a skilled manipulator. The same drives that forced a lust for power were the same that Salome could manipulate for her family's purposes. John's death is a direct result of this decadence. For Shevchenko, such reigns cannot last. The powerful will lose, despite appearances to the contrary.

The life of St. John, the peasant prophet, was one of asceticism. The fruit of their labor was taken and misused by others, leaving them with little. In Ukraine, Polish and Jewish landlord were dominant, and used every means to justify their immense holdings. This is part of what got St.

Arseny of Rostov placed in solitary confinement for life (see below). Polish serfdom was more violent than Russian, since the Polish aristocracy thought themselves racially superior to the “Slavs.” Like Herod, those with power are foreign, hypocritical and possessed of a narcissistic sense of superiority that, like all narcissists, was easy to question. His reaction was again, part of this willful drive to power. At the same time, it is John who won the victory in the long run and created a new epoch in human life. Today, the Herodian line is seen by Jews and Gentiles alike as a foreign and probably heretical client of Rome.

Herod is a symbol for both St. Petersburg and the collaborators in Ukraine. The latter makes sense since this is what Herod was accused of, and yet, it was an effective way to gain power. The Emperor was foreign and not even a Muscovite, but a Freemason educated in the German quarter of Moscow, soon to move the capital to the frozen north as a “window to the west.” It is the Petrine legacy that destroyed Orthodox Russia. Her church was almost secular, the state little more than interlocking bureaucratic offices as the city itself was cosmopolitan, abstract and without identity.

It is not Russia or Orthodoxy that was the problem, but the substitution of a foreign, highly Germanized bureaucracy in a foreign city that caused the destruction and havoc in Ukraine. “Russia” was neither the Petrine Yoke nor the bureaucracy. Russia as such, was a powerless peasant class that is comparable to, but not identical with, the Ukrainian peasantry.

Ukraine's chaotic state in the 19th century is a judgment, a punishment for three sins: first, Khmelnytsky's ill-advised union with Moscow; second, that the Cossacks sided with Peter against Mazepa and third, that so many of the Petrine “new men” were of Ukrainian stock. The punishment was Catherine II.

The opposite to Catherine was the Mother of God.

Catherine had no legitimacy, was foreign and a heretic on all counts. She gave Ukraine away to her favorites so as to solidify her rule. For Shevchenko, Christ cannot co-exist with this sort of serfdom, real or symbolic. Individualism, egocentrism, self-will and the desire for profit leads to doom. This world is to Christ the same as Catherine is to the Theotokos. To consent to this foreign rule implies the obliteration of the nation's history. Petrograd's alien and heretical nature reached its zenith in the destruction of the Sich and Catherine's later condemnation of the Haidimaky revolt against Polish lords. She even had the gall to say that, in reference to Polish and Jewish landlords, "their power is from God."

Why does God wait? His churches have been destroyed in Ukraine. Thousands of parishes and monasteries closed down in the 18th century and the imperial behemoth in Petrograd steals from the peasantry to satisfy its lust for dominance. Petrograd is about as Russian as Dusseldorf as her own actions show her occult mentality. The Cossacks were God's punishment on the arrogance of the Poles and Jews. In the middle of the 19th century however, Cossack degeneracy was a punishment on them.

Shevchenko's legacy remains as the national poet of Ukraine. His main contribution to the history of social thought is the fact that liberty, equality or fraternity exist only in the nation. Fraternity is to equality what God is to the world – its creator and sustainer. The nation is a mother, but in the case of colonial empires, it is a raped woman, treated as a mere object by the empire that suffers as much by its empire as the colonized. No lasting identity can derive from colonial rule. The only good thing that comes from it is that the colonized can use this suffering to build a strong, unified identity that seeks both internal and external independence. Dependency itself is an evil, bought to its highest expression in the idea of an empire. The nation

alone can create solidarity and the sense of oneness
deriving from suffering.

**Shevchenko's Pupils: National-Anarchism in the Social
Theories of
Mykailo Kostamarov, Mikhail Drahomanov and
Ukrainian National Idea**

*Nikolai Kostamarov and the Ukrainian Philosophy of
History*

One very irritating quality of liberal historiography is their sloppy reinterpretation of all non-royalist social theorists as “liberals.” There is no way one can make either of these writers into liberals. The liberal is inherently a nominalist, believing in the isolated ego as the primary measure of utility. “Rights” are also used to substitute for this, but all is subsumed under “free trade,” private property and justice as “procedures.” Ultimately, liberals are disguised advocates for oligarchy, as the modern liberal fascination with Novgorod and the Italian city states prove. Drahomanov, for example, was a Christian ethno-federalist and communitarian. These are the opposite of liberalism. The liberal tendency to “co-opt” all who opposed Pobedonostsev is dishonest and destroys rational thought about these complex theories and events.⁴²

One very specific element in Ukrainian philosophy is the social origin of all thought. This is common in both Shevchenko and Franko, and it achieved its theoretical apogee under Nikolai Kostamarov. The simple thesis is that philosophy is never idle and purely abstract theorizing. Philosophy derives from social problems and takes its peculiar shape given the local issues which form its context. The result is that true philosophy must be national as a result. Since the nation provides the language for all

⁴² All materials in this section derive from his *Collected Works in Ukrainian: Исторические монографии и исследования Николая Костомарова* (Общественная польза, 1872).

thought, and thought is bound by language, philosophy must, to a great extent therefore, become national.

Kostomarov's philosophy of history is also ethnically based. The three civilizations that helped form Europe was Old Testament Judaism, the Greco-Roman world and finally, the Slavs. These three civilizations made specifically religious contributions to European life, and their basic approach to life can be summarized in their religious ideas.

The Jews were truly God's chosen people. The Jews, both in Old Testament times and the present, spent more time being apostates than God's chosen. The prophets over and over again spoke of God's punishment on the Jewish race, finally destroying the temple altogether because the corrupted Pharisaical establishment did not recognize Yahweh in the flesh, Christ. In rejecting Christ they broke, this time permanently, the relationship between themselves and God. In rejecting Logos, or the expression of God, they developed a distorted idea of nature based on Babylonian alchemy and "science." It is from this rejection of Logos that has led to the amoral and revolutionary nature of Judaism. In Eric Voegelin's sense, the Jews became the very principle of "Gnosticism," or the desire to overthrow (or re-create) the Order of Being.

After them came the Greco-Roman idea. These very sweeping and broad ideas of history might be useful, but they all fall into the trap of wild overgeneralizing. This kind of generalizing seems inherent in the very concept of historical philosophy. Nevertheless, for Kostomarov, the Greco-Roman civilization failed because it never developed the idea of true, communal liberty. The Roman concern with bureaucratic politics forced the Roman idea to reject God, and, eventually, Christ in the Roman papacy.

These two great peoples are abstractions. In a sense, they are extreme ethnic forms, similar to his own view on the Poles versus the Russians. Each people, regardless of

the many levels of variation, show general markers of behavior that are historically conditioned. The monotheism of the early Hebrews and the legal mind of Rome are not exhaustive of these peoples, but show a general emphasis in terms of behavior that derive from specific historical variables. It is not so much to say that the Romans were purely and abstract legalists, but rather that the law developed to a great and systematic extent under and within the empire.

Finally, the Slavs became the chosen people of God, the “second Jerusalem” that was to introduce the final idea of history: Sobornapravna. For Kostamarov, the specific contribution of the Slavs was the proper love of God within the context of free, rather than bureaucratic, institutions. Ukraine specifically represents the “Second Jerusalem” (the response to the Russian “Third Rome”), avoiding the eternally persistent Roman pitfalls of state-worship and bureaucracy. Ukraine was the synthesis of Greco-Roman and Orthodox worship.

The Ukrainians were to create and defend the doctrine of Sobornapravna in the world as the final expression of the “world spirit.” In practice, this means that the only source of truth is to be found in the assembly of healthy people. Rousseau's general will continues to remain the formal essence of Sobornapravna, since the General will is never the result of mere voting, but is the recognition of the presence of Logos – the domination of the family and public institutions over private wealth and self-love. The folk assembly, vivified by centuries of oppression, suffering and resistance, can achieve the task of recognizing Logos as the Wisdom of the Father present in both nature and history.

In political ideas, Kostamarov holds that the folk assembly is the receptacle of the General Will. The prince has a function, but it is only to be the executor of the Will. Specifically, the prince is a military leader whose sole

function is to defend the society from external threats.

The ideal state for Kostamarov is based on the idea of election. Elections here are not the vulgar parliamentarian of the west. It is rather the perpetual expression of the General Will in choosing the various elements that will rule the society in those public areas where generally agreement is required. Both Rousseau and Kostamarov hold that the General Will is not the will of all, or the democratic majority. It is rather what the society, as a public thing, has in common with all of its members. Elections are the presence of the General Will in Rousseau's sense, not the whorish searching for votes and financial support so common in western democracies.

The type of government, that is, the specific nature of the institutions, can never be set in stone. They differ depending in the specific circumstances of a people. Russia required a basically centralized monarch to deal with the constant existence of external threats: poles, Austrians, Prussians, Swedes, Lithuanians, tartars an the ever present slave driving hordes coming from the southern Mountains. Under these circumstances, the Russian state required a strong monarch, a coherent law code, and the constant integration of the spiritual and political power for the sake of unity and social discipline.

Federalism for Ukraine is the second element of the ideal state. It is an expression of the General Will because it requires the public to be physically close to the centers of coercion. Distant, centralized capitals like St. Petersburg, under all conditions, are a parody of justice. It crates an alienated, separated and professional bureaucracy to arise that has no real contact or roots within the common people, or the Folk Assembly as its active element. Federalism is the same as regionalism, and is based on the simple principle that different areas of Ukraine, such as the ever exposed south, require different governing structures than the central regions around Kiev.

Trade, currency and law should be singular and central. This is to say that, despite the interest in federalism, these three elements must be the same for all. Law cannot affect one class of people differently than any other. Trade should be free, and the currency should be under state control and stable. The only purpose of a centralized state is for rapid and effective self-defense. While laws in their general, constitutional form are the same for all, the specific manifestations of that idea might differ from region to region.

In David sander's well written article on Kostamarov, he deduces the basic philosophy of history: history is moving towards the spiritual sovereignty of all ethnic peoples globally. Solidarity and a non-statist agrarian socialism is the best Constitution (that is, law in its most universal and rudimentary form) though it will always take different forms.

The rise of nationalism is the death-knell of empires. A strong nation, unified and under strict moral discipline is a stronger force than an empire. Part of the reason for this is that in a free nation, men are fighting for hearth and home. In an empire, soldiers are forced to fight. An empire is based on coercion, while a nation (in its ethnic and religious sense) is based on solidarity.

Kostamarov, a former serf like Shevchenko, saw Ukraine as the symbol of the world's underclass. Misunderstood and oppressed, elites have been co-opted, leaving an isolated and suffering agrarian class easy to demonize, mock and ultimately, eliminate. The familiar claim in the early 19th century that Ukrainian was a "peasant language" meant that it was a language for the ignorant, not for the westernizing new men of St. Petersburg. Such slogans were designed to justify the continuing exploitation of Ukraine both as a land and a people. Throughout the world, the self-serving belief that the agricultural classes are simpletons and ignorant exist

primarily to justify their continual exploitation by the urban elites.

Among Ukrainian writers, Kostamarov is one of the rare specimens who justified Russian intervention in Ukrainian affairs after Khmelnytsky. Two factors went into this argument: first, the existence of the unia and the slow denationalization of the country under Poland and second, the failure of Doroshenko's move to Turkey. It might also be said Mazepa was also a failure, since he sided with Sweden and was crushed. After these jarring experiences, joining with Russia as a pan-Orthodox global movement was the only option for Ukraine, for all its problems.

Kostamarov's ethnic populism, like Drahomanov's, was based around the significance of folk ideas in developing the General Will. With some exaggeration, it might be argued that the entire concept of Sobornapravna is about the folk, expressing itself over the centuries in popular ballads, art and poetry, formalized into a "political program" through the General will. In other words, that the General Will is best understood by looking at the basic structure of folk poetry as it developed over the years. It became, so to speak, the public persona of the Ukrainian peasant.

As a historian, Kostamarov put together one of the best known typologies of Ukrainian history. The Genesis of the Ukrainian People is a landmark in Slavic history. The development of the Host was due to feudal misrule, especially the imposition of serfdom upon a free people. It is the lay element that will bring about Slavic unity.

For Kostamarov, the Christian faith is at the center of ethnic identity. The Host, Ukraine, Lithuania, and Poland are all Christian nations, which serves as the cement to a coming federal union of Slavic states.

What is interesting here is that he deals in sacred history rather than more recent work. After the Expulsion from Eden, men gradually forgot about God and his

attributes. Man became fragmented, earthbound, unable to rise out of his utilitarian concepts. The “gods” are fashioned from Titans. These are people, but the powerful, those with money, that act as gods were thought to act. They are Titans because they force order on chaos. From all this, class rule is created and society begins to divide.

The coming of Christ was about reconnecting the lost, nominalist soul to the divine. Each nation has a specific calling stamped on it by circumstance. Kostamarov and Drahomanov see this as ethno-federalism modeled on the Cossack Host. Ukraine's distinctiveness in history is the strength of the Host. There is a rough equality on the steppe, but one that requires strong communal structures to navigate.

It is the noble class – not the royal – that stands in the way of Ukraine's destiny. Ivan III and Basil III, culminating in Ivan IV were for him a strongly positive development. Russia was well organized precisely in that the strength of the crown could overwhelm the nobles. Further, local and tribal democracy never died out, and the Duma became the “bureaucracy” of the realm. Kostamarov finds little to argue with here. It rests upon the slow dismantling of the Golden Horde on the one hand, and the local freedom so essential to the Muscovite period.

Since Ukraine has no noble class, she is spared this parasitic growth. Federalism should be the representative agency for all regions. Federalism is crucial, for only there can local Duma run the society rather than a distant, centralized system. Bureaucracy is for Kostamarov, a continuation of the noble misrule of the Slavic world. It is Ukraine's mission to challenge it.

Four Basic Elements of Kostamarov's Idea of the Folk

The Church. Orthodoxy in the folk poems centers around the suffering Christ. This makes sense, since Ukraine for so many centuries existed under foreign rule.

God is in control, and thus, suffering comes from Him. This does not mean that God is evil or a-moral, but rather than suffering exists for a greater good. Suffering, if understood correctly, is never meaningless, but creates a purified society capable of independence and moral solidarity.

The symbol of Ukraine is the Mother of God, representing Ukraine's fertility and the connection among national ideas, the peasantry and Logos theology. Ukraine is a mother to her children, a theme of great importance to Shevchenko. This implies further that the family remains the basic unit of society, and social institutions are extensions of the family unit.

Nations come to exist naturally as groups of people, in fighting external elements, develop defense mechanisms that assist in their self-preservation. Once this proto-nation forms, intermarriage is far more common within it than without. This leads to a nation with specific physical and linguistic characteristics. All derives from Logos as the Wisdom in and of nature. Nature reflects God's wisdom and love. Birds specifically play a great role in Ukrainian folk poetry. Folk symbolism uses the image of the Hawk to represent Russia, while the nightingale represents freedom.

A common myth is that peasantry are neither political nor national. This is little more than academic, cliché, liberal wishful thinking. The fact is that in Ukraine, the folk songs and art are strongly ethnic and national. They are deeply historical. The Cossacks play the chief role in folk thought and the embodiment of the national and ethno-religious ideal. More than anyone else, the Turks and Jews are loathed as the enemies of Christ, of Slavdom and justice. While occasionally anti-Russian, the strong religious element of this folk poetry rejects the attack on an Orthodox people. It is the non-Orthodox peoples who are considered the most obnoxious. Military campaigns, uprisings and similar violent, political events are celebrated from both an ethnic and a religious point of view. To hold

that the Ukrainian peasantry is non-national or indifferent to ethnicity is absurd.⁴³

The Cossack, again, is the apogee of Orthodox chivalry. They, at their best, are knights in the true sense in that they care not for death, but only for the good of Ukraine and her Orthodox people. The family, both as an organic reality and social metaphor, is central. This also leaks into the idea of the nation, since the nation is seen as an extended family with some biological roots. Woman, as in Gogol, is the nurturer of the nation and a symbol for the fertility of the soil. Woman is the metaphor in the expanding circles of family, clan, village and nation. These are natural outgrowths of the simple family unit. It is Logos manifesting itself in biology as a “hint” of the nature of justice. For the folk poets, death is always better than occupation or slavery. Death is not necessarily a bad thing, but is a sign of heroism, fraternity, glory and self-sacrifice.

What holds these 4 elements together is the concept of ethno-nationalism as identical with local Orthodoxy. There is little in the Ukrainian folk idea that is more comprehensive and omnipresent as this. If the family is the center of all life and a potent symbol of woman, than the Ukrainian nation and its Cossack protectors are merely an extension of the same idea. Political issues at the folk level are family squabbles. Ultimately, the folk poetry of Ukraine seeks the defense of motherhood. Shevchenko centers much of his work around this idea of motherhood: mercy over law, solidarity over individualism, security and warmth over rationalism.

While the Brotherhood treated here lasted a bit over 18 months, its impact on Slavic and more specifically, Ukrainian ideas is immense. The primary idea of the Brotherhood was a Slavic federation based on ethnic and

⁴³ Исторические монографии и исследования Николая Костомарова (Общественная польза, 1872) contains all his historical and ideological works

non-statist unity. Ultimately, it was the political vision of *Sobornapravna*: the rule of the local community and its tradition. More abstractly, it was about building justice, freedom and equality through the Christian virtues.

For the Brotherhood, Ukraine was in a particularly good position to show the world how to rise up from serfdom and to promote the anti-colonialist nationalism so central to Ukrainian social thought. Serfdom was the single greatest issue – it needed to be destroyed by any means necessary. It was a dehumanizing form of life that was not essentially different from slavery, especially in the Ukrainian context. Serfdom will meet its end outside of political work, with the development of education and literacy among the agrarian peoples of the country.

The Brotherhood associated Freemasonry with the entrenchment of oligarchy, especially the arrogance of the urban, often foreign, forces against the peasantry. Ultimately, the Christian virtues to be developed in opposition to usury centered around the solidarity brought about by linguistic unity, in the broad, cultural sense of the term. Independence, in other words, is to be brought about through ethnic solidarity, which, for them, was the only realistic source of political unity and identification. From this, the Slavic federation would rise from the bottom up. Each Slavic ethnic group would remain within her own borders, and all forms of imperialism, economic and political, were condemned. This was a humane form of nationalism that treated the state as a necessary evil. The nature of solidarity was the source of law and right, not the infamously Petrine reasons of state.

Since Ukraine was an agrarian country oppressed by the urban centers, her nationalism developed in a strongly agrarian direction. This kind of agrarian and communal equality would become Ukraine's specific contribution to the new European order of independent, strong and proud national societies. The singular virtue governing relations

among the ethnic communities was mutual respect. Without exaggeration, the famous membership of the Brotherhood—including Shevchenko and Drahomanov—sought a recreation of the Greek polis, the city state and its “face to face” democracy. The basis of a real Sobornapravna, not the “parliamentarism,” of republican oligarchy.

The basis of political authority, according to other members of the society like Gulak, was paternal. The family is the basis of Sobornapravna and other social associations are expressions of it, but of course without the blood relations. The basic unit of society was the family, expressed in the extended family, the guild and the ethnic group itself. Social units are legitimate if and only if they derive from the basic organic family structure. Society is a large, ethnic organism, not a machine. The basic political unit of society is the local community – a Rousseauian society where the general will rules through the local council. This is the essence of Sobornapravna – the General Will in the literal, metaphysical sense of the world.

For the Brotherhood, the old society of Kievan-Rus was at the root of modern reform. Rus' was a mixed policy of prince, assembly and a military aristocracy checking each other. It was non-bureaucratic and Therefore put a premium on the organic development of social forms. The Brotherhood was a clear manifestation of political hesychasm: the dominance of the heart as the symbol for the unity of all faculties: will, reason, faith, devotion and love. One of these had no right to dominate the other. They all had their own sphere of competence. Combined, they create real, holistic personhood.

All men have the right to own property. Power and influence in society can never be based on it, however, and only merit, holiness and experience can be the basis of power. Materialism is the greatest of all evils, since it creates empires out of ethnic groups and ethno-states. The law of Christ in the gospel should transform the nations.

This was a utopian group that sought to finally bring Christ down to societies, to transform politics into ethics. In a real way, Kostamarov and others saw the Cossacks as the real model for modern democracies and community. Stateless and based only on military merit – they showed that the modern state was not necessary for freedom, real democracy and property.

The Brotherhood held that the slow absorption of the aristocracy into both Russian and Polish ethno-states was a very good thing for Ukraine – her rebirth can start from the ground up; it is based on the peasantry and not the arrogance of the oligarchs. All citizens have the right, by virtue of citizenship, to economic development and property. It is not merely up to the market, but part of the ethnic tradition of the agrarian life.

Drahomanov, in the draft constitution he wrote up developed a strong sense of economic justice. Local control over industry and landownership was central, and local community meetings are the real, Rousseauian legislature. The local assembly sends delegates to the communal, the communal to the *volost*, the *volost* to the district and that to the national organization. Highly limited in power, the state is based exclusively on the local communities and their general will. Working hours should be highly limited, and boards and committees should be appointed to deal with all labor disputes.

Drahomanov and National Anarchism

The centralized, modern (and modernized) state is capable of murders and killings on a colossal scale. The massive mobilization of resources permitted bureaucratic operations that take the anti-social tendencies of politicians and give them a systemic organization. Modern apologists and supporters of the state have yet to deal honestly with this fact.

Proudhon was able to take the best of modern

communitarianism and eliminate the worst of the modern state in to a usable and actively suppressed revolutionary doctrine. The right has never dealt with it, the left suppressed it as “utopian.” Drahomanov was given the same treatment. At the same time, the “producer’s associations” of Proudhon, according to Drahomanov, required an ethnic connection to hold them together into a cultural unity. Socialism failed on the levels of cultural unity on the one hand, and economic determinism and “superstructure” speculation on the other. The fact that Ukraine was a part of “western Europe” rather than Eurasia led to substantial ideological consequences.

Drahomanov's political epistemology negated the nature of ideology. Socialism was an attitude that was capable of being united to any specific agenda. The Russian “social democrats” were as imperialists and culturally negationist as the monarchy. Progress was another ideological buzzword that could be united with any approach to politics whatever. What really mattered was the unity of oppressed peoples against their colonial overlords. Colonialism was the negation of all liberation, whether psychological, religious, national or economic.⁴⁴

He never grasped the idea that nationalism, as the modern supporters of “progress” incessantly claim, can ever “hate” anyone. Not only is that a largely definition-less, empty word, it seemed to him that the imperial mind, regardless of its ideological cloaking, viewed itself as inherently superior to the colonized. Nationalism negated meant that peoples could be colonized without moral harm, since nations do not exist. If nations do not exist, than neither does colonialism.

The famed Ukrainian historian Dmytro Doroshenko

⁴⁴ Rudnynsky's Symposium on Mykhaylo Drahomanov. Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1952 was essential; also Ukrainian Statehood in the Twentieth Century: Historical and Political Analysis. Kyiv: Political Thought, 1996

wrote a piece on Drahomanov as a “pan-Russian” figure whose philosophy of history was based on the meanings of folklore. Folklore is a reliable indicator of popular ideas and opinions largely ignored by elite, urban historians and linguists. In fact, the historical establishment has gone to great lengths in the 20th century to separate nationalism and a political idea from folklore. Even more, the rejection of ethnic nationalism by the elite (of all major western ideologies without exception) is merely a “fancy” way of rejecting the ancient concepts of the people in favor of fashion ideology. For Doroshenko, Drahomanov was a powerful philosopher of history because he refused to follow long: for him, popular history was history.

In Drahomanov's own research on folklore, he discovered the most important themes from all over Ukraine. First, ancient battles against the Greek empire. Second, the more recent Hadimak rebellions against the treaty of Andrusovo. Third, anti-Turkish, anti-Polish and anti-Jewish songs abound. The first two are political, the last, economic, Jews are associated with Polish oligarchy and personal arrogance, and more, specifically, as tax gatherers. One point he makes consistently is that while love songs abound in Ukraine, few are found in Russia. More than anything else, the peasant songs show a loathing of foreign occupation. He also notes that, while the songs are very different between Ukraine and Russia, they are very similar between Ukraine and Belarus.

While many often overlook the implications here, they are enormous. Most importantly, they show a fairly coherent and defensible conception of justice and the political order. It is common to reject peasants as politically inert or even “ignorant,” the massive number of folk-songs discovered and recorded by Drahomanov show a different story. Also, that these peasants were clear, unambiguous nationalists. While this angers the present academic elite (where supporting European ethnic nationalism will get

you quickly fired), Drahomanov proves, with a massive amount of empirical evidence, that peasants throughout Ukraine and Belarus are firm nationalists in an ethnic and religious sense. They often combine the two for a very rich concept of Ruthenian nationalism held by the peasants long before they were compiled by intellectuals.

It also shows what peasants throughout Europe have shown. The popular vision of the Jews is uniformly hostile. The very fact that there are no ethnic groups in Europe who have a different view of the Jews leads to the following conclusion: Either a) this is a massive coincidence (which is the official academic position) or b) the Jews did quite a bit to earn their horrific reputation. The latter is the only historically defensible position. It is quite amazing to see how all historical methods of inquiry get through out the window as soon as the word “Jew” is mentioned. Even more, the academic establishment in history and political science, in their energetic scurrying to defend the Jews regardless of evidence, are quite willing to call peasants “ignorant hicks” so as to defend the Tribe. Drahomanov shows what the evidence is on this score. His findings are identical to similar studies of folklore throughout Europe, the Middle East and even North Africa. This represents one of the most amazing coincidences in all history.

Without folklore, Drahomanov argued, history is merely a chronicle of elites and their agenda. Little has changed in 2011. even folklore itself, now comfortably institutionalized in the academic setting, has lost its purpose. It is meant to ground the national idea of a people on its popular—rather than elite—setting. Yet, Doroshenko, himself a potent philosopher of history, holds that this can be taken too far.

The Cossacks are a case in point. The Ukrainian debate over the morality and significance of the Cossacks remains as alive as ever. For Doroshenko and Drahomanov, the Cossacks represent the best in Ukrainian life. But this is

a far cry from holding them as the veritable icon of the nation. Cossacks were as much a drag on the national idea as its most ferocious promoters. Doroshenko stresses in his own historical writing that the Cossacks were not a populist movement, and only used nationalist arguments when it served the interest of its leadership.

The Cossacks are a philosophical concept. They represent an older, pre-statist political organization. For Doroshenko, such concepts must be described by their social context. That context should take the following variables into consideration: population growth, economics, the social and political order, popular ideas, and the level of education at the time.

Ivan Rudnytsky claims that Drahomanov engaged regularly in the constant dance of local collective and individual wills. This is a familiar dance, but ultimately, finds its more philosophically satisfying conclusion in Proudhonian federalism and ethno-anarchism. The decentralizing ethic of Drahomanov seems to settle this perennial problem of the “individual” in the same way Proudhon did. The fact is that Drahomanov and all honest political writers of his day cannot condemn centralization and rejoice in the French or English revolution. These all led to large bureaucratic states dedicated to the exaltation of the middle class. It always and under all circumstances bears mentioning and repeating that the bourgeois and middle class life developed in a revolutionary milieu that was anti-Christian anti-ideal. The present attempt for these middle class “conservatives” to redefine the term to actually refer to one of the most radical transformations in western history is too large a fraud for even a book to analyze. The reality is that the greatest, most powerful and most centralized states are republics. Therefore, Drahomanov and Proudhon needed to reject them as models.

The concept of “the individual,” whether of a

person or object, is one of the weakest ideas in philosophy. To take this as the central element of philosophy is to begin deep into a conceptual whole, to lose before one even starts. Drahomanov may have had the “individual” in mind as an end, but it only becomes such in the collective.

The individual, to the extent that such an abstraction can be justifiably used at all, has suffered under the imposed “progress” of centralized republics. Progress is really not about technology or science, but rather morals and approaches to nature. Technology might serve as the “material substrate” of progress, its impact is found most potently in the world of moral thought. In this case, “progress,” as defined by western radicals, has been almost entirely destructive.

Progress at the time of Drahomanov's writing remained moral. For him, progress should be redefined to reflect the clear moral change that it always carries, but rarely faces. Progress in the 19th century, or so Drahomanov argues, should be based on the communal liberty of oppressed peoples. That is, a) that liberty should be redefined as a communal property and b) that it should spread to all those societies currently under colonial domination.

Socialism is the final goal of progress. For Drahomanov, socialism is the condition of national, ethnic and non-statist communal liberty. Like many anarchists of all varieties, socialism erred in the 19th century by associating itself with the state. Its association with Judaism is in part, responsible for that. Drahomanov seems to strongly imply this when he holds that 19th century socialism mostly derives from and is supported by those overwhelmingly not a part of the working class. For them, the intellectual and the Jewish street-agitator, the working class is an ideal without empirical content or a code word for “Jewish emancipation and dominance.” That the proletariat was secretly the Jews and the bourgeoisie the

gentiles is not unknown in socialism, and finds its greatest expression in Moses Hess. They have hijacked communal liberty for their own ethnic purposes. More importantly, Drahomanov's philosophy of history is that ethnic nationalism unifies with anarchist socialism to create an ethnic-anarchism. Social and communal liberty is the goal, but these things can never be abstract: they find their terminus in the ethnic tradition. Government, if that abstraction itself can be used, needs to be “sunk” into the locality. This requires a great degree of decentralization. Zit is the heart of anarchism in both its Rousseauian and Proudhonian variety.

Even more, the ethnic-anarchist, including luminaries like Ivan Franko, would not promote the idea of “economic determinism.” this is a cardinal principle of Marxism (though it can be exaggerated). Ideals are the engine of history, though to eliminate economic conditions both for the origin and reception of ideas would be absurd. Even the cut and dry collection of people into classes contains a great degree of arbitrariness. Workers, though important, are only a part of the truly “progressive” forces.

For Ukraine, the “death blow” was the ability of Catherine II and her successors to permit Cossack elders to own serfs under Russian protection. This policy eliminated the Cossacks, in themselves, as a truly progressive force; a role they had played for many centuries prior. His phrase was that Ukraine is a “white Africa” where the wealthy hunt for slaves. What makes this particularly difficult is that owner and serf are identical in race, ethnicity, language and religion. It is an abomination, a form of cannibalism.

Importantly, the role of intellectuals needs to be controlled. Political forces are often seen as the plaything of intellectuals, especially urban ones alienated from the life of the typical Ukrainian, who is a man of the land. Intellectuals should be kept on a short leash in the sense that they must be tightly integrated with the people they

hope to “inform” with their ideas. Scholars are useful in working out the problems in social life and theory, and bringing the two together. But the day to day must be in the hands of those it affects.

The development of the “libertarian, communal nationalism” of Drahomanov is based on a philosophy of history from paradise to the development of Slavic Orthodoxy. In brief, the break of man from paradise led to what is commonly known as 'Persian Dualism.’’ the unreflective unity in Paradise was doomed to fail; it was innocent rather than reflective. Dualism came to recognize a fundamental shift in cosmic ontology as “good” and “evil,” or Cain and Abel fought one another eternally. The final gnosis of this Persian paganism is that good and evil are one and the same, since they require one another to identify the other. They dialectically create a new reality of the New Man of Nietzsche.

From Dualism came the reintegration of reality at Chalcedon. This reality slowly developed within the church's own dogmatic and liturgical structure until the imminence of Logos could be seen clearly. Plato's forms were brought down to earth in the person of Christ, and, after the Ascension, continued in the sacraments.

The final synthesis is the communal Christianity of the Slavs, Sobornapravna, combining matter and spirit in harmony. Popular will does not promote freedom; total unity does not promote it either; only a balance between the two can work. Hegel's concrete universal, in all its theological and social implications, is the goal of history.

*Panteleimon Kulish and the Development of a
Ukrainian National Socialism*

Panteleimon Kulish is one of the more interesting Ukrainian social theorists of this era. Contemporary with Drahomanov (d. 1897), he was the most pro-Russian of the Ukrainian autonomists, but his agrarianism and Spinozistic

mysticism places him within the tradition of Skovoroda and hesychasm.⁴⁵

Private property for him is similar to the modern yeoman idea in that independence is not merely a formal freedom, but a lack of dependence on banks, states or global economies. It is the simple localism and mystical Orthodoxy that makes a happy life, and it is precisely this that modernity and empire destroy.

Nature was the domain of logos, yet only the sensitive can grasp it. The rise of empire in Russia was based on the Mongol domination of Moscow. By the time Ivan III was free of that decrepit empire, Russia herself was part Mongolian and adopted her policies. The legacy of Kiev-Rus was forgotten and a new legacy of empire was born. Moscow internalized Mongol humiliation.

Moscow and Poland together destroyed Kiev's

⁴⁵ The main works consulted for Kulish were:
Галей С (2002) Народознавча спадщина П.Куліша. Народна творчість та етнографія 4: 62-74
Very valuable work on the connection of Kulish to the folk tradition
Гнідан О and Н Осмак (1991)Світогляд Пантелеймона Куліша. Дивослово 10: 38-41
Гончар О. Роман (1992) «Чорна рада» П. Куліша в школі. Слово і час 9: 3-11
Грушевський М. (1992) З історії релігійної думки на Україні. К.: Освіта
Грушевський М. (2003) Переяславська умова України з Москвою 1654 року. У кн.: Переяславська рада 1654 року. К.: 16-21.
Бочковський О (1958) Ольгерд-Іполит Бочковський. Наука про нації та її життя. Нью-Йорк
Сарбей В. Г. (1993) Етапи формування української національної свідомості (кінець XVIII –початок XX ст.). Український історичний журнал 7-8
Бандура О. (1992) Вивчення роману П. Куліша «Чорна рада»: Хроніка 1663р. Українська мова і література в школі (по 11-12)
Балтівець С. (1995) Психологічні особливості вивчення поезії П.Куліша. Дивослово, по 4
Вайтюк А. (1997) Символи віри П. Куліша. Віче 3: 102-128

innocence, raping her and reducing her to a quivering, weak collection of individuals with no culture and no identity but a borrowed one. Interestingly, Kulish is one of the first to note that the penetration of western ideas was facilitated by the Horde, not blocked by it. Genoa and Venice were firm backers of the Horde and used it to smash and competition from the east. Mongol raids were often accompanied by Jewish and Italian merchants seeking new opportunities for plunder and profit. For Kulish, this demonic alliance of merchant capitalism and Mongol dominance created the most violent and indelible marks on Russian history.

As a critic of St. Petro, this obsession with “anything but the Slavs” led to the adoption of Scholasticism and western science. In this scheme, Poland and Ukraine were, at best, going to be junior partners of a western empire that sees them as only sources of raw materials. Thus, by the time of the Unia, the peasants were the sole source of the older teaching.

Kulish is interesting too because he rejected the Cossacks as part of the national rebirth of Ukraine. Kulish made the argument that the Host was selfish, and not interested in a rebirth of anything but their own power. Class interest solidified what had long begun, the desire for power above all things. Under a leader with the strength of Khmelnytsky, the Cossack force can be one for good, but the Ruin showed their weakness. Kulish even rejected Mazepa. However, the Cossacks are an ideal that is part of Ukraine's distinctiveness. They are not to be idealized, however.

His famous *Chorna Rada* (the Black Council) takes place during the Ruin and is Kulish's most famed work, published in 1857. From the point of view of the historian, it is invaluable. It references a Cossack council of 1663. Briukhovetsky, head of the Sich, is seeking to take power against the populist Yakima Somko, Hetman of the Left

Bank. In addition, Pavel Teterya is also depicted as Hetman of the left Bank.

This period is marked by the decline of the moral sense, of the natural law ethic of virtue in context. Somko seems to be the Cossack ideal: stable, romantic, honest, living in accordance with nature, but those voting are too corrupt to understand or accept him.

In the Ruin, as well as in the time when it was written, honesty and virtue are bizarre idiosyncrasies. When society does not understand virtue, being virtuous leaves one like Myshkin in Dostoevsky's *Idiot*. Thus, the Sich Hetman wins, though his officers live in luxury and pride.

The character of the Zaporozhian Elder might be Kulish himself. He is elderly, a veteran of many wars, and the guardian of the old traditions. He is a true populist, rejects class divisions, but is naive and easily manipulated. He is manipulated by the wealthy around Briukhovetsky and his innocence is openly mocked. But this is the fate of a true warrior in these times.

The race between Somko and Briukhovetsky is between two different principles. Ultimately, it comes down to the aristocratic order versus the populist narod; idealism versus greed, and the idea of domination versus duty. The purpose of the work is to expose the marks of degeneracy, especially passion as the extreme expression of emotion, and its anti-type in mutual aid and the ascetic struggle that it requires.

The Cossack rabble understand freedom as the ability to enrich themselves at the expense of their fellow man. His mocking slogan “God bless the Hetman, now get me a plot free of charge!” That is, the simplest protestation of loyalty needs to be met with some material benefit.

As the Sich Hetman makes his appearance, he states: “My heart hurts as it looks upon your pain. Our father Khmelnytsky created a nation of happy, red-faced

people. Today, the officers will as soon take the skin off your back. . .” This sort of hypocritical populism sways the thousands at the council, and Somko is taken into custody. As he is dragged away, he exclaims “Why do you fight for my head as Ukraine is burning? What will you think of this when Ukraine's enemies come crashing down on you?”

As Briukhovetsky is sworn in, the mob states “Now there will be neither lord nor peasant, neither rich nor poor; plenty for all!” As Somko is brutally killed, the population cooperates their own demise. Somko seeks only the unity of Ukraine under one mace, while Teterya and the Sich Hetman seek power through division and factional intrigue.

The Sich is the symbol of populism and national-anarchism, but Kulish sees it as partaking in the general decay of moral life after Bohdan's death. It is the Hetman of the Sich that lies his way into power with the blessing of this knightly commune.

Supporters of Briukhovetsky include the oligarch Hvyntovka, the ultimate symbol of moral degeneration. The former Cossack traded in the life of ascetic honor for that of a merchant who projects material desires onto all things. This merchant landlord backs the Sich Hetman not out of any idealism, but because he thinks he could get a better deal from Muscovite centralization than the Jewish elite in the Polish cities. He spouted “patriotic” slogans that were sufficient for the mob, but his sole desire is to turn them all into serfs.

On the other side, Teterya does the same relative to the Polish szlachta. In his case, he does not have public support, so he uses all manner of trickery and deceit to eliminate his rivals. He ends up needing Polish troops to put down populist rebellions. However, it is clear that Teterya has an interest in seeing Briukhovetsky become Right Bank leader because he knows he is no patriot, and has no interest in unifying the country. Thus, the two corrupt Hetmans are identical, but they have chosen to use

different instruments.

Kulich's work here is of little interest to this essay as a work of art, but as a window into this important writer's mind. He stresses the emotional and sensual aspects of personality that reduce the role of rational and volitional aspects of the ethnic idea. The Ukrainian soul is ascetic, but this does not negate the true enjoyment of life. Orthodoxy is concerned with the here and now, about justice and the distinction between real needs and sinful desires. His extremely detailed descriptions of the Ukrainian countryside are a constant reminder that nature is a moral manifestation of logos, and not the dead "raw materials" for the modern elite.

Kulich reveals features of the Ukrainian character in characters that are not necessarily historically accurate, but ways to express a political ideal. This work is not recommended as a historical text. It is not and was not meant to be anything but a vehicle – a set of symbols – that express the good and bad of the Ukrainian idea.

This writer has consistently defined the ethno-nationalist idea as comprising those institutions and ideas that serve to defend the folk from external threat and internal decay. This means the ethno-nation is forged in the fires of adversity and the nature of the folk can be deduced from the nature of the pain that folk has endured. The result is the "national ideology," which is a highly abbreviated summary of these institutions that can never be confused for the national idea. Unfortunately, it is rare among American professors to find any serious distinction made between the "ideology" or "myth" as they snidely describe it, and the actual life of a people. The alienated, urban academic with no ties to any cultural tradition whatsoever are the last people who should be interpreting this sort of work.

Empire is Babylon: the institutionalization and normalization of the passions for power and control. It is

the apostasy of Solomon, the very archetype of the Canaanite state. The farm is the symbol for eternal life and fertility. Ukraine is in the peasantry and far from the filthy cities. The goal of politics is the consolidation of the national tradition relative to the needs of the people. In Ukraine and in all healthy societies, it is in the agrarian life. The nation is from nature and is not foreign to logos.⁴⁶

God is immanent in nature though logos, showing that not only is nominalism a heresy, but one of the pan-heresies revealed at these terrible last times. Nominalism is a heresy because it enshrines the complete lack of Christ – the logos – in the created order. In fact, the nominalist can admit of no order at all. It is inherently atheistic and meaningless. It is the ontology of despair and loneliness. It is a foretaste of hell: meaningless, inter-subjective control and the rule of images. It is the manifestation of deceit.

Since Kulish is an agrarian, the nature of this life is both communitarian and polycentric: the eternal enemy of the farmer is the urban banker. There, from a centralized source with plenty of resources and legal deceit, the honesty of the yeoman meets its doom. The ethnic concept is required to make war on this eternal enemy. The nation is part of the natural and cosmic order, bringing the isolated ego to an ethical union with the sobor, the people as experienced both in space and time; the folk, the narod. To have a single center is to concentrate power in the wrong hands.

Part of this approach leads to a cyclical view of history, where periods of virtue and decentralized, spiritual communitarianism alternate with an alienated, fragmented urban monocacy. The former society is linked with the cosmic order through logos, which takes the place of Substance in Spinoza's vision. When the Platonic Forms are both generated and collected in the single person of the

⁴⁶ Particularly valuable here is: Гнідан О and Н Осмак (1991)Світогляд Пантелеймона Куліша. Дивослово 10: 38-41

Son, it takes on many of the aspects of Spinoza's substance, except that it is a person with a will of his own.

*At the Dawn of the 20th Century: The Work of Mykola
Mikhnovsky*

At the dawn of the 20th century, Ukraine entered into an ideological chaos few countries can match. The political parties that came and went exhausted every combination of Radical, Socialist, Democratic, People's or Revolutionary imaginable. Little benefit would come from detailing each and every one. It is important that every one of these parties and platforms comes directly from Kulish, Drahomanov or Kostamarov. Once the chaos begins to settle, two factions emerge, one an internationalist and socialist approach, the other, nationalist and integralist. There was not much disagreement over economics, as western capitalism and nominalism was universally rejected.

One of the more interesting participants in this process is Mykola Mikhnovsky (d. 1924). As was typical at the time, he was the founder or co-founder of at least four political factions: The Revolutionary Ukrainian Party, the Ukrainian People's Party, the Ukrainian Democratic Party, and a strong member of the Brotherhood for Self-determination. From these came the Brotherhood of Taras.

This wing of Ukrainian political thought is well described as a "labor nationalist" faction. Labor was the creator of all wealth, and as such, are brothers. This brotherhood is not abstract, as in cosmopolitanism, but based on the very real cultural history of Ukraine. Mikhnovsky was, like so many others, a national-anarchist, where the state was little more than a parody of the nation. These are opposites, almost always opposed, where the state is the plaything of the rich while the nation is a collective reality born through history and cultural communication.

It needs to be stressed over and over again that Marxism

was an eccentric, unpopular and radically reductionist form of socialism that negated its own existence by its materialism. Financed by the elite banking houses of the west, Marx and his followers were to establish centralized dictatorships where the economy could be controlled from one point. It was a bankers dream that cut out all the messy due process and went straight for direct control.

Communism was never egalitarian, never anti-rich and universally created a class system far more rigid than anything in the west. The Party, having no contact with labor and with few productive skills, merely used the state to transfer all wealthy to themselves. Western investment could be counted on to make up for any shortfalls.

Instead, national-socialism or national-anarchism, in numerous, idealistic and often religious guises, was building a popular presence and had largely taken both right and left in Ukraine and Russia. The worst nightmare of finance is a nationalist and socialist movement such as Pugachev, Razin, the Cossacks, or Nepulyev's Brotherhood of the Cross. Hundreds of fairly successful experiments in national Christian socialism were smashed by the Reds as being to inconvenient for the rapid absorption of all production. The simple proof that communism was about class stratification and elite rule can be found in the smashing of every and all socialist group that did not answer to Trotsky. Successful labor communes were destroyed and their literature burned. The history of the 20th century is one long story so absurd that only tenured academics could ever believe it.

Regardless, Mikhnovsky is one of these national-socialists and anarchists whose radicalism was real. This sort of populist radicalism was traditional in social and cultural life, but radical in economic life. This combination is the one that is not permitted in western capitalism. It is the one combination that would be explosively popular and hence, it's called "fascist" "anti-Semitic" and "racist" as a

ritualistic and formulaic denunciation, usually without the foggiest notion of what is being professed. There are no exceptions to this in the post 1945 western world.

Brotherhood, given all this, is hence made real by ethnicity, faith and a common history. There can be no brotherhood without a common language or ideals, and thus, Marxism never cared for it other than as a slogan. The Party-Class was the sole purpose of Marxism.

For Mikhnovsky, Brotherhood was found in the building of self-sufficient independence of the family, region and nation. Accepting tsarist labor legislation as the most advanced in the world, this early advocate of total independence, sought to make this (at least temporarily), the law of the land until capital came under the control of community organizations. This had to be a slow process because the people needed much time to understand the nature of the modern economy and its limits. The Reds had no understanding whatsoever, and merely took all production and placed it at the hands of planners. The real socialist movement was national and agrarian, seeing the city as the center of exploitation and the family as the primary unit for all life: religious, personal, social, legal.

All nationalist, socialist and anarchist parties agreed that land should belong to those who till it. Whether this be owned by a commune, extended family, monastic, individual or fraternal organization was up to the people themselves. The sole party opposed to all this was the Bolsheviks. Mikhnovsky was one of the leaders of the ethno-national and anarchist wing of this movement, but, despite the chaos of parties and platforms, there is far more agreed upon than is normally mentioned.

Mikhnovsky went so far as to advocate a strict marriage policy where Ukrainians should only marry their own kind. The greater the ethnic and linguistic tie, the more society is liable to develop the ethic of sacrifice and public spirit that any political system requires. The Ukrainian

Radical party – the one party explicitly dedicated to Drahomanov's ideas – sought a more Russian-style communal ownership of land. In trade, protectionism remained a controversy, but most nationally minded socialists accepted at least a strategic and temporary tariff wall. Another aspect that these parties and movements had in common was the universal belief that Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not believe word they preached.

The building of a nationalist socialism, sometimes tinged with an anarchism espoused by Franko, was one of the most important contributions of Ukrainian political thought that had repercussions from Ireland to Africa. It is rare to hear even the simple and obvious point that Ukraine was one of the earliest and most influential anti-colonialist movements in the world.

In Ukraine, the national socialist ideal was an independent society, some form of federalism, and peasant ownership of land. For the most part, these parties were opposed to Jewish rule and many developed Zionist ideas that are also passed over in silence in English-language treatments of these issues. In 1900, the Kahal took about 75% of its massive income from non-productive rents. This sort of parasitism was protected by the language barrier, an international network, and the immense influence that money brings. Jews were a privileged people in the Slavic world, and no laws against them were ever enforced, regardless of the intentions of the “absolutist” tsar. Surprisingly, the Jewish issue is yet another issue that all parties in Ukraine agreed upon, except, of course, the Bolsheviks.

**The Synthesis of Drahomanov, Shevchenko and
Suffering Ukraine:
The Political Philosophy of Ivan Franko**

Blessed is the man who goes where evil reigns
And raises there his voice for truth;
Who, fearlessly, accuses the lawless ones
and torments their mind with the true.
Blessed is the man who, in dark days,
When even the most courageous souls cower in fear,
Will with his voice rouse the sleeping people
And then before their eyes boldly speak the truth
(“The Righteous Man,” 1906)

It is disturbing to see how Marxism, materialism and socialism are all used interchangeably, even by historians. Socialism is neither Marxism nor materialism, and has produced far more interesting and usable concepts against capitalism than Marx. Socialism does not need a powerful state, or even a state at all. It need not be materialist, since the capitalist ethic is equally obsessed with products and consumption. Socialist theories before Marxism were often Christian and idealist, as well as promoting decentralization and communitarianism. Socialism's connection with Marx and Lenin is a tragedy.

Franko, though after Marx, was a socialist in a different sense than the materialist crowd. The simple axiom is that since production is social, so is its product. The egotist that is considered heroic in capitalism takes his profits not merely from labor, but from an entire civilization without which the deluded ego could not exist. It is a contradiction in almost all sense. Family, education, tradition, moral example, language and previous scientific thought, developing since ancient times, are all needed for

even the most insignificant notion to be considered, discussed and created. All is social because all education, action and understanding is mediated by the collective through language, infrastructure, division of labor and thousands of other less epic variables that permits a society to concern itself with science at all.

The individual is a bourgeois myth; there is no such object; nothing is “self created.” Civilizations create the infrastructure for all thought, science and development. All is based on cooperation. These nations and peoples are not a collection of random people, however, but is a specifically national or linguistic world. Franko writes, “In international issues, including socialism, healthy organic shoots can grow in every land only in unmistakably national soil, and only then will they cease to be theory and become a blossoming reality.”⁴⁷

The state is the opposite of socialism in Franko's idea. The state is not essentially changed if its ideology changes. Any ruling group requires a bureaucracy and coercive institutions for even the smallest thing. The statist school of Marxism was rejected by most early and non-Marxist socialists as the dream of opportunists and moral degenerates to impose their will on others in the name of a “revolution.” Franko and many other socialists of his time realized that Bolshevism was really the “dictatorship of the Jewish Marxists” rather than the labor as a broad social force. Bakunin, though largely censored in secondary works argued that Marx was funded by the Rothschilds. Centralized forms of socialism were created by elite financial forces because they guaranteed that the economy can be controlled from one place, the dream of every financier, terrorist and tyrant.

Like most socialists, Franko argued that there is a close relation between the development of classes and the state. Authority is always needed, but this does not

⁴⁷ Quoted from Reient, 2006

necessarily have to take the form of coercive power. The creation of bureaucracies was necessitated by mass production. The state is itself a mass-organization of resources taken from others. Under Bolshevism, it would control the wealth of all. The Bolshevik revolution that Franko predicted would be merely a massive transfer of wealth to the professional revolutionaries. The state needs enemies and ideologies to consolidate its own legitimacy, and the ruling ideology is not important in this respect. Men are naturally social, but they are not naturally political. States are means by which the neurotic seek to justify their control.

The struggle for existence and life creates community. This community creates rituals, ceremonies and beliefs that recapitulate its own history. As societies grow more complex, these rituals soon devolve to a professional class that maintains the history and symbolic understanding of a whole people. Franko, however, sees the negative element as important: this same caste creates the justification for state power and centralization. To use Spengler's language, it helps the culture become a civilization. This is an argument for the ancient origins of the nation. Absolute power, however, soon destroys the original community as the state absorbs the forces that created it. This historical scheme is very general and simplistic, but worth discussing.

Yet, the priesthood is often a check on the power of the ruler. It is often forgotten that in Byzantium, every heretical movement was supported by emperors and the Orthodox were persecuted. Yet, the Orthodox faith prevailed, showing that these doctrines are not "imposed" by the "state" as some less-educated people might believe. Centralization is often a matter of necessity when a rapacious nobility are brought under control.

The Positivist school that the young Franko embraced soon lost its charm. Charles Darwin had the

backing of industry, much of the religious establishment, though a minority of the scientific one. It was far more important as a convenient way for capital to justify their dominance and desire for colonial domination. The Darwinian law of struggle will remove the unfit, whether in the natural order or in the economic one. Since positivism can never accept any system, let alone one so dogmatic as Darwinism, Franko's youthful enthusiasm dampened when he realized that Herbert Spencer was using it to justify capitalism and the British empire that protected and enforced it.

Two Poems: "The Hired Hand" (1876) and "The Pioneers"

"The Hired Hand" is a powerful argument for social justice as well as a defense of the agrarian life of Ukraine, an important aspect of its identity. As a son of the peasantry, Franko had the authority to write on this topic, but more importantly, gives a clear look into his political idea.

The poem begins on a very disconsolate note: the hired worker that does not own his own land is depicted: "For from the cradle he has lived beneath fortune's frown; His life but labor bleak." The hired hand is an oppressed man from an oppressed class, but then the verbiage changes radically: "Wherever his plowshare passes, it turns the fertile earth upon the rolling field, which speedily will bring the waving rye to birth, the soil its fruit will yield."

Franko shows us the virtues of the hired hand after his life has been described. He is a farmer and is thus responsible for feeding the people. He takes the "raw material" of nature and creates what is needed for life. He is close to the natural laws that God has built into the material order. The "rolling field" is certainly not depressing, but depicts the love of the beautiful Ukrainian landscape. He brings the crops "to birth." He is not just a

laborer, but a “midwife,” a man who can make the landscape bring forth what humanity needs through the creator's own law.

Soon, the reality of life reasserts itself:

Why does he like a beggar wear a tattered cloak?
He's but a hired hand!
Born as a serving man, once glorified as a free man by the
heroes of his folk,
In wretchedness with no escape, in misery,
He [now] bows beneath the yoke.
His life, his liberty, his strength he sells
for a crust of bread,
Which adds naught to his strength and scarce his hunger
quells.⁴⁸

This is the core of the poem. Franko takes note of the Ukrainian national idea of the land as the yeoman nation, distinct from the Great Russians. That story exists no more when Catherine and the Petersburg bureaucracy destroyed Ukrainian independence. The worker's life is based on exploitation. He rents himself out for food; he has no freedom at all. He owns nothing except his own body. So, from the old Ukrainian liberty and prosperity, the modern economy has forced the hired hand into something that can only be called slavery *de facto*. Even in slavery the master needed to care for his slaves, lest they be of no use to him. In the modern world, even this modicum of care is gone, and “free labor” has been attenuated to wage slavery, earning not enough to even quell his hunger. He writes, “Let him but see the earth which his hands cultivate; a harvest bring to birth, Though 'twill not be his hands that shall appropriate, God's blessing on the earth.”

⁴⁸ Franko, Ivan. (1876) “The Hired Hand.” Trans. Roman Kosarenko et al. *Ukrainian Poetica*. The Press of the Ivan Franko National University of Lv’iv Ukraine

Only the master benefits from the misery of the “free worker.” Serfdom had been abolished for over a decade as this poem was written, but the reforms of Tsar Alexander II just substituted one form of misery for another in this distant borderland of the empire. The “free laborer” makes a mockery of itself since it implies that the job taken was taken freely. The fear of starvation forces such men to take these jobs. Suddenly again, there is a shift in mood, and this trampled and broken worker becomes the vanguard of a new world:

A better lot it seeks throughout long centuries,
And still it waits in vain,
Surviving devastation, Tatar miseries,
And serfdom's toil and pain.
For in that heart, however a bitter fate may mock,
Eternal hope still dwells,
As oftentimes from out a cliff of granite rock
A living fountain wells;
As in a golden haze, a magic fairy tale sees its future
gleam,
And day by day endures its gloomy, sore travail
Through one unending dream.

The peasant has suffered through foreign domination, unremitting and unrewarding labor, famine, persecution and now, a proletarian dependency that is anything but human. Though he feeds the entire empire, he receives no reward. The new future can be seen. The grind is something to be endured for the sake of a better future:

Plow on, O Giant! Though in chains
Of ignorance and toil!
Thy chains shall some day fall, the evil that remains
No more shall thee despoil!
E'en when by foes overwhelmed. not vainly hast thou sung
The spirit's moral power;

Not vain have been the tales told in thy people's tongue
Of victory's coming hour. Thou shalt overcome in time the
 crusted ills of yore—
 Then on thine own freed soil.
Thou shalt as owner plow, and so shalt be once more
 The master of thy toil.

The poem asserts that landless laborer is a “giant” because of their great numbers. They suffer partially because of the feudal regime whether of Russian or Polish⁴⁹ design, but also partly because both the masters and the laborers themselves are ignorant. Soon, as the revolutionary winds blow through Central Europe, the landless will have access to land that is their own (or that of a commune) that they can cultivate for their own benefit, rather than for the (often absentee) owners.

By 1878 Franko had already done time in prison for sympathizing with the national-socialist movement. Once released from confinement, he wrote a poetic version of his political and economic idea that seems to add more detail to the concepts in “The Hired Hand.” “The Pioneers” concern the same dichotomy between depression and anticipation, despair and triumph. Moving radically from one mood to another is the prominent feature of these works, though their social content is why Franko is second only to Shevchenko in the Ukrainian national literature.

In a poetic apparition, Franko envisions lines of workers, similar to the man depicted in “The Hired Hand,” except that these seem to be miners and industrial workers.

⁴⁹ One of the variables that made Polish serfdom harsher than the Russian was the fact that Ukrainian or Ruthenian serfs were easier to dehumanize than one's own fellow ethnics. Whether it be Polish Sarmatian solidarity or the foreign, non-Russian nature of Petersburg, the elites seemed to have solved that problem creatively. Further, the differences between the Roman and Russian churches were so substantial that they were also of two different civilizations. They were foreign slaves in one manner or another.

Franko sees their liberation,

A mighty iron sledge I saw in every hand,
And sudden from the sky a voice like thunder burst:
“Break through this rock! Let neither cold nor heat
withstand
Your toil! In spite of danger, hunger, cold, and thirst,
Stay not, for yours it is to smash this granite band!”
At this we all as one our sledges raised on high;
A thousand thundering blows crashed down upon the rock.
On every side we saw the shards of granite fly,
The rock crack off in blocks. With ceaseless, desperate
shock,
We hammered on with strength that nothing
could defy.

The revolution occurs without warning. The line of unfortunate workers is abruptly roused by a divine voice. The “granite” mentioned above is a mountain of oppression that the workers are to destroy, using the tools that they use to create the very life of their oppressors. Franko stresses that there is no immediate change. Life does not work like that. It is “on the bones” of such work that the new world will be born as the poem concludes:

We march in close accord, for each the purpose owns
To form a brotherhood, each with a sledge in hand.
What though the world forgets, or even us disowns!
We'll rend that imprisoning rock, we'll pave a broad new
strand!
New life shall come to man, though it come over our
bones!

There is no hope without suffering, no wisdom without these crushing and invigorating experiences. The working class also represents the nation, since it is this

oppression that helped forge the idea of a new, decentralized and agrarian Ukraine. Freedom comes with a heavy price, which, in this case, is the painful death of this generation's working class to make a better future for coming generations.

For decades they have labored for a lilliputian reward, while the owners reaped the benefits of their toil and skill. In this case, the reward of this work will belong to their grandchildren. The revolution will come suddenly, but this violent convulsion that this poem prognosticates can only be brought to fruition and incorporated into the culture by enduring, disciplined labor. Sooner or later, this granite mountain, the “wall” that bars them from a human life, will disintegrate suddenly. It is this thankless and painstaking hammering at its strength that will eventually bring it down so that their sons and grandsons can rebuild using their own tools and the mountain's pieces they have jarred loose.

Franko was a crusader for social nationalism, or the mixture of ethnic nationalism with socialist reform. In and out of prison, the tsarist attempts to silence this giant of Slavic poetry only spurred him on more and more.

Franko on Equality and “Scientific Socialism”

In 1880, Franko's “A Hymn,” a Hymn to revolt stated:

This living spirit of revolt,
Of progress, liberty and right,
Shall not retreat before the night,
Shall nevermore be brought to halt.
In ruins evil round us lies,
The avalanche's rush now dies —
In all the world there is no force
That can avail to stay its course,
That can put out the vital spark

We now see glimmering in the dark.

These lines refer to the folk, Ukrainian people as an ethnic entity, largely bound to the soil as “free laborers.” But it may also refer to the Russian people as well, the common laboring folk that might speak a different language, but suffers under the same regime of “free trade.” Suffering leads to dreams as escapism but these lead to agitation and understanding, which in turns, creates the victory. It cannot be stopped, only explained away.

Equality—as a concept—for Ivan Franko was not a “legal” or “formal” equality. It was true “equity” in the sense that there is really no element of society that is not involved with creating what is needed for a civilized life. Ultimately, real democracy and equality, as opposed to modern parliamentarism, can be achieved through a “community of labor,” a commonwealth of producers. As a follower of PJ Proudhon, Franko saw productive labor communities as cells of a new world. They are, in Hegel's sense, the normal extension of the family. They are joined together in a coherent whole by the language of the people. This language is understood in the broad sense of social norms and cultural imperatives. This is the nature of “social nationalism,” the single ideology that the west does not possess. As soon as the workers realize that they are also part of an ignored and despised race or nationality, the vigor of the movement can only increase. The coupling of nationalism and socialism is the elite's worst fear, so they react by labeling it “fascism” or some other meaningless term. One of Franko's best known political poems is the 1905 “Moses.” Writing of his own nation, Franko says:

You are my clan, you are my children,
You are my pride and my glory,
In you lies my spirit, my future,
And the beauty and the state;

All my life I have been giving you
all my labors
With irrepressible vigor—
And you will go on your journey
through the centuries
With the stamp of my spirit on you.⁵⁰

Unlike many socialists, Franko held that a socialist order cannot merely rest on an economic foundation. Economic interest alone is incapable of eliciting solidarity. The worst error of the modern left is to reject ethnic unity as “mythical.” Without ethnic and spiritual wholeness, the socialist order can only rest upon force. In fact, without these ties that create integrity, any social system can only rely on violence.

Modern socialism is tolerated in the west so long as it does not become national. International socialism has done all in its power to destroy national or ethnic solidarity, usually relying on “elite consensus” or name calling. The materialist and cosmopolitan socialism is a suspicious movement only in that it destroys and condemns all other forms of itself. Even successful, egalitarian communes have been smashed by this ideology's governments.

Soviet socialism and Marxism are not about labor in the normal sense, they are about enshrining a small elite of

⁵⁰ The works in this section come from:

Франко І. (2004) Дещо про себе самого : Вибр. Твори. Іван Якович Франко, Дрогобич :

Коло, volume 3, 27-33

Франко І. (1900) На склоні віку. ЛНВ book 12

Франко І. (1900) Поза межами можливого. ЛНВ, book 10

Франко І. (1904) «Східно-Західні непорозуміння. ЛНВ, 27

Франко І. (1895) Ukraina ingredienta. Житє і слово 4

Франко, Іван. (1897) Соціалізм і соціал-демократизм. «Житє і слово» 6(4): 265-292

Франко, Іван. (1936) Формальний і реальний націоналізм.

«Назустріч» (This also appears in his Collected Works, 1980, vol 27, pps 355-363)

urban intellectuals who have likely never seen a farm. Marx himself did not believe that “laborers” (as opposed to “labor” which is radically distinct) had the ability to run the movement ostensibly created in their name. In Marx's own elite-funded political organization, actual workers were nowhere to be found. His angry and pathological denunciation of Proudhon is very suspicious. Asking for actual worker representation in this elite collection of well-off intellectuals, Marx threw the entire movement out of his Intentional. Marxism and Leninism were not about workers, but the esoteric idea of “the workers” [of social justice].⁵¹

The only thing that all modern socialists have in common is the breaking down the true source of social ties and the foundation for all rebellion: what makes a people distinct. When a movement dedicated to “labor” rejects actual worker participation, smashes all successful forms of worker control and seems to care about nothing but transferring all social wealth to itself, there is reason to believe that the entire thing was a con.

In his “Cossack Immortal” he writes,

I've soundly slept, I plainly see,
And, Kozak-like, a century.
Whether to win or lose I stand.
I'll look once more upon the world
And see Ukraine, my native land,
That Eden's beauties once unfurled,
That was the dearest spot on earth,
The blessed land which gave me birth.
I wonder who now rules o'er her,
And what the folk who dwell in her?
This newer generation's tongue—
What do they speak, what songs are sung?

⁵¹ Франко, Іван. (1897) Соціалізм і соціал-демократизм. «Житє і слово» 6(4): 265-292

O God, my heart is filled with fear!
It may be that no longer there
Dwell any who still speak our tongue,
Our ballads are no longer sung;
Perhaps the Kalmuck or Kirghiz
Roves o'er the steppes where sleep our kin;
The Chuvash, Mordvin, or the Finn
May dwell now in our villages.
Great God, why from that century's sleep
Didst Thou call on me to awake ?
Was I aroused my heart to break,
Then back into the grave to creep?⁵²

This is one of Franko's most nationally motivated passages. The symbols here would require a book to unpack. The first group of foreign controllers, the “Kalmuck or Kirghiz” is a broad references to medieval Ukraine where the Turkish tribes of southern Russia raided Kievan Rus. These tribes attacked Russia hundreds of times, leading to tens of thousands of dead and, more significantly, hundreds of thousands of slaves sold on the slave-marts of the Middle East. The republic of Genoa and the Jewish mart at Kaffa were financing these tribes to take from the strange and foreign Rus' people. How many Russians ended up dying early deaths on the estates of the Arab, Catholic or Jew throughout Asia?

The second group is interesting. The “Chuvash” had several states in the middle ages, one of which became the Bulgars of the Volga. Another western-financed military state raiding Russian territory, her use of the Volga to become a wealthy slave mart was only ended by the decisive action of Ivan IV Grozny. “Mordvin [and] the Finn” are a Uralic people of non-Turkic background. They are Aryan in language, with many words coming from the

⁵² Франко І. (1895) *Ukraina irredenta*. Житє і слово 4 (among other places)

Sanskrit. These also are intermixed into the Great Russian genome. The great Old Believer saint Avvakum was of Mordvin stock. Many of the “sects” deriving from the initial Old Ritualist rebellion have been disproportionately made from these marginal peoples. Franko's mix of history and poetry here makes him one of the world's greatest writers.

“Scientific socialism” is the most cynical of myths. To make any social system “scientific” is to also remove freedom from it. “Science” in the west has different meanings than elsewhere, and has changed over time. Aristotle saw it as any systematized and logical organization of knowledge. Today, it is an approach to the world that only recognizes standardized and quantitative objects as real.

Socialism for Franko was a moral idea, not a “scientific” means of controlling labor or justifying totalitarianism. Ethnic nationalism and tradition, while containing many elements of interest to modern science, is not essentially a scientific object. It is a holistic construct taking into account all aspects of human life. “Scientific socialism” artificially isolates production from all other elements of the human community.

In his 1900 “Beyond the Limits of the Possible” he says in prose,

Everything that goes beyond the framework of the nation is either hypocrisy on the part of people who are ready to conceal their strivings for the supremacy of one nation over another behind international ideals, or the sickly sentimentalism of dreamers, who are ready and willing to conceal their spiritual alienation

from their own nation behind wide-ranging 'universal' phrases.

If nations are not the foundation, then the society degenerates into meaningless atoms with no real relation to one another, which will then invite an imperial takeover. Whether that power claims that its domination is to further “progress” or “socialism” is irrelevant. If nations do not exist, then neither does imperialism.

Franko's foundational idea is that there are two forces in the world: love and slavery. Love is life, slavery is death. Slavery is the worship of matter at the expense of the spirit. More specifically, it is the belief that quantitative science can solve all problems, but this is prefaced on the idea that matter is all that exists. It is the modern religion held on faith.

The creation of a unified nation is one of the more powerful manifestation of love. Unity and oneness are not stump speech slogans, but are rather compelling moral and metaphysical ideas that, at the very minimum, seek to destroy hierarchies based on access to money. Class distinctions and the materialism upon which they are based are the root of all suffering.

Franko's “The Passing of Serfdom” and “The Righteous Man” are similar in their message but radically contrasting in their expression. The essence of the first poem is the reaction of the local, landed elite (often foreign) in Ukraine to Tsar Alexander II decree abolishing serfdom, but it can also be applied to the same event in Austrian Galicia in 1848. The gentry cannot think in any other categories but those based on serfdom.

Peasants, in their simplicity, are wise. They are paragons of wisdom and virtue in the simplest and purest of senses. They can hardly believe that they are now free, and Franko leaps to connect the Tsar's decree to the French revolution in its level of historical significance. In other

words, there will not be a single aspect of life that will remain the same from this moment on. For the gentry, this is a horrible realization; for the peasants, it is the time for quiet rejoicing.

“The Righteous Man” is another foundational expression of Franko's political theory. It develops Franko's agrarianism and the connection between love and the peasant. On the other hand, materialism is the idea of the aristocracy. For Franko, man's primary purpose in the world is to confront evil. This is the single virtue that separates the good from the merely extant. Love is partly the courage to fight for others, even others one does not know. In the nation, they are all relatives, so the sacrifice required is not abstract. Love in the modern west is one of the most meaningless words in existence, which is why it is used constantly. is not some maudlin desire to indulge someone, but the love of Truth above all, which is also a life of pain and sacrifice, since nothing torments human beings more than the reality of things.

This confrontation appeals to the elite's conscience. Franko was an admirer of the Old Testament's prophetic tradition. The prophets were not rewarded on earth; their entire purpose for existing was to confront the apostasy and paganism of Israel's religious and political leaders. The good man stands firm in the face of universal condemnation, but the stand must be based on Truth, never self-interest.

Love leads to pain, but a pain that cleanses rather than destroys. It is the mighty that will see to it that the Righteous man, the prophet, is killed. This martyric death only makes the lack of Truth in society that much more obvious. Death in this case, death in love, is its own reward and is not “death” in the normal sense of the term. Franko sees the political task of the poet in this same way. True poetry almost always courts death, prison or ridicule. The poet is never rich and never loved. The wealthy poets are

the “court poets” who say what the Regime wants to hear. It is purposeless outside of a love of death. It is a parody of poetry.

“Love” is the opposite of material self-interest. The lover of death is a utilitarian, since matter is dead. Matter becomes a god, a universal in the mind of the nominalist, that can only be based on blind faith. Matter is god in that it is omnipotent, can create all things and is eternal. It does not die.

The poet is a prophet. They are always under attacks and live on the defensive. Even worse, the poet is sensitive to the extreme. He feels not only his own pain, but that of all mankind. It is a life of misery; but sensitivity to life's misery is the real inspiration of the poet and prophet. The poet is alone, but he can point the way to Eden. The poet's real pain centers around the growing realization that people, especially those who speak often of their freedom, are tightly controlled by those with power. Believing the lies (or more commonly, the half-truths) of a corrupt society is easy. Few have the ability, or the sensitivity to take up the cause of Truth – a thankless task that will lead to your death, or worse.

In his “Death of Cain” (1887), Franko lays out his ethical philosophy of science. His epistemology is reducible to this idea: People fight to reach the Tree of Knowledge. None get there. The result is that they then turn on each other in fratricide. It is this that leads to social death. Even worse, progress towards Eden proves fruitless – eventually, many even doubt its existence. This quest for love and charity destroys most who engage in it. The synthesis of this is that knowledge and virtue have become enemies.

Love is the only force that can save Cain, or the symbol of fallen mankind. This love is to be found internally, while science is constantly looking outward for the Tree, for Eden. Mutual love is nationalism – the

devotion to the national cause unto death. This nationalism lies at the root of love and mutual interaction. Social life is not possible unless people speak the same language and have similar customs. Hence. Love can only exist at the national, ethnic and linguistic level, but it is all the same love wherever it manifests itself.

The goal of the progeny of Cain is to manifest this internal love in action; to manifest this inner sense in the material world. While it might ring as too saccharine, it is the simplicity of cognition; simple in that it is true, and requires no mental gymnastics to accomplish. The truth is always simpler than the lie.

Franko's little read novel, *For the Home Hearth*, written in 1892, expands in great detail on his shorter, pithier poems. The basic purpose of the novel is to deal with the home as a philosophical category. The plot of the novel is simple, and serves as an excuse for the potent philosophical insights of the work.

Anton is a Ukrainian captain in the Austrian service. His wife is Angela, daughter of a wealthy aristocrat who marries Anton knowing that his captain's rank cannot provide her with the world she grew up with. After 10 years service in Bosnia, Anton returns home only to find that, apparently, his wife has been running a brothel out of their house to make ends meet. The Jews are everywhere, and are at the very heart of the global, European-centered prostitution ring servicing the elite worldwide. The prostitution world is run out of Vienna (among other places) by a Jew suggestively named Shiteenburg. Julia, one of Angela's "employees," turns out to be a "spokeswoman" for this global, Jewish, elite prostitution ring. The fact that the Jews are so prominent in the global slave trade is the only reason this novel is never read – it is forbidden for academics to read it and comment on it positively. Hence, it is ignored.

Franko shows the Jews to be at the center of all attempts to destroy otherwise virtuous Christian homes. Yet, the Jews might be the formal cause, they are not the efficient cause, since so many of the Austrian and Ukrainian officers in their region (these are city folk) were regular customers of Angela and Julia. Angela hired Julia to run the brothel, while, because of her aristocratic connections, remained a silent partner. Because poverty was held in such contempt, anything and everything needed to be done to ensure that any aristocratic family not fall below a certain level. With Anton gone, Angela seemed to have no other choice. She is condemned by the very aristocratic society that took advantage of her services, and Angela commits suicide as a result.

Franko, in this suppressed novel, exposes the existence of a huge, global Jewish slave network with headquarters spread out from London to Prague to Vienna, tightly connected with banking capital. However, from a philosophical point of view, this novel is saturated with ontological and economic truths that serve as an ancillary reason why it is not read.

First of all, this all takes place in an urban environment, the traditional home of the Jews. The urban life, in sharp contrast to the village, is the realm of deceit. Natural objects like the female body are taken from the agrarian and fertile context and given over to the profoundly unnatural world of prostitution. Prostitution, in other words, is the very negation of nature as it relates to the female body.⁵³

Second, the home can either be a respite from the city, or it can partake of its evil. Gogol's *Nevsky Prospect* is another clear Ukrainian version of the identical idea. One of the phrases Franko uses is "behind decorum's veil." This is a Tolstoyan idea that bourgeois values (even in this faux-

⁵³ Franko, Ivan (2006) *Behind Decorum's Veil*. Trans: Roma Franko and Sonia Morris. Language Lanterns Publications

aristocratic setting) are not values or virtues at all, but masks (veils) that shield the evil of the world from outsiders. The world, in this case, has taken up residence in the home in the same way that demons can possess souls.

Third, elite power is immoral. This is not a conditional statement dealing with the Austrian empire, but the very idea of elite power is evil in itself. Authority and influence is legitimate, but coercive power centralized in a wealthy bureaucracy is never legitimate. Prostitution and white, female slavery is the direct and understandable result of elite power. Vienna was the home of some of France's most powerful Jewish bankers connected with the Parisian Sassoon family. Materialism leads to death since it can justify such practices. Women, like all else, are nothing but matter in motion. If this is true, then only power rules.

Fourth, Franko hints at, but does not directly state, that war is the elite's constant drive to distract attention from its own immorality. The war on the family that Franko notes is far more significant than the Bosnian uprising that is the background of the book. This uprising is why Anton is gone for a decade.

Fifth, that Jews are the icon of corruption. They are the presence of demons—anti-Christ—in European society. Not only is the banking cult in Vienna related to this global prostitution ring (it should be noted that the Sassoons were the main force behind the opium trade with China), but that these people had also taken control over the government, at least its law enforcement operations. Anton is tipped off that Jews control local law enforcement, and therefore, there is no hope for justice of any kind.

In sum, Franko makes the argument that any philosophy of history must concern itself with human happiness. This has been the goal of every human action since there has been human action. Progress is measured to the extent the populations in a society as happy. One benefit of this view is that one can be happy at any stage in

history, since the self develops its expectations relative to what's out there. One generation need not sacrifice itself for a promised “future” that never arrives.

**Two Autocephalous Orthodox Churches in the 20th
Century:
Vasyl Lypkivsky and the Kharkiv and Poltava
Movement**

The Lypkivsky Synod and its Theology

Both Volodymyr and Dmitri were heads of the Autocephalous church of Ukraine. This work would be remiss to ignore it. The 1921 debacle was anathematized by all other Ukrainian groups. It was an embarrassment and set the cause of autocephaly back many years. It will dissolve itself in the early 1940s, with a tiny branch in the US.

The simple description is that in 1921, many Ukrainian nationalists formed a sobor of Orthodox laymen and priests to establish the Autocephalous church. Unfortunately, no bishops arrived, though the Georgians had dispatched several hierarchs that were not permitted to cross the border into Ukraine. Impatient and desperate, the sobor consecrated Vasyl Lypkivsky as “metropolitan.”

leading up to this “sobor” however, was the gradual growth of the Autocephalous movement as a legitimate and quite ordinary development of Ukrainian nationalism. Parthenius (Levitsky) had initially agreed to lead the UAOC, but died in 1920, along with Antony (Granovsky) another Muscovite bishop with great sympathy to the Ukrainian cause. Another bishop, Alexi, of the Moscow patriarchate backed the UAOC, but he too died in 1920. Bishop Agipit (Vishnivsky) openly refused, though he was not opposed to Ukrainian autonomy. Priests S. Orilyk and Pavel Pobsilko were sent to Georgia, but were turned back at the border. It is this frustration that created the desperate error of 1921.

Outside of this gaffe, Lypkivsky was a priest of sound mind, firm national-populist principles and of strong

moral fiber. His writings on nationalism are worth serious attention. Unfortunately, the 1921 disaster has prejudiced so many against him that his otherwise first class writing has gone unread.

The archpriest Vasyl Lypkivsky was a strict adherent of Orthodox doctrine. The one issue he had with the development of the Orthodox church was royal supremacy. The theological doctrine of Sobornapravna was a response to the fact that, in imitation of the state, the episcopacy too became autocratic. The development of the episcopal office mirrored the state. The Ukrainian idea at the time, however, was that holiness and grace – not office – are the real marks of authority. From an Orthodox point of view, this is accurate.

When the ancient church was in formation, the development of an autocratic episcopate made sense because it facilitated the communication of the church with the emperor. Bishops were often of the upper classes for this reason. However, from the 15th to the 17th century, the development of the national and ethnic idea rendered the bishop a representative of the local sobor rather than an autocrat. The Brotherhoods in the Baroque period in Ukrainian history are a graphic example of this.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Materials in this section can be found here:
Metropolitan Basil Lypkivsky: Biographical Materials (The Central State Archive). Compiled L. Pylyavets, Ukrainian Institute of Archeology of Sciences of Ukraine., 1993
Zinchenko, Arsen (2007). Metropolitan Basil Lypkivsky. Stozir'ya. B-ka ua
Zinchenko, A (1997). Delivered by Faith. The Life and Work of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi. Dnipro Publishers
Lypkivsky KO (2003) Shadows of Unforgotten Ancestors. Kyiv
Lypkivsky, Vasyl (2002) The Memorial Anthology of Lypkivsky's Writings in Two Volumes. Kyiv, Yevroimidzh, 2002 (in Ukrainian)
<http://lypkivskyivasyi.in.ua/index.html>
First Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. 14-30 October 1921. Documents and Materials. Compiled by GM Mickle, LB Pylyavets, and IN Prelovska.

He rejected the Bolshevik decree on the “Separation of Church and State” and advocated that education should be under the local church. His frustration was in the a priori rejection of anything Ukrainian in the liturgy or church life. Roughly rejected constantly by Moscow and the local Russian hierarchy, the radical decisions of the 1921 “synod” should be placed in part at the feet of this imperial arrogance. There was simply no canonical reason why Ukraine should not have its autonomous or autocephalous church, especially when the war and revolution cut Ukraine off from the rest of the empire. Moscow had accepted the independence of Georgia, why not Ukraine? Apart from the economic and political reasons for this differential treatment, this stonewalling threatened to turn this staunchly Orthodox people into opponents of the Orthodox monarchy.

Moscow certainly was correct to condemn the “consecrations” of 1921, though they could easily have solved the problem by supporting this national movement and sponsoring it. They are not innocent of the errors of this sobor. The problem was that even when the 1921

Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv, 1999

UAOC (2007) The Second Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. October 17-30, 1927.

Documents and materials. Compiled by SI Bilokin, IN Prelovska and IN Starovoitenko. The Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv

UAOC (1987) The Martyrdom of the Ukrainian Churches in 4 volumes. Volume I. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church (documents, materials, Christian samizdat Ukraine). Compiled and edited by Osip Zinkevych and Alexander Voronin. Torch Publishing Committee

UAOC (1997) Ukrainian Church Liberation Movement and the Formation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

A.Zinchenka, ed. Logos Press

Kyrydon AM (2005) Time Trials: the State, the Church and Society in Soviet Ukraine 1917 – 1930. Stockholm Textbooks and Manuals.

IV Buharyeva, VM Danilenko, V. Okipnyuk, IN Prelovska.

Repressed leaders of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (1921-1930). Biographical Directory. Kyiv, Torch 2011

movement was anathematized by the Polish Church as well as the Poltava Church, Moscow found other reasons to condemn it. This strongly suggests that the canonical argument against this church was smoke and mirrors: less spiritual reasons were at the root. No matter how strict the Ukrainians were in their canonical formulations, even to the extent of receiving a tomos in 1924 from the Petrine See of Antioch, Moscow would always find some reason to reject it. Thus, the Russian church is far from innocent in the errors of this early synod.

The synod of 1921 initially based itself around the fact that it was representative of Ukraine as a whole, and thus, given the unity of faith, the Spirit was present. A bishop need not be present for the spirit to work, and as such, this was a legitimate sobor, though not one empowered to consecrate bishops under its own authority.

However, the simony in the Greek church under the Turks and the purging of the Russian church under Peter I was no less a farce than the 1921 consecrations. Peter I was a Freemason and materialist, as was most of the “oberprokurators” of the “synod” in the 18th century. Peter's openly satanic orgies where bishops were tortured to death on the wheel were apparently not sufficient to condemn the canonical status of this “church,” but the successors of this had the authority to condemn the errors of 1921. The Soviets were not the first body to purge and destroy the church of Russia. By the end of the 18th century, the Church in the Russian empire was less than a quarter of its size before Peter's reign. The new martyrs under Peter and his successors were not as numerous as those under Lenin and Stalin, but the mentality and methods were identical.

The Ukrainian national movement had sought episcopal consecration from 1917 to the fateful events of 1921, only to be either rejected or stymied by circumstance. If the holy spirit functions in any Orthodox communal body, then why not this one? Grace is not the province of

bishops alone, and hence, this sobor – so the reasoning went – had every bit the authority that any other national synod had. Further, when these consecrations were carried out, the priests placed their hands on Vasyl's head, and all behind them formed a “chain” leading to the new “metropolitan.” In this sense, it was a powerful, “national” consecration. Unfortunately, it lacked all canonical authority.

The Archbishop Theophan (Sergiev) accepted the 1921 consecrations as extreme economy during wartime. This is not the norm however, and this author will make no attempts to defend this ill-advised action. At the same time, the growth of this neo-Orthodox church was impressive. In the first five years of its existence, this UAOC had roughly 1500 parishes. Less well known is the recognition that the UAOC under Lypkivsky gave to the Old Catholic movement, and ordained several priests for this group.

This “1921 movement” was poor. No parish was required to give money, and the decentralization was so substantial that bishops had little power and no real source of income. In his later defense of his actions, Lypkivsky stated that after World War I, most of Ukraine had no clergy. Without the UAOC, he argued, most of the country would have been without priests at all.⁵⁵

His political view was firmly nationalist and populist. He condemned the Bolsheviks and the Renovationists. His view was that the Red coup was a power grab by urban Jews and represented a transfer of wealth from the people to the state. The decentralized structure of the UAOC is certainly canonical and a reform worth discussing, but under the strained conditions of the 1920s, it was a substantial weakness.

⁵⁵ UAOC (2007) The Second Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. October 17-30, 1927. Documents and materials. Compiled by SI Bilokin, IN Prelovska and IN Starovojtenko. The Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv

As a national and nationalist church, Lypkivsky argues that this implies international respect, especially with other Orthodox nations. To accept domestic nationalism while rejecting others is a contradiction and makes no sense for the consistent nationalist idea. In Ukraine, the use of folk chant and folk artistry is legitimate and praiseworthy.

His main criticism of Moscow was the interference of state structures in the life of the church. After Peter I, this criticism carried substantial weight and nearly all the saints of this period agreed that Peter's synod has no canonical authority. Instead, he offered the model of Kievan Rus, where an independent church was self-financing and ran its own court system.

He saw the USSR as the final apogee of the Babylonian idea, believing that many Ukrainians are possessed and do not realize it. Like the man beaten by robbers, the Ukrainian church was ignored by elites and the rest of the Orthodox world. The “oil and wine” applied by the Good Samaritan was true theology in the Ukrainian language.

The spirit is more important than the law. The law, whether canonical or the Old Testament law, can be fetishized and turned into an idol. The burdens of the law were reimposed by the canons of the Byzantine period. For Lypkivsky, these needed to be simplified. As the Romanov church saw no synods in 300 years, it is up to Ukraine to rectify this stagnation.⁵⁶

In August of 1921, the GPU arrested Lypkivsky and offered him freedom if he became an informant. The UAOC will be destroyed, but he and his family will be spared. He said no. After Vasyl, Nicholas Boretsky was elected, and the tortures he faced in prison led to his insanity before his death. Boretsky, while accepting the

⁵⁶ Lypkivsky, Vasyl (2002) *The Memorial Anthology of Lypkivsky's Writings in Two Volumes*. Kyiv, Yevroimidzh, 2002 (in Ukrainian)

1921 idea, did not accept a married episcopate and sought the regularization of his own office. The arrests began in 1926. The church was deeply penetrated by the GPU and, rather than face imminent dissolution, the UAOC dissolved itself in 1927.

One of the guiding forces of the 1921 Lypkivsky group was the philosopher and historian Vladimir Chekhivsky (shot by NKVD, 1937). In addition to being the main historian at the 1921 sobor, Chekhivsky was also the Council of People's Ministers and the head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Directorate. He opposed Skoropadsky, but worked in his cabinet as Minister of Confessions. He is also the main author of the laws governing church and state under the Directory. Most problematic was his public membership in the masonic cult "Star of the East," headquartered in Odessa.⁵⁷

Much of the Rada and Directory were members of that and similar Lodges throughout the country. This includes Petliura, but Skoropadsky was an opponent of the Lodge. Hence, those who otherwise would accept his rule had to oppose him regardless of his success in governing. The Lodges in Ukraine were the upper crust of both Ruthenian and Polish society and supplied the manpower and ideology for the failed Decembrist coup during the inauguration of Tsar Nicholas I. In fact, the Lodges of Ukraine read like a who's who of Ukrainian elites of all political stripes.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ The most representative collection of his views can be found here: The First Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. 14-30 October 1921. Documents and Materials. Compiled by GM Mickle, LB Pylyavets, and IN Prelovskya. Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv, 1999

⁵⁸ An excellent resource can be found here: <http://studentpro.ru/vneklassnaya-rabota/obrazovanie/masonstvo-na-ukran/>. This is a Ukrainian-language paper entitled "Freemasonry in Ukraine" and has a list of

The problem with analyzing the Lodge is that its true teachings are never explicitly written. The use of coded words and double meanings is meant to deceive the “cowan” but is gradually revealed to the initiate. In fact, one way to envisage the masonic initiation process is as the gradual revelation of the meaning of words and symbols. Several Masonic books have been published that show the general outline of these meanings, and hence, for the serious student, the content of much of this is knowable, albeit arcane.

The listing of all public Masons is available, and it comprises members of every profession, political background and region. It is exclusively the wealthy and powerful, especially academics, politicians, merchants, military commanders and bureaucrats. It is safe to say that the Ukrainian Revolution from the Rada to the People's Republic was entirely masonic, though whether this means the movement was “Illumined” is another matter.

His theology and philosophy of history should be be tainted by this possible membership, since most of his views are quite traditional. He is one of the most interesting and ignored theologians of the early 20th century, but his association with the Lodge and the 1921 disaster prejudice most readers.⁵⁹

He defines the Autocephalous church as a “network of communication” that is based on authority, never power. This is the same network idea found in the Slavophiles and

all members of the known Lodges. A “P. Chekhivsky” is listed as a member of the Poltava Lodge (no public name) in the early part of the 20th century, but this might not be V. Chekhivsky. The “Star of the East” in this paper does not list Vladimir.

⁵⁹ In the bibliography, the Ukrainian language book of the minutes of the 1921 synod is listed. This is the main source of the philosophy of Chekhivsky, as many of his books are recapitulated in detail in the minutes of the synod. Secondary literature is excellent in summarizing his views as well, but there is nothing for the English speaker at present.

St. Andrei of Ufa. The new martyrs Valentine Sventitsky and Andrei are both Christian anarchists whose ideas on church governance are identical to Chekhivsky and Lypkivsky. The idea of Sobornapravna is detailed at length in the minutes of the 1921 sobor.

This idea is expressed as the canonical and patristic opposition to the Petrine Synod, a monstrous chimera from the diseased mind of the Freemason and demonist Peter. When the Petrine synod is accepted by Russian Orthodox, Peter's Masonic membership and that of most of the oberprokurators does not seem to be a problem. Peter's system was such a farce, designed to neutralize and purge the church, that any acceptance of its legitimacy is suspect. Much of the thought of the new martyrs and Ukrainian autocephalists is aimed at this monster. The reactions of Andrei or Valentin are patristic replies to the Petrine heresy and the Masonic idea that created it. Not a single Russian new martyr accepted Peter's synod as legitimate.

This also implies that the Ukrainian bishop is to rule by example and holiness of life. This is authority rather than coercive power. The 1921 movement and its canonical replacement were a means to restore the respect of the church that had become quite unpopular. It was a form of Russification that looked down upon the Ukrainian language as unsuitable for liturgical use. That it is used daily in millions of parishes today still has not swayed some of the ROCOR hardliners.

The synod was based on the rights of holiness rather than the fetishization of office. One of the most abused words in theology is "Donatism." What began as a very specific issue about clerics who had weakened under torture became a blanket excuse for so many clerics to behave wantonly without any consequence. Donatism is not the idea that sacraments can come from demonic or even possessed clerics. If it can, it is irrelevant, since the validity of the sacraments by itself has no meaning. One is better

off going without priests than accepting the sacraments from a corrupt prelate. At the same time, if moral behavior was the sole source of sacramental grace, most of the church, especially then, would cease to exist.

Hence, Chekhivsky begins his theological view by reiterating the evil effects of the Petrine era and its distortion of the nature of episcopal office. Bishops are not conduits of grace, they have no special “powers” and are often the cause of so much church corruption and arbitrariness. Holiness and love (in the Christina, not modern, sense) is far more significant than a bishop's political appointment to office. Grace is found exclusively in the body of the church, and bishops participate in this grace like anyone else. They can also be removed from this grace without affecting the people they are supposed to “oversee.” This is the exact same position of Khomiakov.⁶⁰

Like St. Andrei or Valentin, Chekhivsky argues that the parish is the heart of the church, not the chancellery. The parish body is the “cell” of the church as well as its center, and is akin to the family. It is occasionally forgotten that the village came first, the church was built as its center. Parishioners knew each other from birth, and grandparents had been baptized there and buried nearby. Today, parishes are often a random collection of people otherwise living the consumer, bourgeois-mass lifestyle of postmodern America. Thus, the modern parish is not a “parish” in the canonical sense of the word. It was the extension of the family because it – especially in rural Russia and Ukraine – literally was the extended family manifest in the village. It is no accident that part of Peter's “parish reform” was to destroy this link of the extended clan to the parish, as more than 50% of Russia's churches es were closed by the end of

⁶⁰ The First Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. 14-30 October 1921. Documents and Materials. Compiled by GM Mickle, LB Pylyavets, and IN Prelovska. Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv, 1999

Catherine's reign. Parish "consolidation" was a measure to break the connection of the parish to the family.

The "synod" is just a meeting of bishops. This is not the church, but rather, the bishop is a convenient representative for their diocese, itself expressed in the diocesan sobor, not the bishop as a person. The autocracy of the bishop is an implicit denial of the hesychastic truth of the reality of light. It is always present and fills all things, a good bishop might point the way to it, but little more than that. It implies that the bishop "creates" grace and then "dispenses" it to the people. This is false: Eden is always present and the church body can often manifest it in a limited way. The bishop has no "control" over this, but this error is what is implied by the episcopal dictatorship idea that is the overwhelmingly dominant view of Orthodox people today. Add this to the fact that simony and political machinations dominated the episcopate, so the 1921 approach, while extreme, is certainly understandable.

In the Second Synod of the Lypkivsky group, Chekhivsky stresses that the social role of the church is to side with the downtrodden: the peasant and the worker. Bishops often are urban elites, far more comfortable with bureaucrats and businessmen over the folk. In Ukraine, that was in addition to the fact that the episcopacy and clergy were often not fluent in the local language, or worse, looked down upon it. For Chekhivsky, like St. John of Kronstadt, the church body is associated with the poor, the rejected, the repentant sinner. St. John had far greater "episcopal" authority than the metropolitan of Peter's city who often mocked and condemned him. St. John was a threat because he was an active Christian who openly challenged the Petrine class system in Petrograd. Kronstadt, remember, was the place where the regime forced all poor people to live, so as not to "pollute" the geometric streets and fashions of the capital. Only western dress was legal in the main part of the city, so any poor peasant wearing

traditional Russian garb was either evicted or forced into the Kronstadt slum.

Mot controversial, however, was Chekhivsky's defense of the non-episcopal method of consecration. Ivan Tedorevich wrote that this is was an emergency measure to be rectified at the first opportunity, not a matter of policy. Chekhivsky disagreed and argued that the episcopacy was influenced by the developing Byzantine autocracy and became itself autocratic. As Lypkivsky also argued, the monarchical episcopate was the result of political conditions where the cleric acted as autocrat in the same way that an emperor did. It was the default means of governance. This argument is historically dubious and claiming some causal connection is almost impossible. Neither writer attempts it. Instead, Chekhivsky states that the patristic record powerfully argues for the identity of bishop and priest.⁶¹

St. Jerome argues in several letters that the bishop is just the chief priest rather than a separate order. Whether by election or seniority, the bishop is just a form of the priesthood that serves like an archpriest might serve today.

In addition, the canons of Pope St. Hippolytus (c 340), specifically 9-10, suggest this same thing.⁶² In canon 6, Hippolytus states that consecration is automatic for those who have suffered severely for the faith. No ordination is needed. Further, that the verification of any gift of healing is also an automatic ordination. There are no distinctions

⁶¹ The First Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. 14-30 October 1921. Documents and Materials. Compiled by GM Mickle, LB Pylyavets, and IN Prelovska. Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv, 1999

⁶² The claim to "Alexandrian tradition" is the same as the Canons of St. Hippolytus. The text can be found here: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf05.iii.v.v.html>, and the editor states that these are "wrongly attributed to St. Hippolytus." The canons mentioned here come from his collection.

made in clerical orders since it is the strength of the gift or the martyric struggle that grant title.

Canon 2 states:

A bishop should be elected by all the people, and he should be unimpeachable, as it is written of him in the apostle; in the week in which he is ordained, the whole people should also say, We desire him; and there should be silence in the whole hall, and they should all pray in his behalf, and say, O God, stablish him whom Thou hast prepared for us, etc.

The argument is that there is no mention of other bishops, only that the people are to say this prayer over their candidate. As there is no reference to different clerical orders and that bishops are to be elected and confirmed by the people, there is no reason to argue that the “people” of Ukraine could not do the same thing.

He goes on to argue that the singular episcopate came into existence as a means to regularize the church for the sake of communication with the state. Arius is quoted as saying that since the Orthodox have no bishops, there is no one to consecrate. Hence, he says that the people in Alexandria to the see of Alexandria and consecrated him themselves. Thus, it is not just that priests can consecrate, but laymen too.

Chekhivsky argues that Patriarch Eutyches of Alexandria in the 10th century mentioned that bishops were only necessary after Nicaea, when the state was now able to join with the church in some sort of union. Both institutions needed to accommodate this revolutionary change, and having a single representative of a diocese became a legal need. It still did not imply and difference in power, but an election of a representative that would serve the needs of the city at the royal court. In this discussion, many

authorities are cited by the 10th century Alexandrian church saying that the Nicaean requirement was not absolutely needed for apostolic authority.⁶³

The problem is that none of this seem to apply to Ukraine in 1921. The overarching idea is that the Apostolic mandate does not require a hierarchy. It might be useful and workable, but it never rose to an utter canonical necessity until the second millennium. Alexandria, always jealous of its authority, was the last to give in to the upstate church of Constantinople and hence, has the most records of this older form of consecration.

The 1921 group sent Ivan Tedorevich to the US, but he soon joined the Polish synod, leading to a rebellion of a tiny faction that broke away and was loyal to the 1921 tradition. In 1921, that church had 24 parishes, growing to 152 parishes and 64,000 people. In 1929, that synod elected Joseph Zuk, who quickly recognized his complete lack of canonical standing. He and his successor brought the UAOC in the USA under Constantinople. Bogdan (Spilyka) was elected and enthroned in Constantinople and sent to the US. The group was about 45 parishes in the US.

By 1950, there were thus two large groups in the USA numbering about 110,000 people. The church in Poland elected Palladios and Polykarp as archbishops, with the former heading the “western rite” mission in the US. They also consecrated Genady (Shyprykevtch). It was around that time when Metropolitan Ivan also saw his shaky foundation and joined the Ukrainian church of Poland. They also consecrated the new head of the Belorussian Autocephalous Church Sergei Ohotenko. The Ukrainian lack of canonical status in the Russian's eyes did not stop them from seeking to include the BAOC in its group under existing rank.

⁶³ cf. First Synod minutes, 1921

It was Christopher Contrageorge and Mstyslav Skyrpnyk that consecrated Ivan Tedorevich in Volyna in 1945. Sergius, once elected “patriarch” by Stalin, immediately anathematized the Polish church, which led to the Ecumenical Patriarch doing the same to him. But between endless, self-destructive pressure from Moscow and the Polish nationalist movement, the Orthodox Church in Poland lost many parishes and tracts of land. Within a few years, about 50% of their parishes were closed. That this church was very pro-German might have not worked in their favor. It should also be noted that the Polish Orthodox head, Dionysus, was consecrated by Antony Khrapovitsky, then metropolitan of Kiev and soon to be the first head of the ROCOR.

*The New Martyr Metropolitan Theophilus Buldovskyy
and the Poltava Answer to 1921*

On the other hand, the great Patriarch St. Tikhon erred substantially in his claim for all of Poland. This was the case even after it was granted autocephaly by both the Ecumenical Patriarchate. While an icon of holiness, Tikhon's misinformed opinion on Ukraine caused him more problems than the entire situation was worth. Tikhon had an exarch in Ukraine, initially Mikhail, then Constantine. Both refused to recognize any synod regardless of its origin. This is a strange stance since that same church had just recognized the Georgian autocephalous church.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ The major data in this section derive from these sources:
Kharkiv Regional Security (nd). The criminal case of Metropolitan Theophilus Buldovskyy. Case No 147900
<http://uapc.org.ua/e-biblioteka/>
Voloshin Y (1996) The Renaissance of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kharkov During the German Occupation. From the UAOC-Poltava Site 96 ch.7-9 (38-40)
www.hklib.npu.edu.ua
Skorobahatov A. (1999) The UAOC Relationship with APTS Administration in Kharkiv 1941-1943. Scientific and Scholarly

Navigating these waters was the “Poltava” group of the UAOC. Begun by bishops Antonin and Parthenius (mentioned above), they anathematized the 1921 fraud before it began. Both men dying in 1920, they heard rumblings of some anti-canonical movement. Their successors, disgusted with the 1921 farce, rapidly created the “Fraternal Organization of Ukrainian Autocephalous Churches.” The leader of this group was the charismatic Metropolitan Theophilus Buldovskyy. They were Ukrainian nationalists and were pro-German throughout their existence. But they also sought the pre-revolutionary tradition. They sought autocephaly the proper way. Moscow rejected them time and again, each time with a different canonical reasoning so minute as to be blatantly artificial.

Metropolitan Theophilus during World War II sought to revive the church in suffering Ukraine. Like so many, Theophilus thought the Germans to be liberators, only to be disappointed later on. His agenda was simple, and is comprised of five points:

- 1) Loyalty to the German occupation authorities;
- 2) The recognition of a single Autocephalous Ukrainian Orthodox Church;
- 3) That all clerical appointments at the parish level made by the metropolitan;
- 4) That the liturgy is to be said according to the language of the majority of parishioners;
- 5) To restore all the rules, customs and traditions of the church that existed before the revolution.⁶⁵

Works of Sloboda Ukraine: Philosophy, Religion and Culture, Kharkiv

<http://uapc.org.ua/e-biblioteka/>

⁶⁵ Voloshin Y (1996) The Renaissance of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kharkov During the German Occupation. From the UAOC-Poltava Site 96 ch.7-9 (38-40)
www.hklib.npu.edu.ua

The Germans initially agreed to the proposal under the condition that the church could not be used for political purposes. Upon submission of these conditions and the German acceptance, the metropolitan wrote his Appeal to the Faithful of the Holy Orthodox Church in Ukraine.” He stated

Oppressed for over twenty years under the godless regime, the faithful sought numerous ways to reconstruct church life. This created division, which further led to defamation, quarrels and mutual contempt. This was only to the advantage of the godless regime and assisted in its demolition of this movement. Our people were destroyed, many expelled, and the church almost completely destroyed in our country. We have suffered enough; too much innocent blood has been shed, but this blood has also redeemed us from our mistakes. We beg the Lord Christ to deliver us from our sins and selfishness and to finally gather our people into the One Holy Apostolic Autocephalous Orthodox Church.⁶⁶

During the nativity liturgy in 1942, the Metropolitan compared their present state to Christ's own advent in a manger. He was rejected by all both in his birth, as well as at his death. However, the Ukrainian people are not mere victims, he stated in addition:

I am ashamed to mention it - but it is true: We have forgotten his covenant and trampled upon

⁶⁶ Kharkiv Regional Security (nd). The criminal case of Metropolitan Theophilus Bu. Case No 147900 (translation mine) <http://uapc.org.ua/e-biblioteka/>

his holy truth. And he, in his righteous judgment, is punishing us, and we are impoverished. We have been thrown into chaos as the world looks upon us with pity. At one time, we walked with pride and arrogance, but now, after we have turned away from Christ, we ask forgiveness of our sins.⁶⁷

In a very short time, the metropolitan opened hundreds of parishes, a seminary, and several monasteries, including that of Pochyaev. As this is occurring, the Moscow Church under Stalin raged against this spiritual resurgence, calling these anti-communists fascists. They wondered aloud why the Ukrainians would dare fight against Stalin. That the kept church of Stalin might ask this question is understandable. Today, however, it is still being asked by those with access to the same documents referenced here. That is not understandable and inexcusable.

In terms of political theory, the metropolitan could not be clearer. To bring Christ to Ukraine again, it must be done in a way that Ukraine can understand. Hence, the church must be national. How this simple concept eludes the modern cosmopolitan churchman remains a mystery that this writer is not psychologically equipped to tackle. Nationalism is precisely this social and linguistic context that brings the Christian message not in some abstract way, but in a way that is specific to the people, their struggles and hopes. Without that, theological discussion becomes hair-splitting canonical debates and almost obsessive concerns for bishops and institutions. The nationalist

⁶⁷ Voloshin Y (1996) The Renaissance of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kharkov During the German Occupation. From the UAOC-Poltava Site 96 ch.7-9 (38-40)
www.hklib.npu.edu.ua

church is that of the people. The cosmopolitan church is that of the elites.

Just as there was no American “anti-communism,” the German commitment to this cause is also suspect. The clearly anti-Marxist, pro German and pro Ukrainian vision of this church came under “suspicion” by the German police agencies. It seemed that Hitler's bureaucrats in Ukraine were anti-communist so long as they were doing this fighting against Stalin. Using natives who actually lived under Marxism did not occur to them. One of the more recent histories of this era makes this startling claim:

Concerning the Orthodox Church, the Germans considered this revival not as a means of relaying Nazi and anti-Soviet propaganda, but as a threat to their regime. The strengthening of the popular Orthodox faith, its reliance on traditional, ethnic rites combined with a national and popular historical education on Ukraine was not seen as anti-communist. . . At the same time, the Soviet secret police, acting near Kharkiv and deepening their penetration into German territory and Ukrainian nationalist structures significantly increased measures to weaken the impact of the Autocephalous movement in general and Metropolitan Buldovsky in particular.⁶⁸

The absurdity of this policy should be very clear. The Germans saw Ukrainian nationalism as a threat, though that movement sought an alliance with Germany against Stalin. Stalin, at least with actual reason, also sought to destroy this movement. This strongly questions the German dedication to the anti-Soviet cause and adds to the evidence that this was an anti-Russian movement. The Cold War

⁶⁸ Voloshin, 40

only became “heated” when “Russian nationalism” became an issue. Otherwise, American capitalists were massively invested in “building socialism.” In Ukrainian history, nothing is ever as it seems.

The insanity does not end here. This same author, writing the official history of the Poltava movement in the UAOC, states that the German police helped spread Metropolitan Sergius “anathema” against the UAOC throughout the country. They hoped to divide this movement and neutralize its effects on the Ukrainian peasantry. Based on the idea that they could not accept an independent Ukraine, the German authorities arrested the metropolitan more than once and banned all UAOC services. Despite this, bishops Mstyslav (Skrypnyck) and Igor – consecrated by Polykarp and Nikanor of the Polish Church – were added to the UAOC at St. Andre's cathedral. The Bishops from the Polish (that is, Ukrainians in Poland) church sought good relations with the Poltava group against both the Soviets and the “1921” crowd. In July of 1942, the act of communion of the two churches was signed. Later as Patriarch, Mstyslav spoke highly of his connection with Theophilus and his tremendous work in the resurrection of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine.

It might also be noted that since this act of communion was expressly accepted by Dionysus, the work of bishop Mstyslav brought the Poltava UAOC into full communion with the rest of the Orthodox world. Yet again, this was a threat to the Germans, who under the Reichcommisar Erich Koch, increased the repression of the UAOC almost in proportion to the failures of the eastern front for the Germans. By 1943, any chance of mobilizing the people of Ukraine against the USSR was gone, yet, this could have won Hitler the war.

In 1943, eastern Ukraine was the scene of a see-saw battle between the two armies, meaning that Theophilus was arrested numerous times by both the SS as well as the

NKVD. Finally, when the Soviets retook the area, they arrested the metropolitan, tortured him, and finally murdered him on January 23 1944.

As this is not sufficient insult, the metropolitan, now a new martyr and hence a saint, was not rehabilitated when his case came before the state in 1997. In 1991, the law was passed in Ukraine entitled “On the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression Ukraine” and became law on April 17, 1991. His specific case did not arise until 1997 and the result was apropos of his life: “Buldovsky was properly accused under Art. 54-1(a) of the Criminal Code and thus not subject to rehabilitation.” it was signed by the deputy prosecutor of Kharkiv, working under the office of Justice Mikhailov on the regional bench and dated February 20, 1997. As he himself said in 1941, as Christ was tormented and rejected, so was he and all Ukraine.

The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church under Patriarchs Volodymyr (Romanyuk) and Dmitri (Jarema)

Beauty takes many forms, but, in good Platonic fashion, it remains one and the same regardless. Beauty, as proportion, can refer to a work of art and, in the same way, to a life of virtue. In this article, two approaches to beauty are described, the life of courage as manifested in the life of Patriarch Volodymyr, and the theology of light that served as the foundation of the theology of Patriarch Dmitri. Largely ignored in the west, these two patriarchs were of great social and intellectual significance.

The Orthodox world has unfairly and unreasonably fought the autocephaly of Ukraine. While accepting Georgia with equanimity, Ukraine became an important liability for nationalist forces in both Russia and Ukraine as World War I erupted. The canons are clear: Orthodoxy is a nationalist religion in the sense that the church is founded upon a linguistic basis. “Language” to repeat, is not merely vocabulary and syntax, its the social context that makes sense out of these symbols. The canons of St. Photius equally legislate the national, ethnic and hence, linguistic, basis of the local church.

Ukraine's claim to independence is solid. Independence need not mean isolation. The White armies, in refusing to accept Ukrainian autonomy, lost this very powerful ally in this world-shaking event. Hitler, selectively using his absurd racial theories on Slavs, refused the assistance of millions of Slavs, the single most important decision that lost him the war.

Ukrainian is a language distinct from Russian. Documents and treaties between Russian and the Cossack host were bilingual, and translators were needed in many

negotiations. Ukraine is an Orthodox country whose church was tried in the fires of mass apostasy and genocide and should be treated accordingly.

Much of Ukraine's history has been part of empires that were not Russian. Poland, Lithuania, Crimea, Austria and Germany at one time or another brought Ukraine into a very different life. It is not superior to the Russian, but equal to it, with the same strengths and weaknesses that any two people have. It is one thing to reject this independence when Ukraine was becoming a spring board for attacks on Russia. However, when this was long past, so was its justification.

Patriarch Volodymyr (1925-1995)

Patriarch Volodymyr, as is well known, was part of the nationalist dissident movement in the USSR. Arrested as a priest for spreading nationalist ideas, he was sentenced several times to the camps. Ordained priest in the Carpathians, Fr. Vasili increased the number of believers there tremendously. His work covered most of the 1960s, and, at least politically, focused on the peasant nature of the Ukrainian and Ruthenian idea. Concerned primarily for the impoverished and the young, the KGB kept him under constant surveillance. His message to youth was simple: reject fashion, reject statist ideology. And most of all, maintain the old traditions that are rarely fashionable, but will mean the difference between social sanity and western, liberal illusion.

Fr. Vasili was of peasant stock, maintaining the ancient folk mystification of nature and its connection to national identity. His brother, Basil, was murdered by the NKVD in 1947. For Vasili, theology was necessarily political, since social organization is part of human nature and this is, in turn, saved, transfigured and deified by Christ. To leave out the social and moral is arbitrary and absurd, since Christ was to be “all in all,” not just in “all

that is convenient.”

Ultimately, Fr. Vasili was sent to the GULAG on four separate occasions that spanned the years 1949 to 1959, and then again from 1972 to 1979, where he was finally released and escaped to Canada. Having lost his wife, he became a monk under Metropolitan Mstyslav, the future patriarch of Kiev and Volodymyr's predecessor. Only when the USSR fell in Ukraine did Mstyslav take his rightful place as Patriarch of an independent Ukraine, and the newly minted monk Volodymyr was made Metropolitan of Lv'iv and the heir apparent of Mstyslav.

It should be mentioned that Mstyslav warned Volodymyr and his flock generally against the machinations and corruption of metropolitan Filaret (some claim that Mstyslav had anathematized Filaret, but the latter's great wealth and political connections made such an pronouncement of no effect). Volodymyr was never excommunicated by Mstyslav, as the Wikipedia article on Patriarch Volodymyr claims.

Fr. Vasili Romanyuk, later to become Patriarch Volodymyr (Vladimir) of all Ukraine, wrote several epistles from prison. Within these, one can discern a very specific and well thought out social philosophy based on the church and the Ukrainian tradition. His two main essays, “Sons of Day and Sons of Night,” (1979) as well as “The Kingdom of God Within Us” (1979) are directed against the world Orthodox and their attachment to the fraudulent Moscow Patriarchate.⁶⁹

For the then-priest Vasili, the true Orthodox resisters “have no right to sleep because we are the light of the world. . . one may be called righteous only if we are ready to lay down our life for our friends.” Of course, those who

⁶⁹ All quotes from the patriarch are taken from Romanyuk, Patriarch Volodymyr. *A Voice in the Wilderness. The Society for the Study of Religion Under Communism*, 1980

attached themselves to the MP were interested in saving their own skin. “Our Christian calling obligates us to categorically reject all the deeds of darkness, and enter into no compromises with the sons of night. . .”

While the world Orthodox were comfortable, well ed, and complacent in their acceptance of the Moscow Patriarchate and the WCC who supported it, the future patriarch writes concerning the True Orthodox “There is no grumbling about their fate amongst them because they know whose sons they are, why they have been called into this world, and where they are going. . . no one has been given the right to be indifferent to the events of this world.” On the other hand, the world Orthodox have been led astray by “insidiousness, deceit, flattering words and the guise of ‘magnanimity,’” as the world persecutes the righteous. Even more, “The devil wants to legalize the interception of human souls for himself with the help of various secular laws that persuades Christians to agree with the legalization of lawlessness.”

But what remains steady in the patriarch’s words is that there can be no compromise here: “Let us not be diverted from our chosen path by any diabolical ‘peace’ proposals, because there can be nothing in common between darkness and light.” Clearly, this is not only directed against the left wing in western politics, but more importantly, the semi-Orthodox that have joined with Moscow and those others who have sought to compromise with anti-Christ rejecting their Christian calling for being comfortable in the mainstream of social life in the west: the same west that not only ignored the future patriarch’s many appeals, but continued to aid and trade with the Soviet bloc while the GULAG remained in motion.

In an appeal to the world Orthodox to break with Moscow and the WCC, he writes “Therefore, what emerges fro the present sate of things is that the Christian community should not reconcile itself to the conditions

which have come about in today's world and should demand in those so-called 'dialogues' that the opposing side promptly change its attitude towards us!" That is, the suffering Orthodox in the catacombs. The WCC, needless to say, ignored Fr. Vasili's appeals and continued to support the Moscow Patriarchate and its "world Orthodox" hangers on.

For Patriarch Volodymyr, the voice of Christ can be heard in the conscience of every Orthodox person. "It speaks to us constantly if we have not deadened it by our sins" he writes. For a man that spent a generation throughout the various GULAG camps in Russia and Ukraine, camps that the Moscow Patriarch denied even existed, he writes "It is namely our sins that prevent us from feeling the joy of the Kingdom of God already here on earth, and later become a hindrance to entering it, for according to the Word of God nothing impure will enter there." This is an important theological point. The Kingdom of God and the transfiguration of nature and human relations has already been accomplished. Heaven exists on earth in the church in its fullness, but our sins keep us bound to the lower world of cause and effect, in short, the world of power and its relations.

In his first sermon as a bishop entitled "Ukraine: The New Jerusalem," he stressed what made Ukrainian Orthodoxy distinct from all others. Nationalism, folk culture and Sobornapravna were all healthy expressions of state building in a Christian context. Imperialism fears nothing more than a strong, rational and historically based national movement. Denying the nationhood of the oppressed is a means to take away that essential ground for rebellion.

Unlike Catholicism, Protestantism and new Orthodoxy, heaven is merely a dimension of the created earth, bound together in lawfulness by the Logos, saved and transfigured by Christ, and it can be experienced here

and now by the saints and great ascetics. It is not some far off world, not some “place up there” as the simple would have it, but within the church, within the ascetic struggle itself.

Death is a simple transition to the possession of this kingdom with complete security, but a kingdom that can be accessed while still in the flesh. In other words, Christ has already accomplished this task of transfiguration, only humanity and its arrogance and pride has prevented itself from experiencing it. “Entire generations were lost in the murky thickets of centuries only because they believed not in God, but in corrupted human wisdom. And this is not all. Human wisdom inspired by a diabolical spirit, strives to somehow justify its abuse of people, embellishing it with great attributes and far fetched epithets in order to look enticing and pleasant to human hearing and sight because in this way it is easier to capture all kinds of credulous and naive people.”

In his “New Agenda for Ukraine” he advocated for everything “world Orthodoxy” refuses to countenance. The linguistic revival of Ukrainian is essential, since that is the lifeblood of a people. It is a repository of peasant wisdom and the sufferings of historical experience. Christ came to save all, not merely the comfortable bourgeois Orthodox sitting in his cushioned pew in the Antiochian parish, but the nation, our suffering and the marginalized.

Keeping desires simple is another: making war on the same American Solzhenitsyn did, this requires the disavowal of all excess money, the rejection of all luxury and all forms of cultural vulgarization. Maintaining the old Ukrainian tradition is necessary as, at a minimum, a protest against the world, its churches and politicians. Avoid harmful vices such as smoking and alcohol and, most of all, do battle with the comfortable, pop culture and all other forms of demonic illusion.

For Fr. Vasili, the west was completely fooled by

the leftist propaganda machine in and out of the USSR. Corrupted media, religious complacency and sheer ignorance and self-importance forbade western politicians and religious leaders to fully comprehend the Soviet menace. While the Nazis were condemned to the skies on a daily basis, being a Marxist was little less than chic in American universities.

The Ukrainian Orthodox mind rightly equates nationalism, that is, a strong ethnic and religious community with both representation and human rights. His “Agenda for Ukraine” was simple, but of immense significance. In order to build a rational, sane, strong and balanced state that can hold its own against the east as well as the west, the consumer mentality of the western mass must be rejected. Desires must be kept simple, popular culture rejected and all excess assets given to those weaker than oneself.

The law should reflect the historical experience of the society, and should be challenged when it does not. The strong Orthodox man should never fear death and stare injustice down regardless of the consequences. Passions carry their own punishment: gluttony leads to obesity and health problems, lust leads to destroyed families and adultery, greed leads to dishonesty and oligarchy and the desire for power leads to a state run by the most devious.

This the likes of Patriarch +Volodymyr and Solzhenitsyn knew very well. Professional academics have ignored the testimony of GULAG inmates among the expatriate Ukrainian and Russian exiles in America, while giving “Holocaust survivors” speaking fees of \$100,000 and up. Had Solzhenitsyn not won the Nobel prize, he also would have gone down the Orwellian memory hole as well.

It needs to be kept in mind that one of the essential arguments of Patriarch Volodymyr was that Soviet domination was justified, in the minds of Muscovite bureaucrats, as ending the “backward” life of Ukraine. Like

most recent imperial ventures, modernity and progress was the justification.

For Fr. Vasili in the GULAG, the Moscow Patriarchate was little more than a propaganda organization for the KGB. The fact that these men wore clerical dress and chanted the services meant nothing, none of that proved their Orthodoxy, only their usefulness. Today, the Ukrainians in Bound Brook, in full communion with Constantinople who never wavered in their support of the Moscow Patriarchate, would like to drop +Volodymyr down the memory hole, something that we cannot permit. For Fr. Vasili, the Moscow Patriarchate exists solely for the purposes of “self-liquidation,” in his words, a bureaucracy that exists to oversee the manipulation, alteration and eventual disintegration of religion in Russia and has no other purpose.

Hence, the Moscow Patriarchate maintained close ties with the WCC to permit a further penetration of the propaganda to the “anti-communist” west. In fact, the WCC was a willing partner with the MP in flooding the west with false stories about “freedom of religion” in the Soviet Bloc. In fact, the future patriarch writes from prison, concerning the Moscow Patriarchate,

This church has no rights. It is unable to set in motion its own activity. Furthermore, it has been assigned the function of self-liquidation. . priests and active believers are submitted to various repressions while the hierarchy washes its hands of the matter. . I have turned to the Moscow patriarchate several times, so that they could intervene in my defense, but on none of these occasions have I ever even heard a reply.

In dealing with the obliviousness of the corrupted

west, he writes: “Brazenly and arrogantly the USSR persecutes believers while the Christian world not only remains silent, but signs various agreements with this country.” The phrase “Christian world” was uttered in sarcasm.

In mocking the western delegates at the 1975 WCC convention in Nairobi, Fr. Vasili writes: “. . .how the delegates of the west permitted themselves to be deceived and manipulated in everything! A visitation from the Lord! It cannot be called anything else. How benevolently and attentively they listen to the emissaries of falsehood and atheism cry out from the rostrums about the equal rights of believers and other citizens.”

The “religious academics” gathered in Nairobi, with major foundation grants, to pontificate about the progressive nature of the USSR in order to satisfy their paymasters. These then went back to their universities and pompously pontificated about their sophistication and their world travels, as millions starved in the GULAG. As they piously prattled about ecumenism in their protected and tenured chairs, the true Christian world was liquidated. Those that spoke out were summarily called “fascists” and, even worse, “nationalists” by the apostles of openness and ecumenism.

The future Patriarch hence indicts the entire “world Orthodox” organization, the Phanar, Antioch, Alexandria and the OCA, as being part and parcel of the liquidation of the True Orthodox in Russia and Ukraine. Even worse, the flatulent, neo-Orthodox world of the OCA, themselves openly venerating KGB “Patriarch Nikodim” who created them, openly sided with the KGB hierarchy over the True Orthodox, the latter of which were anathematized as “schismatics” by the western “World Orthodox” organization and the WCC, of which the world Orthodox are merely a small branch office.

For Patriarch Volodymyr, the only true virtue is in

the acceptance of martyrdom: but the world of “mainline Orthodoxy” is the opposite of martyrdom: it is a compromise with the world for the sake of money and mainline prestige. The OCA has received millions in grants from the WCC and Archer Daniels Midland to finance their seminaries and “scholars.” But these same bishops, to acquiesce to all sorts of non-canonical outrages and sit on personal fortunes and tenured chairs, spit in the faces of the TOC and say we are “non-canonical” and, as always, that they “lack love.”

Patriarch Volodymyr saw the same in the USSR in the 1970s. Certain KGB bishops, all of whom maintained communion with “world Orthodoxy,” were wealthy men who traveled the world preaching peace with the USSR and condemning the underground church as “graceless.” The Serbs, Antiochians and especially the OCA nodded along with them, and turned to condemn the TOC as “lacking in compassion.” For Patriarch Volodymyr, there could be no compromise with this mentality: they were as evil as the KGB who financed them.

Volodymyr soon learned that the WCC was not going to help him in prison, but in fact were helping to finance his jailers. Was the OCA going to help the imprisoned in Russia, when they were created by the Moscow Patriarchate and the WCC that has assisted in the rounding up of underground Christians? But martyrdom is precisely this: rejecting the world and its pomps, and receiving the attacks of the world in return. While world orthodoxy can offer much money and academic respectability, it can not offer virtue, since the world of martyrdom is foreign to it. It cooperates with the princes of this world in order to continue to finance its activities and receive invitations to the major academic conferences.

“Evil has become more subtle these days,” patriarch Volodymyr writes. It needs not to continue rounding up the Christians, since none of them are willing to fight their

jailers. The Orthodox can have their liturgy, their harmless theology AND worldly respect. But this is the voice of the anti-Christ, the one who says that you can have it both ways. Neither Patriarchs Mstyslav nor Volodymyr would commune with anyone who recognized the patriarchate of Moscow as a matter of official synod policy, and therefore, sought ties only with the True Orthodox.

To reject this martyric legacy is solely based on the endless pursuit of filthy lucre and the approbation of Baal. For Volodymyr, human reason and the will that controls it is crippled by sin. This and only this is at the root of the fraud of world Orthodoxy and its support for anyone who finances them. It is a will so blinded by schism and sin that it can see only the approbation of the world as the only true good the good for which all other goods should be sacrificed.

Patriarch Dmitri Yaerma (1915-2000)

The confusion in the Ukrainian Orthodox world is mortifying and degrading to the mission of Christ. However, there are a few clarifications of this that might make the whole mess less foggy. Dmitri was elected Patriarch on September 5, 1993. Volodymyr was elected to the same position on October 21. The election of Dmitri was defensive in nature. Volodymyr was elected by the forces of Filaret, though Volodymyr's hostility to the former KGB cleric is well known.

Immediately upon Dmitri's election to forestall Filaret's takeover, the future patriarch contacted his former allies in the Ukrainian and Russian intelligence services to dig up as much dirt as possible on Dmitri and his supporters. Patriarch Dmitri made it very clear that Filaret—and only Filaret—was the reason for the divisions in the church of Kiev.

To grasp the implications of the Ukrainian patriarchate and its philosophical significance, the most

important concept is that the church, persecuted throughout the Soviet era, has been forcibly prevented from being resurrected through fraud and violence. In this case, from one man. The implications here are enormous: not the least of which is that, in many respects, Ukraine is mission territory. In some cases, people alienated from the church hold that it was merely a tool of the regime, and Filaret continues that sordid history. Yet, it is not the fault of the church that its best members, killed or in exile, were not permitted to govern her.

The fact is that the specific philosophical contribution of Dmitri to Ukrainian life in the late 20th century is focused on confronting and transforming the corruption, crime and fraud that surrounded him. Without this hideous environment—an environment that killed and destroyed even those who had survived the camps—Dmitri and his school of aesthetics cannot be understood. As the “canonical Orthodox” scoffed at Dmitri and self-righteously pontificated – from the security and wealth of their offices or seminaries – how “terrible” and “nationalist” this church was, Dmitri sought the ancient forms of renewal and spiritual rebirth for a bleeding nation.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ The material for this section derives from the following works:
In Memory of the UAOC Patriarch Dmitri. UKR-Inform, 2000
Hmilovskyy, N (2011) *Ora et labora* - the vital principle of Patriarch Demetrios. Lviv Museum of the History of Religion
<http://www.museum.lviv.ua/novyny/9-novyny/39-ora-et-labora-zhyttievyyi-pryntsyp-patriarkha-dymytriia>
Yarema, D (1999) *Testament Patriarch Demetrios*. UAOC Press
Димитрій (Патріарх Київський і всієї України) (1999)
Дискусійні думки про об'єднання церков. Прес-центр Патріархії Української Автокефальної Православної Церкви Димитрій (Патріарх Київський і всієї України). На порозі 2000 року: послання до християн України. Прес-центр Патріархії Української Автокефальної Православної Церкви
Demetrius (Patriarch) *Church building in Western Ukraine*. Ed: Yu Kryvoruchko; International School of church architecture. Lviv,

The concept of “recognition” is a false one. The church is not a country, one that requires “diplomatic recognition” from powerful states in order to be a legal entity according to “international law.” This is the highest and most devastating manifestation of historical, canonical and moral incompetence in the church today. A church need not be “recognized.” It is the manifestation of the Holy Spirit, not a social body.

In fact, as the regime continues to spread its demonic tentacles throughout the world, “recognition” is precisely a sign of the lack of canonical truth. The fact that Orthodox people, even some educated ones, hold that, in order to be a “church,” it must be recognized—by the Phanar no less—can either be deliberate fraud or ignorance run amok. It remains however, that “recognition” can only derive from churches with money and social prestige. Holiness is not an issue.

In his (1999) “Testament,” Dmitri emphasized the necessity of remaining under the Ecumenical Patriarchate. This is significant because it is the same claim that the diaspora must be included within any idea of Sobornappravna. Since Constantinople has a special jurisdiction of small mission societies, this is quite coherent. Rejecting the present constellation of UAOC in Ukraine (Volodymyr had died in 1995), he sought to focus the idea of unity on the recently deceased Metropolitan Constantine in the USA.

He was also concerned with the broader context of the UAOC. His “Cult Forces of Television,” he writes that the cult of “business” has seeped into Slavic lands: money for money's sake, the alchemical means whereby gold can produce more gold and have the power to stand in for objects of labor. Foreign agitators brought these in from the west, dubbed them into Ukrainian, and presented them as “normal” for the “civilized west.”

The use of video images as a method of control is nothing new. As Marx swept away the older agrarian culture, this tabula rasa was rapidly filled by the animal passions of Hollywood. There is nothing inherently wrong with a policy that mandates traditional songs and poems on radio. Competing with multi-million dollar western productions, the Bandura-player does not stand a chance. State action can serve as a countermeasure to the rule of western capital and its media. Dmitri writes,

Church every nation aims to save his people from evil and sin, lead people to Christ, and with Christ in heaven.
Church in the state must first work with his people. native people. Bulgarian clergy working for the Bulgarians, Serbs - Serbs, Romanian for Romanian. Romanians pray and praise God in their native Romanian, and we have tortured people long dead language like minded Catholics - Latin - as required by the idea of the Russian empire that oppresses us for over three hundred years, and that the pronunciation of the Church Slavonic language decrees changed to Russian. Therefore, in our nation destroyed living faith, destroyed the inner spiritual life. To our people revived, got rid of the inferiority complex - have put a solid principle in Ukrainian church - only the Ukrainian language. On the minority in the country - let them think leaders. Our church has to think about this, driven to unconsciousness and spirituality people.⁷¹

⁷¹ cf. Yaerma 4, May 1999

Canon law, even among orthodox intellectuals, remains a blank spot. A quick read of the Rudder—if such be possible—shows that the majority of Orthodox bishops and “scholars” today have no hope of being “canonical.” Ecumenism, recognition of heretics as “Christians” and the near-veneration of the Pharisees and Khazars place these men as the agents of demons, not “churchmen.” The result of this widespread ignorance and corruption leads to the common belief that the Phanar is the region of the orthodox pope who controls grace and “sends” it to who he will. As the True Orthodox resistance to the innovations of ecumenism and liberalism continues to publish, debate and use to internet to spread the little known frauds and heresies of “mainline Orthodoxy” new calendar polemicists have ran and hid from this heat by using the concept of “recognition” as a means of deflecting attention from these significant issues.

The concept of “recognition” is as anti-canonical as one can get. It assumes that the church requires (in order to be the church) an external authority that can provide or withhold the concept. There is no such external authority, nor does the church require it (to be the church). The church generates, so to speak, its own authority through its adherence to tradition. Tradition here is a highly technical word. Tradition is the specific modes and methods that the Holy Spirit has used in history to manifest Christ's presence. Monasticism, self-denial, self-sacrifice, martyrdom, conversions, just monarchy and social rule, simplicity and many other marks are the symbols (in the true ontological sense only rarely grasped by moderns) of the presence of the Spirit. One symbol of the demons is fetishization, including the fetishization of external authorities. And who judges them? Ultimately, it is the Tradition, in the proper sense, that serves to unify the church. Bishops do not, under most circumstances, have

their authority and are often the worst offenders in creating schisms based on their own self-interest.

Secondly, the fraud of Filaret and all those who seek “recognition” as the sine qua non of “grace” show Orthodoxy to be in an extremely low state. Yet, this is not the first time Ukraine has been forced to rebuild her church from practically nothing. The struggle for autocephaly under St. Job Boretsky was a similar situation: the lack of education was one of the main problems that led Ukrainians to embrace the Latin heresy, and even brought St. Peter and others like Militii Smotriskii to advocate a Patriarch of Latins and “Greeks” so as to iron out differences and rebuild a shattered Christian civilization. Under conditions of captivity and almost total de-Christianization – such a thing was considered necessary.

Dmitri made it clear that the re-Christianization of Ukraine required, first of all, a real Ukrainian church. This meant that it was not the church of Filaret, the Phanar or the Russians. It was the Church of Ukraine that did for Ukrainian culture what the Russian church did for its own. Just as St. Peter sought a reconciliation “patriarchate” (showing that even the most educated of Orthodox people make mistakes, albeit under extreme conditions), the patriarchate of Dmitri sought recognition from the Phanar. Dmitri, however, had no chance. Filaret was a master politician, with billions of rubles at his command. The UAOC patriarchate of Dmitri was poverty-stricken by comparison. Dmitri was a man who struggled for holiness and made errors under extreme duress. Filaret was in his element: chaos and amorality where the only value was cash and contacts in the Jewish underground.

Patriarch Dmitri was a student of beauty. In a pedestrian, prosaic and materialist age, Dmitri sought solace and renewal in iconography. As Filaret was advocating statues of Francis of Assisi in his “churches,” Dmitri, an iconographer himself, sought the renewal of the

older Ukrainian schools of iconography. More realistic, with much natural background foliage, the Ukrainian, or Kievan school, was a mainstay of the Ukrainian renewal that has received almost no coverage from professional theologians who saw no remuneration in following this poor, marginalized church. As his movement was under attack from Russian Patriarchate, state security, Jewish organized crime and, occasionally, from within his own ranks, Dmitri saw the renewal of humanity in the icon. The icon, to him, was the antidote for all that was evil and corrupt in the world. Most could not—or would not—see what he saw. They only saw wood, paint and an artist's salary. The patriarch saw much more.⁷²

This concern with true, ancient and native iconography was the center of his philosophical contribution to Ukrainian life. Like all those who see the church renewed in true aesthetics, Dmitri centered his theology and metaphysics around the divine light. Though few realize it and fewer can recognize it, the hesychastic life was the root and branch, for Dmitri, of the resurrection of Kievan Orthodoxy. His Testament is a summary statement of his views on this.

The combination of iconography, “Light theology,” monasticism and hesychasm was the contribution of Dmitri's fairly short patriarchate to Ukrainian philosophy. It was a metaphysics of renewal; it was the life of self-denial in a hostile world. Man is not “body and soul.” man is a unified composite: man reflects the Chalcedonian union of Christ and his natures.

Grace, in the theology of Patriarch Dmitri, also has a very specific function. It is uncreated and identical with both the church itself and the recreation of paradise on earth. The fetishization of “external authorities” also

⁷² cf. Demetrius (Patriarch) Church building in Western Ukraine. Ed: Yu Kryvoruchko; International School of church architecture. Lviv, 1998

imply the damaging heresy the grace is created and “bestowed” on supplicants through “bishops.” Nothing could be more false: it is the heresy of created grace and is the main distinction between western and eastern Christianity.

In Dmitri's approach to the monastic fathers, grace is that which holds the human composite together. In fact, it is that which holds everything together. It is that which keeps the universe in order. In a life of prayer and humility, the soul can experience this unifying power with greater and greater degrees of intensity. This is the very ontology of hesychasm. Grace is uncreated, it is not under the control of the bishops. Bishops are only guides to its attainment. This is the main reason why all bishops need be monks.

Patriarch Dmitri writes “the icon is written with light.” The icon is the “enlightening” of the human composite through grace. Without grace, soul and body fight. The latter always wins. Under grace, the soul wins, and brings the body into subjection. The icon, so to speak, is the representation of that proper ontological subordination. It is a subordination, however, based on the natural order, not on an arbitrary power.

The icon is a link between God and matter. Art, aesthetics and the life of ascetic struggle are all unified in the “light” of the icon. Christ, through the Holy Spirit and the uncreated grace of the Trinity made available through the Transfiguration and Resurrection, is made present in a very real way. It is not the icon itself, but the icon in its context: prayer, the sacramentals, asceticism and correct doctrine. Nothing in the church exists outside of a context. This contextualization shows the Orthodox world—the Christian world—rejects nominalism as a deadly sin. It is the sin that individuals are valuable in themselves without links to grace or each other. Nominalism is the “ontology of Hell” in that it separates things from each other. They become isolated, useless and slowly decompose. The horror and dread of the existentialist school showed in an

immensely profound way what nominalism and its
resulting individualism will achieve (and have achieved).

What Hrushevsky Wrought: An Overview of Ukrainian Nationalism in Second Half of the 20th Century

The 20th century began with, among other things, the writings of Hrushevsky, whose work altered the nature of Slavic historiography. No later Ukrainian nationalist can be understood without him. Kiev was the center of Ukraine, and existed as a thriving civilization before Rurik. The Mongols did not destroy it, nor was there any “mass exodus” to northern Russia as a result.

The Kievan state was the apogee of the Ukrainian Orthodox ideal. The prince was highly limited by the tribal elites acting as his high command, and, since they were tribal based, their legitimacy was generally accepted as they ruled over cities. They were not conquerors, but were forced to cooperate with the urban *viche* (the assembly) that functioned largely as a check on bad or incompetent princes. An independent church, a strong aristocratic element checking a strong princely one, created a balance of power that was both Christian and just. This was upset by the Mongol influence over eastern Slavia.

Hrushevsky argued that eastern Ukrainian cities were both independent and self-sufficient after the Mongol conquest, and he cites papal envoys who speak of conquest, but not destruction, in Ukraine. Volyn landowners speak of an exodus to the west, but never to the north or east.

Most Ukrainian nationalism is based around the Galician state as the first manifestation of a specifically Ukrainian idea. The monarchs Roman (d. 1205) and Daniel (d. 1264) unified a wealthy, powerful state with greater trade ties with the Greeks than Kiev. Wealth not only helped the growth of a strong state, but also its anti-type, a strong nobility, the existence of which is the ground and

source for all injustice and national decay. These monarchs were focused enough to destroy the arrogant nobles who were not above bringing in Turks, Poles or Magyars to overthrow their king.

However, these powerful monarchs can not last forever. From Daniel came Leo and Yuri, defeated by the Lithuanians and Poles respectively, and the Grand Duchy took Galicia to itself after the Mongols finished their conquest. The Cossacks are the successors of the princely era and came into existence as a response to the genocide unleashed by the Union of Lublin in 1569. The emergence of ethnic Ukraine is in the growth of Galicia, the Host and Volyn in the 12th century.

The essential themes of Hurshevsky's work revolves around the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL) as the true guardian of the Russian Orthodox tradition. It was as large as Moscow even under Ivan III and these two states created an immense amount of Orthodox writing and sanctity. Hrushevsky offered a well researched and reasoned critique of the Muscovite historical schema. From this came the nationalist movement in the later part of the 20th century that, generally speaking ,accepted most, if not all, of his views.

Bandera and the OUN

Famous Ukrainian nationalist Stepan Bandera (died 1959) argued that the nation is a genetic unity. It is based on shared biological foundations because it is based on intermarriage and hence, genetic similarity. People normally do not marry those who do not speak their language, which in the present climate in America, is a controversial statement. This difference in genetic constitution implies that economics and life choices will differ among peoples in that they are – at their most rooted biological level – different from one another. As genetics interact with the topography and political history of a

people, a real, distinct ethnos is formed.

For Bandera, the family is the first community and the primal one. This slowly develops into a sense of mutual interdependence, one founded on a sense of solidarity that becomes the root of nationhood. This is especially pronounced if the group is undergoing external pressure from a marauding foe or a rapacious empire. This solidarity is, importantly, the root of a basic egalitarianism in economic life. Labor, as Hegel argued, is national in the sense that the division of labor is the transformation of individual interest into the collective.

A common goal requires working in a climate of sacrifice and virtue. Like Ivan Franko and many others, nationalism for Bandera is a cultural unity leading to solidarity. In turn, this sense of family belonging alters the nature of work and hence, economic life. In many respects, this is an excellent ethical understanding of the folk-ethnos.

The state is essential here due to the size, power and militancy of the myriad enemies Ukraine faced in the first half of the 20th century. The state protects the ethnos and guarantees independence both economic and political. The state, as the instrument of the ethnos, guides investment and focuses resources on that which Ukraine can produce well. The point at which the state develops interests of its own, which might come close to adding some actual content to the “civic nation.” This, in truth, is just a mystification of state power without an ethnic or moral focus other than its own survival.⁷³

Some object to Bandera's insistence on ideological uniformity, seemingly innocent of the extreme levels of genocide the country had suffered. Apart from being a common and universal goal of all those with political power, Bandera sought a unified Ukraine as a means of

⁷³ Посівнич, Микола. Степан Бандера — життя, присвячене свободі. Літопис УПА, 2008, III (N. Posivnych, from the Collected Works of the UPA, vol 3).

self-defense and economic development. It was either that sort of militancy or national destruction. As of 2014, it is the latter, showing the fate of all “civic nations.”

Bandera accepted a limited state (since ethnic states are limited by definition), but one strong enough to maintain independence under the worst of conditions. While the concept irritates western minds that generally have no identity at all, the Ukrainian context fully justifies his combativeness.⁷⁴ For him, the state was a moral unity that, at its best, protects and facilitates both the material and spiritual life of the people (as opposed to a party).

The reality is that Bandera argued for a simple platform that sought primarily to fight the USSR, and only later to build a strongly integralist state that is capable of maintaining what would be a highly fragile independence. He rejected the idea that political factions, even together, represent “the people.” The nation is a unity while its negation is the party or faction which invariably represents some frustrated faction of an elite seeking power. Imperialism is when an ethnos decides to take other territories outside of itself. Mutual respect can only exist when each group remains on its traditional territory.

The nation generates its own ideological and philosophical forms. It does this by synthesizing historical experience and the cultural defense mechanisms that have been erected to deal with war, colonial occupation, genocide and poverty, all of which Ukraine has had more than its share. These are precious expressions of the human desire for freedom (though not egotistical self-assertion) and are crucial towards creating a strong foundation upon which an integral foundation can be erected.

In this sense, the nation is organic in that it is a natural outgrowth of the family and genetic principle, as well as the division of labor and the need for human beings to cooperate. Cooperation cannot occur without the nation.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

The role of the political or philosophical leader is to synthesize all of these into a program that is wide enough to contain many different tendencies, but narrow enough to be a source for policy.⁷⁵ Bandera argued that the moral norm is universalism, but such a view can only be expressed through the many nations that each form an aspect of it. There is no universal truth without particular truths.

Nikolai Stsborsky was an important leader in the OUN, killed in 1941. Like nationalists all over the world, he was a corporatist in economics, seeing capitalism as just the imposition of oligarchy on undeveloped peoples. The corporation or the syndicate was to control the class struggle by channeling it into specific sectors. There, any inequality can be based only on excellence rather than access to cash.

Rejecting fascism as too centralized, he accepted the rejection of modernity as egocentric. The nation was the highest form of socialization and provides all political action with ultimate meaning. The nation was a second family. It was the organic expression of the family that does not include the state. Like Osap Boydinyka's "National Solidarism" idea, classes are inevitable, but it does not mean the distinction between them should be great. Inequality can only be justified relative to service.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ Кук, Василь. Життя і діяльність Степана Бандери: документи й матеріали / Редактор і упорядник — Микола Посівнич. Тернопіль: Астон, 2008 (Vasyl Kuk)

⁷⁶ Himka, John-Paul. The Ukrainian Idea in the Second Half of the 19th Century. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Volume 3, Number 2, Spring 2002 (New Series), pp. 321-335

Imperialism and nationalism were polar opposites. Imperialism denies the existence of certain nations that stand in its way. Significantly, he makes the argument that if there are no nations, then there is no where to stand to condemn imperialism. Imperialism is evil because it imposes itself upon national groups. The state is inorganic. Its sole role is to protect the nation. The primary way it does this is controlling all rent seekers; the middlemen and parasites that skim the labor of others without doing anything in return.

For both writers, the rejection of capitalism begins with the rejection of land as a commodity. It is not, but the foundation of all things. Capitalism creates the dependence of small nations on the great, forcing small nations to do the financial bidding of the powerful. As soon as profits fall, the capitalists combine into conglomerates. This is the natural tendency of capitalism given its boom and bust cycle.

Cyril Trylovsy was the organizer of the “Sich Riflemen,” a Catholic military group formed under the Austrian Empire. By 1907, this unit grew to 30,000, and saw Ukraine as finally becoming independent under Austrian protection. Using Vienna against the Poles, Ukraine would be much like the Croats, the reliable ally of the crown against ethnic arrogance, whether Polish or Magyar.

His legal view was for the gradual Ukrainization of courts and schools where Ukrainians were in the majority. All land should go to those who work it as a matter of full, legal ownership. Independence, if it is to be lasting, must be gradual. For each people, there are periods where they assert their ethnic independence. This always creates a backlash. These backlashes can be very violent, but if the national core can survive it, the lessons learned only make the society stronger. This ebb and flow is essential to building the structures of defense that are the core of all

nationalist movements. They are times of national reflection and a sharpening of ethnic identity.

This sort of Social Nationalism is shared by Eugene Olesnytskii. A national socialist who rejected both Hitler and Mussolini, his concern was with the protection of the family farm and the small business. He saw Hitler as a pagan with a great faith in the infant science of genetics. Hitler was Darwinian and a materialist, seeing all history as the clash of races. Yet, European history is little more than one white group slaughtering another. Hitler was forced to go to the rich for the sake of rapid recovery, meaning his older socialist ideals had to be compromised. Otto Strasser said much the same thing. Rather than race, the nationalist ideal in Ukraine was the nation, far less based on biology, but distinct nonetheless. He, like most of the OUN, saw a temporary centralization of state power as an emergency measure to consolidate power against the nation's enemies. Given the time period, this was a necessity.⁷⁷

Others such as Roman Shukho saw Germany as the only power that can successfully fight both Poland and the USSR. In 1941, this certainly seemed to be the case. Without a pro-German approach, he argued, Ukraine was lost. Shukho lived in Berlin and operated as a spy and saboteur in Poland. In 1942, Hitler ordered the destruction of all Ukrainian nationalist cadres, ending what might have been an independent Ukraine under German protection. Hitler's racial stupidity cost him the war against the USSR, and hence, the war itself.

Stepan Tomaszewsky said the same as early as 1930. The basic argument in his case is that Galicia is the central element in Ukrainian identity. Unlike many others, he accepted and supported Hetman Skoropadsky. Ukraine

⁷⁷ An excellent source for writings by these men is Антологія. Український націоналізм 2 том. Українська Видавнича спілка імені Юрія Липи, 2011

came into its own as a reaction against Russian and Polish imperialism. In defense of its specific life, Ukraine became an outgrowth of Galicia.

Julian Bachinsky died in 1940, but his “Ukrainian Irredenta” became a classic of nationalist thought. The essential argument is that international peace can only come about when nations and ethnic groups have the maximum degree of independence or autonomy. For him, it was the empire at Vienna that consolidated the Galician idea and set the stage for a coherent nationalist movement. The big problem with his work was that “Ukraine” was a territory, not an idea. He believed in the Rada, but that other ethnic groups on Ukrainian soil are also “Ukrainians.” This state was the engine of progress. Without a state, ethnic groups are either inert, or soon victims of a more powerful neighbor.

For both Tomaszewsky and Bachinsky, the Galician state in the High Middle Ages is the locus of identity. This state protected Ukraine from becoming Polish, had little relation to a very young Moscow, and was both Orthodox and western. In other words, Ukraine begins as a war first against the steppe nomads, then Poland, then Russia. From these wars came the Ukrainian idea. In general, this movement saw Ukraine as a synthesis of the west, Byzantium, and the Slavic idea.⁷⁸

Those Ukrainians supporting Hitler were given a rude awakening when the Plan Ost was unearthed. Hitler's blunder was rejecting the Slavic nationalist alliance, it cost him the war. This Plan stipulated that 65% of Ukrainians and Belorussians were to be deported to the far east and Siberia. Part of the mentality comes from Erich Koch, the man quite possibly responsible for Hitler's failure in the east.

Koch was technically Hitler's representative in

⁷⁸ Бойко, Юрій. Проблеми історіософії українського націоналізму. УВС, 2014

Ukraine, but more specifically, he was to run the “Central European Trade Association” with 30 commercial departments and 200 field branches. Its role was to extract grain from Slavic lands and send it west. From 1941 to 1944, Koch oversaw the extraction of 10 million tons of grain to Germany, 622 tons of meat and many other products. This was to be just the beginning. Hitler's plans in the east revolved around Ukraine, and it was meant to radically reduce the local population and treat the east as merely a source of cheap labor and raw materials.

About 2.8 million were deported from the USSR in this period, almost all of which came from Ukraine. The Ukrainian population declined by 13 million during the German occupation.

Vasyl Stus and Existentialism

Ukrainian anti-Soviet dissident Vasyl Stus (died 1985) made the claim that only in suffering is the self ever really known. Each man, in Stus' view, creates a “shell,” a sort of protective coating that protects him from the world of the spirit. This is a defensive mechanism to avoid all that which cannot be quantified. The spirit cannot be mechanized, it cannot be reduced to slogans or ideological manifestos. Therefore, it is avoided.

On occasion, this shell is broken when suffering is imposed upon it. The practical life of the external world is exposed as disguised contempt and the self discovers it has no anchor. Suffering forces the person to become fully known, to live entirely according to internal, ideal principles rather than external results.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ From the collected works of Stus, those most relevant to his politics are these:

Stus, Vasyl. Твори : У 4т., 6 кн. / НАН України. Ін-ту літератури ім. і. Г. Шевченка. Відділ рукописних фондів і текстології.

Львів: Вид. Спілка „Просвіта”, 1994.

Т. 4 : Повісті та оповідання. Незакінчені твори. Сценарії.

Літературна критика. Заяви, публіцистичні листи та звернення.

The world has gone mad, therefore, we are forced to turn inward. The problem is that, for many, if not most, there is nothing to turn to. There is no inner self, but rather a superficial set of masks that are changed as circumstances dictate. Here, avoiding suffering seems to be the only purpose. It comes at the expense of personhood. This is the “mass man,” one incapable of rising above the pleasure-pain nexus. They are already dead.

Looking around, Stus came to realize that “success” was identical with both mediocrity and amorality. In the Soviet Union, the most absurd policies and ideas needed to be defended and justified. The problem was the long lines of volunteers to do just that. When pain becomes that which should be avoided at all costs, amorality is the necessary consequence. He watched professional frauds loudly trumpeted by the Soviet press solely because they supported the KGB's agenda. Talentless hacks were being called “geniuses” while the truly gifted were dying in frozen Gulag cells. Certain things do not change.

Stus is significant because he connected the symbols of home, mother, nation (motherland), nature and freedom as essentially one thing. If JP Sartre was to “solve”

З таборового зошита / Підготували тексти, упорядкували та склали примітки : М. Гончарук (худож. проза), С. Гальченко (літ. критика та публіцистика). -1994. - 544с.

Т.6 (додатковий), кн. Г : Листи до рідних / Упоряд. : О. Дворко, М. Коцюбинська; Підгот. текстів О. Дворко; Авт. приміт. М. Коцюбинська. -1997. - 495с.

Т. 6 (додатковий), кн. 2 : Лист до друзів та знайомих / Упоряд.: О. Дворко, М. Коцюбинська; Авт. приміт. та Словника М. Коцюбинська. - 1997. - 262с., [16] арк. фот.

Не погасить свечи зажженной / Пер. с укр. Е. Санниковой. - М.: Возвращение, 1994. - 36 с. - (Малая сер. Поэты – узники ГУЛАГА). – На обкл. фот. В. Стуса. - Рос. 1995

Золотокоса красуня / Упоряд. Д. Стуса; Пер. з укр. Л. Рахліної; Передм. Д. Стуса. - Харків : Око, 1995. - 126 с.: портр. – Парал. рос.1996.

Василь Стус. Зібрання творів у 9-ти томах. – Львів, 1996-1997.

the existential issue in Marxism (or his own version of socialism) then Stus, who actually lived under it, created his own “solution” – our home, our motherland. The earth sustains man in that our ancestors are buried in it while we eat what grows out of it. The soil of one's motherland literally becomes part of our body.

Freedom cannot exist without our home. There is no abstract man, nor is there abstract freedom: it is always a service to something. For Stus, fighting the USSR was the only service he knew. In 1965, a movie was shown in Kiev, one by Sergei Paradzhanov, *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*.⁸⁰ This led to a protest against the recent spate of arrests against dissidents and Ukrainian nationalists currently taking place. Stus was one of a handful that spoke out after the screening, knowing full well what will happen to him as a result. Once he publicly denounced the KGB's tyranny, he was removed from the university where he was pursuing its graduate studies for “systematic violations of the norms of behavior of graduate students and staff members of research institutions.”⁸¹

The Ukrainian dissident movement during the Cold War was normally an aspect of the nationalist movement. The Ukrainian ethnos, of course, was defined in many different ways, but there was a radical disjuncture between an artificial ideology such as Marxism on the one hand, and the organic development of custom and language, on the other. The latter is fluid, having stood the test of time. The former is rigid and doctrinaire, leading of course, to the

⁸⁰ This film was released in the US in 1967. Not only did Stus get arrested due to his support of this film and its director, but the producer himself, Paradzhanov, was sentenced to five years hard labor as a result of his work. Technically, the film was condemned due to its purely realistic and romantic approach to the Hutsul people (a Slavic tribe in the Carpathians), but it shows an ethnic group in the full flower of its customs. This was why it needed to go.

⁸¹ From Kotash, 1998

existence of the dissident.

The fact that the Gulag loudspeakers during Stus' time there were proudly announcing the signing of the Helsinki Accords on human rights was a vivid reminder of the nature of ideology. That the Soviet Union was so insane as to beam this into a Gulag population shows just how inverted and carnivalesque things had become. The world was mad, so the only thing that a man deprived of his home could do is go inside. To enter one's inner world is the last line of defense against insanity.

Stus placed the ethnic question as a matter of personal suffering. Prosaic gratification takes the place of virtue and calls itself "progress." Those fighting it are rounded up. Modern man can only think in binary terms: individual and society, while the nation and community are syntheses of these terms. Love ends in tragedy just as Teterya and Skoropadsky's love for the motherland led to their exile. Most of all, Stus argued that tyranny and collectivization requires a mass, not real persons.

The USSR, as Stus wrote from prison, is a "twilight" world where nothing is as it seems. The senses deceive, since the term "liberty" or "equality" is everywhere affirmed, but denied everywhere in practice. Nationalism is little more than those structures erected to protect the population from irrationality, colonial rule and exploitation. Nationalism is to see the archetype in both nature and culture and seek its realization in our nominal world. Poets can do this, so long as they suffer enough. To get what one wants is to avoid the archetype, it is not needed when desires are met. Just before his 1985 murder, Stus proclaimed that his very existence was an act of protest. Socialism did not know what to do with such people except put them in prison. One was either a proletarian New Man or he was not. The "nots" ended up as "zeks."

The nation is a community, the individual can only

be collectivized. Collectives and communes are as different as individuals from persons. The individual is an ego, a person is an acculturated being. Suffering forces one to discover the fundamentals of existence. It forces self-knowledge, but it is always dangerously close to despair.

Dontsov's Integral Idea

In Dontsov's papers, "Where are our Historical Traditions" (1938) and "The Spirit of Our Past" (1944) he tries to build a new version of Ukrainian history based on the much older doctrine of traditionalism, which was based not directly on the values of conventional agrarian society, but rather takes its origin from A. Schopenhauer or even Ortega. His vision had more in common with Nietzsche and Sorel than Bonald.

Slavic philosophers such as A. Losev use the conception of "myth" in a way differently than westerners. It is common in Dontsov's thinking, but does not refer to that which is somehow fanciful or untrue. Like Losev, the "myth" in this view is a means of organizing thought. It is the backdrop upon which any thought must have to take place.

Myth for Dontsov is a "faith." It is what must exist for any society to understand itself; a set of axioms. One aspect of it is to write history in such a way that a clear goal emerges such as that of an integral, independent state. It is not subject to reflection precisely because it is what reflection requires to exist at all. It is the vocabulary and the universe of meanings that pre-exist any political thought.

Dontsov position is that the flowering of the nation is based upon the rule of a caste of self-sacrificing activists. Throughout the history of Ukraine, the lack of a native nobility has been a liability. In the 20th century, the greatest evil is "massification," almost identical with the rule of the middle classes; it is mediocrity or the bourgeois mass.

He is not speaking of a caste system, but an order like that of an older, military nobility. A sort of order of the Dragon (to which belonged many Serbian Despots), that would stress the chivalric virtues in defense of national tradition. They need to come from all classes of society and distinguished by what Lev Gumilev calls their “passionary” status, that is, their desire to place the common good ahead of their own well being.

As a historian, Dontsov divides Ukrainian history into three segments: First, until the 19th century, a nobility ruled the country, albeit a foreign one. Speaking about Kiev or Galicia, hierarchy was the norm and was the foundation of the state and culture. The Kievan prince did not “rule” in the modern, bureaucratic sense of the term, but acted as a leader and spokesman for the tribal elders who became the “druzhina,” or the high commanders of his Host.

Those that historically have this role are Princes Oleg and Yaroslav from the Kievan era, Khmelnytsky from the Cossack state, and even Skovoroda from the intellectual class. These men have authority, but not necessarily power. Very much like Gumilev, there is a social class of those who put their nation and people above their own comfort and life. Gumilev says this is a genetic mutation, since it negates the normal drive for self-preservation, but if the state (in the broad sense, not the “government”) is to progress, this caste is a critical necessity.

Under Polish rule, this caste was destroyed, and only reemerged in the rebellious acts of Hetman Bohdan or the Prince of Ostrog. It was only a few elites such as Shevchenko that kept the flame of the old tradition alive. Normally, the church would have this role, but Polish control reduced the Ukrainian and Kievan Orthodox church to almost nothing. At the same time, the Cossack Host became degenerate because they took upon itself the values of property and oligarchy. “Private life,” material pleasures and administration destroyed the Cossack sense of mission.

This view of the Cossacks is very rare among Ukrainian historians and sets Dontsov apart. This is why the Sich so quickly went over to St. Petersburg when Poland was no longer a threat.

Finally, the third period in Ukrainian history is the return of an aristocratic strata to Ukrainian society. The caste structure needed to be refurbished and repaired, and only then can Ukraine function as a true independent nation. The lack of a native nobility might be part of the reason Ukraine has failed so miserably as an independent state after the fall of the USSR. The cumulative affects of Polish, degenerate Cossack, Russian and Soviet rule has been a total destruction in any real values or virtues. Ukraine was doomed in 1991 and her Independence a regrettable error.

Pavlychko and Stoyan as the Post-Soviet National Idea

One useful but largely ignored approach to nationalism comes from the work of Dmytro Pavlychko (b. 1929). His “The Ukrainian National Idea” (2002) defines nationalism simply as the single highest form of meaningful social integration. Nationalism must be ethnic, since that is the source of culture. In addition, the struggles of a people are fundamental aspects of the folk and its subjective sense of unity. It is, as Bandera also suggests, forms of self-defense that have become ritualized as aspects of social behavior. This is the sign of a healthy society in the same sense that a strong immune system is a sign of a healthy body.

In his lecture of 2002 at the Kiev-Mohyla Academy, Pavlychko defined nationalism this way:

It is difficult to ascertain what the national idea refers to generally, because it can be understood as a complex unity containing ones mother tongue, customs,

rituals, etc. . . It is the language of each people that serves as the foundation for identity, as well as its cultural and spiritual tradition. It also contains historical memory, its general mentality, its economic development, topography and general folkways. The national idea combines the essential identity of a people and the requirements for their autonomous and free development, none of which are independent of the state.⁸²

The last sentence is crucial. It is the summary of his thought in general. Nationalism is the synthesis of two distinct sets of ideas, that of the ethnic identity and purpose as well as how these are protected and nurtured. The state, in traditionally German and Slavic sense, is both the nature of this unity and the form of its protection. The “state” is both the constitution of the state, that is, its traditional sense of justice, and the more formal institutions of coercion.

Historical facts have forged a unity in the face of constant pressure, violence and the very real possibility of destruction. Language too is born from the violence of history. No people on the globe have been free of foreign occupation or devastating warfare. It is these periods where one's “otherness” is made quite clear, and thus, is the source of ethnic identity.

Each ethnos will create structures appropriate to itself, since conditions vary so radically. Law and state structures emanate from custom and history. Importantly, as soon as this connection between law and the ethnos is severed, the state loses its legitimacy. In saying that “none [of these things] are independent of the state,” he is

⁸² Pavlychko, D. The Ukrainian National Idea. Inaugural Lecture honorary doctorate of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, 2002 (translation mine).

speaking from a typically Ukrainian point of view. While national-anarchism was very common in 19th century Ukraine, its precarious geographic position and its tough neighborhood make statelessness impossible. The state must exist for both Pavlychko and Bandera because all the custom and history in the world will not save the people from Stalin, or worse, western capitalism.

Suffering reveals the truth that happiness is not in possessions, urban “sophistication” or the bureaucratic pecking order. It is to be found in simplicity, something that has long been a part of Ukrainian ethnic thought since at least Kulish. This is what the enemies of nationalism fail to grasp: that ethnicity is born in the fires of pain and suffering. It is a function of what this writer has called elsewhere the “structures of resistance.”

The more evil the ruling system becomes, the more isolated the ethnos. The contradiction between the outer, disordered regime and the internal memory of the folk become extreme. What this can do is re-orient priorities, force people to find happiness in simplicity, and spiritualize daily life. Post-communist Ukraine, he states, works from the foundation only of money and power, the only “universal values” in the present global order.

Pavlychko's idea is that the Ukrainian sense of self had existed as a medieval construct. Just as the Anglo-Norman shaped the subjectivity of the Gaels, the unia and Polish occupation shaped the Ukrainian idea. The Cossacks and Brotherhoods were the mainstays of the Orthodox Church under the violent thumb of the Polish nobility, and hence, these institutions are manifestations of ideas that became a part of the Ukrainian sense of self. Suffering can be cleansing and generate an awareness of reality rather than the image.

The academic hacks who condemn nationalism as “mythical” have no difficulty accepting abstract concepts such as the individual, the “global community,” or

“international civilization” as perfectly real and obvious. This absurdity shows that the academic elite are tied to capital, since this is their creation. For Pavlychko, there is no such thing as an “international morality” and certainly no planetary “civilization.”

National belonging is a prerequisite for a solid doctrine of rights. Since rights do not hang in midair, they must have an origin that is not entirely reducible to mere expressions of utility or self-interest. Cosmopolitanism can generate no doctrine of rights, since it has no substantive qualities at all. The abstract “individual” or “universal values” can generate nothing concrete, since those slogans are themselves vapid and vacuous.

The distinction between truth and the world of media-generated images is what suffering can make clear. Foreign occupation and constant war forces the more civic minded of the ethnos to be isolated and impoverished. Only from this vantage point can the system be seen for what it truly is. The bureaucratic mentality is one that will serve anyone with power. Hence, these functionaries, since they benefit from the system, cannot judge it. Those who they exclude in the name of “tolerance” and “openness” see them as the frauds they are, but it is only through such exclusion can the truth be fully understood.

In the work of Darius Stoyan, a young graduate student at Taras Shevchenko University (as of 2013), the main concern is to justify the primordial origins of the folk. He writes that the nation derives from the Latin word for “tribe.” The tribe, not self-sufficient, slowly develops into a larger confederation of similar peoples until a nation is formed. Stoyan agrees with the conception that this development is hastened by the existence of a violent enemy or foreign occupation. People suffering this way are automatically excluded as a group and hence, their resistance becomes identical with the nation.

Put differently, ethnicity has always existed, as the

ancient annals of Scotland, Ireland and Greece testify. However, it was not necessarily politicized, nor part of the subjective mentality of the common folk.⁸³ It was merely there, a unity within which social interaction can be mutually comprehensible. The growth of the modern state and the arrogance of bureaucratic empires created the politicized version of ethnicity known as “nationalism.”

Nationalism for Stoyan is comprised of the people, living in a specific territory, forging bonds and affective ties through the constant struggle with neighbors, powerful empires and nature herself. A spiritual essence is formed that becomes the center of the ethnic consciousness and marks them off from others close by. Religion, language and economic forms further differentiate the peoples. Intermarriage becomes inevitable since families must have significant commonalities to function, similar to nations.⁸⁴ He writes,

The national concept is manifest in the supreme principle of unity and actualized through the human will determined to create unity from the raw material of the ethnic experience. It has its own values developed by the creative interaction of people living in the same area speaking the same language.⁸⁵

⁸³ The concept of “subjective awareness” is a red herring. Ideology is always the domain of intellectuals and activists. Most of the common folk take their unities for granted, since much else occupies their time. Using this as an argument that nationalism is a recent phenomenon is just poor reasoning.

⁸⁴ Stoyan, D. (2012a) Шевченка в історіософській концепції Ю. І. Вассіяна. Publications of the Dmytro Dontsov Research Center.

⁸⁵ Stoyan, D. (2012) Проблема визначення поняття «нація» в контексті філософської спадщини Ю.Вассіяна. Publications of the Dmytro Dontsov Research Center (translation mine)

Following the work of D. Dontsov, the stress here is on the common will of the leadership in forging a nation. As mentioned above, however, the severe circumstances of Ukraine throughout the entirety of the 20th century – and even more so today – makes such militancy justifiable. The “raw material” (which is my translation) is the historical folk-ethnicity of the population, often taken for granted or seen as so normal that it does not require comment. A militant leadership comes into existence, as Bandera shows, at times when the very existence of the nation is at stake. Militant organization, the forcible creation of unity in the face of extermination, is the issue here. In 2014, the same conditions apply.

Nations have existed as ethno-linguistic units throughout history, as has the imperial desire to destroy such identity. Empires are defined as those entities that unify nations in the interests of the ruling group. Empires are not nations themselves, but federations answering to a common center. The point is that there is no empire without nations, and they come to define each other. There is no civic life without linguistic and cultural unities.⁸⁶

Since a non-alienated mankind seeks solidarity, justice, protection and communal belonging (which are all tightly related), nations are a natural and normal social form. Empires, however, are the products of greed and alienation. Solidarity creates the standards for progress, success and organization that abstract theory cannot hope to provide.

Nationalism became the weapon of choice against the economic aggression of the industrial world. Industrialization is inherently international since imperial

⁸⁶ See two articles of his: Stoyan, D. (2012) Проблема визначення поняття «нація» в контексті філософської спадщини Ю.Вассяна. Publications of the Dmytro Dontsov Research Center; and Stoyan, D. (2012a) Шевченка в історіософській концепції Ю. І. Вассяна. Publications of the Dmytro Dontsov Research Center.

empires existed before either capitalism or industrialism. Europe after World War II became an economic, rather than a cultural entity. The Bretton Woods system demanded the rejection of nationalism and mercantilism as a condition for access to credit. The post-war order was, in part, based on the implication that only the economy has rights over the population.

In Stoyan's analysis of nationalism, he summarizes the concept in several ways. It is a subjective principle of identity, but its objective elements are equally significant. Culture is really the manifestation of a historical unity. Culture, in other words, is a product of history acting within the variables such as geography or available resources.

The Borotbist' and National Communism

From World War I to the death of Stalin, Ukraine developed its own variation of Marxism and created the *Borotbist'* national communist movement. They were born, unfortunately, in the face of Hetman Skoropadsky's stunning successes of rebuilding the country. Falling under Masonic propoganda that Skoropadsky was the spokesmen for the "landlords" he was opposed by all factions in Ukraine and hence, the country's best hope for even ethnic-social development fell with him.

Bishop Nikodemus and labor generally supported Skoropadsky, but in the chaos of the time, that was insufficient. For the first time since Khmelnytsky, about 30 countries recognized the independence of Ukraine. Like Alexander III, he chartered the peasant land bank where cheap credit could be had in repopulating the countryside. He balanced the budget and social security was in that each family was entitled to 25 hectares of land by law.

Skoropadsky's essential element was balance. All factions have a part of the truth. Each working with the others comes close to the whole. Spurring domestic

demand was critical for economic recovery. Grain prices were fixed as an emergency measure and generally followed a distributist scheme in land allotments. State revenues increased drastically, so much so that Skoropadsky was able to loan Denikin and the White army under his command 10 million rubles. He died in Germany in 1945, and was the last hope for Ukraine.

Perhaps the Borotbist were another. It was a decentralized and democratic socialist collective not too distinct from Drahomanov above. The Bolsheviks anathematized it, calling nationalism a “disease.” This meant that Trotsky, head of the Red Army, had disapproved of the goy becoming national socialists. Trotsky was so ethnically obsessed that his entire view of Marxism had the Jewish element as its foundation. Whenever there was a contradiction between a communist and a Jewish idea, the latter always won.

From the first sightings of the Reds, Trotsky's ethnic nationalism appeared over and again. The Reds had no relation to the land, and were solely based in the cities and comprised almost exclusively the Jewish middle classes. The Borotbist' movement was anti-statist and agrarian. In fact, the Communist Party under Trotsky was so urban and so cut off from the land, that their definition of “taking” or “occupying” an area just meant the surrender of its cities.

Trotsky's poorly disguised war against the peasant in Ukraine was called the anti-Kulak movement. That “kulak” referred to non-Jewish peasants of any background was clear. Trotsky's typically diabolical and brilliant plan was to connect Ukrainian nationalists with the kulak movement. This is a small bit of evidence that the question was an ethnic and not an economic one. On February 22 1920, Trotsky and Lenin stated that “nation” and “kulak” were the same. Trotsky is reputed to have said “I will decide what a Ukrainian is.” If this is not genuine, it still is an apt summary of his policy.

This author has argued for some time that Marxism depended on aid from the US to function. Further, that Marxism had nothing to do with labor and was entirely about state control over all capital. Partial proof of this is the total destruction of any other, non-Red socialist movement anywhere. Socialism has a long history, but was only accepted by the British establishment when God was purged from it and it was reduced to purposeless atoms-in-the-void. Prior to that, it was agrarian and pro-family, such as in Winstanley or Proudhon. Each and every church father was communal and socialist in their economic understanding. That Marxism and socialism are the same has no foundation, and the same could be said about Bolshevism. These are three distinct ideologies.

Can any nationalism be attributed to the Communist era? Soviet Ukraine from 1960 to 1980 slowly began its disintegration. Growth had slowed, and Soviet reformers such as Kosygin sought to introduce enterprise autonomy and connect prices to the cost of production. The profit motive even made its appearance under Brezhnev.

The Eighth Five-Year Plan was from 1966-1970 inclusive, there more firm-level autonomy and rewards for efficiency were introduced. Ukraine saw a 30% increase in income, but much of this was artificial. The Ninth saw a 28% GDP increase over 5 years, by between 1976 and 1985, slow growth became collapse. Planning failure and the increasing complexity of the economy was one cause, but the exhaustion of the soil and the poor use of resources in general had taken its toll. The Ukrainian countryside lost about 1.3 million people between 1959 and 1970. In 1963, one year before Khrushchev was sent packing by the KGB, the Soviet Union had to buy grain from the US. Of course, there can be no “Cold War” when the “enemy” is a) heavily invested in the “opposing” state and b) will sell grain to save the dying system of its “opponent.” Time and again,

the USSR was bailed out by the capitalist west when its demise seemed certain.

Ukraine had been exploited mercilessly, and the result was a rapid depreciation of fixed assets, a decimated agricultural sector and declining health. The infant mortality rate increased as life expectancies fell. Of note also is that between 1959 and 1970, about 1 million Russians moved to Ukraine.

Up until 1972 however, the closest thing to a National Communist was Petro Shelest, who ruled Communist Ukraine from 1963 to 1972, dying in 1992. His main goal was to localize economic planning at the republican level. He accused the Moscow bureaucracy of bungling Ukraine's economy and inefficiently using Ukraine's resources to the point of exhaustion. By 1970, Ukraine accounted for 25% of all Soviet exports. Ukraine gave the USSR 28% of its coal, 52% of its steel, 53% of its diesel engines and almost 100% of its sugar. The problem was that Ukraine was not compensated for this. To fight any manifestation of the ethnic life was insult added to injury.

In 1965, the small, decentralizing reforms of Khrushchev that were introduced in 1956 were withdrawn, and many nationalist figures were arrested. Shelest pointed to the very high labor productivity of Ukraine, yet those in charge of Ukrainian planning were Russians or Jews. Russia was exploiting Ukraine's water resources for its own use, as Shelest wryly pointed out that one of China's criticisms of Soviet Communism was that it treated Ukraine as a colony.

In Soviet Ukraine from 1960 to 1980 slowly began a long disintegration. Growth had slowed, and Soviet reformers such as Kosygin sought to introduce enterprise autonomy and connect prices to the cost of production. The profit motive even made its appearance under Brezhnev. Hence, Marxism was quickly thrown overboard time and

again, with Ukraine often being a central platform. That the USSR was “communist” or “Marxist” is as absurd as believing that the real issue in all of this was “labor.”

The Eighth Five-Year Plan was from 1966-1970 inclusive, there more firm-level autonomy and rewards for efficiency were introduced. Ukraine saw a 30% increase in income, but much of this was artificial. The Ninth saw a 28% GDP increase over 5 years, by between 1976 and 1985, slow growth became collapse. Planning failure and the increasing complexity of the economy was one cause, but the exhaustion of the soil and the poor use of resources in general had taken its toll.

The Ukrainian countryside lost about 1.3 million people between 1959 and 1970. In 1963, one year before Khrushchev was sent packing by the KGB, the Soviet Union had to buy grain from the US. Of course, there can be no “Cold War” when the “enemy” is a) heavily invested in the “opposing” state and b) will sell grain to save the dying system of its “opponent.” Time and again, the USSR was bailed out by the capitalist west when its demise seemed certain.

Khrushchev's rule was a disaster at numerous levels. It revived the attacks on the church, but just as importantly, added a series of disconnected reforms that raised expectations enough so that, when they were abandoned, many people were upset. Khrushchev was a disaster because he introduced reforms leading to a more decentralized planning system that, as soon as it showed its inevitable strain, was quickly abandoned and centralization reimposed. This created a sense of arbitrary government, abuse of power, and an administrative instability that put to death the already moribund sense of confidence. The decline from, 1966 onward can be at least partly blamed on this.

While it is a stretch to call Shelest a “nationalist” he did provide a solid platform from which a movement could

take shape. In 1972, he was replaced by the more obedient Shcherbytsky and was also expelled from the Politburo. Shelest was called a “deviant nationalist” and became a “non-person.” In the Ukrainian Weekly of July 3, 1988, Bohdan Nahyalo wrote:

Fostering a sense of Soviet Ukrainian patriotism and defending Ukrainian cultural values, he not only sought to establish and maintain a modus vivendi with the nationally minded Ukrainian intelligentsia, but also became identified with a resurgent national assertiveness and a defense of the rights of the union republics.⁸⁷

Nahyalo goes on to say that the official Party line was that “Ukraine cannot be examined apart from the history of Russia.” Strangely, these “cultural values” so dear to these Marxists is never laid out in detail. Without Orthodoxy, the art, music or ethics makes little sense. “Cultural values” do not exist unless they are a part of a holistic spiritual tradition. It is this tradition that the Soviet Union and the US were dedicated to denying.

After his humiliation in 1972, Ukraine soon went into an economic free-fall. The USSR was falling far behind the west in technological innovation and this forced the system to spend more on defense than otherwise would be needed. Afghanistan harmed the legitimacy of the system as civil life seemed to stagnate. Old slogans no longer had any real currency, but Shelest created enough interest in Ukrainian sovereignty that even his dismissal

⁸⁷ Nahyalo, B (1988) A Glimpse of Soviet Reality. Ukrainian Weekly of July 3, 1988
http://ukrweekly.com/archive/1988/The_Ukrainian_Weekly_1988-33.pdf

could not stem the tide.

The real fact about this era is that the Soviet system was irrational, and, rather than having any interest in labor at all, represented the revolutionary cadre seeking to transfer all wealth to itself using violence and manipulation. There is only so much fuel for this apparatus and only so many ways of using the state to mobilize resources.

Eventually, the completely irrational lack of efficiency will catch-up to a system designed only to enrich a handful of Jewish adventurers under Lenin. Never was labor given any break, pride of place or even consideration in this Marxist system. That it – even with all the new documents proving otherwise – is still considered a system dedicated to “labor”: shows the condition of western academics. Workers in the USSR were a necessary evil.

*Ukraine in Contemporary Nationalism:
Home, Woman and the Bureaucrat*

Vasyl Shevchuk was a part of the “Sixtyer” generation. Much of his work is either about or artistically from the baroque era at the height of the Hetman state. Shevchuk, however, remains an Orthodox populist with strong ties to the east.⁸⁸ Shevchuk's works have several commonalities that manifest some of the historical events that make Ukraine unique.

A common idea running through his works is that of “home.” This is a powerful archetype that accents the quality of rootedness. The adaptation to local customs, climate, and ethnicity, over time, creates a home. Without a home there is no life. There is no basis from which to order one's goals. There is no such thing as a generic man, but the contextualized one is one that lives in a place called his “home.” Ukrainian nationalism often uses feminine

⁸⁸ Chernetsky, Vitaly. Mapping Postcommunist Cultures: Russia and Ukraine in the Context of Globalization. McGill, 2007: 193-194

imagery, as Shevchenko did, to refer to the “motherland” as this suffering but loving birth-giver that remains shackled.⁸⁹

The concept “home” in Shevchuk is to call back those whose culture was taken from them by force. No one can have a “home” that has no roots or cultural tradition. After 70 years of enforced de-Ukrainization and Marxist genocide, the rise of the national idea is a healthy reaction to Ukraine's long status as a colony. But for these same reasons, it remains contested, as all things are.

The metaphor of “home” in Shevchuk has deeper symbolic meaning. It places the woman at the head of the family. She is the guardian of family tradition and the bearer of nourishment in all senses of the word. The woman is a symbol for Ukraine, but also (and for the same reasons) the village, farm, parish and nature itself. It might be the case that given Ukraine's lack of luck in history, the mother as the widow, at times where men are killed in huge numbers in warfare, now called upon to play both maternal and paternal roles. Her stoic forbearance is part of the “village prose” tradition where she is the fertile ground that feeds a wretched ethnos.⁹⁰ She is the Protection of the home, as reflected in the Pokrovsky icon of the Veil that is one of the most important Ukrainian Orthodox devotions.

The Prodigal Son is related to all of this. Under forced industrialization, Ukrainians were torn from the village and sent into the alien city to obtain jobs in industry. They lost their roots, became an appendage to the literal and metaphorical machine, and hence, had no home. To return to the land in Shevchuk's work is essential. Ukraine has always been a peasant nation, where the city is little more than a Hell of deceit and usury.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Rubchak, MJ. Ukraine's Ancient Matriarch as a Topos in Constructing a Feminine Identity *Marian J. Feminist Review*, No. 92 (2009): 132ff

⁹⁰ Chernetsky, 190-191

⁹¹ Hnatiuk, O. Nativists vs. Westernizers: Problems of Cultural Identity in Ukrainian Literature of the 1990s. *The Slavic and East*

One of the great representatives of this era was Oles Gonchar (d. 1995), a poet both western and Orthodox. He was a nationalist, anti-communist dissident whose work was central to the revival of Ukrainian culture in the 1990s. Unlike the west, the notion of national-anarchism is important. Anarchy is generally an ethnic and religious life, one that stresses grace over law. Drahomanov, Kostamarov, Vyshenskii and the Cossack Host are all aspects of this anarchist ideal. This is why the sloppy use of these labels by western authors is so damaging to students: it does not mean what it normally does in the west.

For Gonchar, bureaucracy is the negation of liberty. The state is defined as a set of often rent seeking institutions of coercion. This is not the nation, but rather its opposite. The nation is the ethnos, the cultural markers of Ukraine, setting it off from both Poland and Russia. Duty, love and empathy are the three themes of both his prose and poetry. The Orthodox church, as well as the Cossack tradition, are affronts to enforced materialism, whether it came from the west or the east. Bureaucracy, an unfortunate importation from the western era of absolutism, seeks to rationalize law, imposing it on a society regardless of its congruence with national experience. Medieval societies did not have it, the Cossacks did not have it, and neither did Russia until after the Time of Troubles.

Instead of the bureaucratic monolith, Gonchar advocates the Slavophile idea of Sobornapravna, or the state of free cultural and spiritual agreement among a specific people. This approach removes individual exclusiveness, casting a suffering society into a single unity. This unity is created by different functions all approaching the same goal. The concept of Sobornapravna is to bridge the gap between the individual and the

collective, creating the ultimate ethical entity, the person.⁹²

Given Ukraine's history, Gonchar divides humanity into two broad camps: destroyers and builders. There are far more of the former than the latter. Builders are those who bring the mentality of the folk back to the villages, now almost deserted. Folk thought is essential to many Ukrainian writers since 1990 as the most genuine of moral norms, rooted in the people themselves.

Gonchar, on the other hand, sees the folk-mind as the collected wisdom of the ages, passed down through the generations. It serves as a strong weapon against Ukraine's many colonizers. Gonchar sees independence, decentralization and representation as essential to the rebirth of Ukrainian society. Empires are inherently predatory, which means that nationalism is a necessity to maintain independence, control economic factions and build solidarity.⁹³

Ivan Drach (b. 1936) has been significant in Ukraine since the 1960s. As a poet, his highly symbolic technique has brought a western art form into Ukrainian life. Drach, both in his career as a dissident as well as part of the rebuilding of Ukraine along the western vector, stressed the role of the peasant as emblematic of the country. Simple, pious, and possessing a superhuman ability to tolerate pain, the peasant is the backbone of the nation. For Drach, all art is national. For Ukraine, this means that western concepts from the Renaissance onward should be an essential element of Ukrainian thought.

Like Shevchenko and Shevchuk, the image of the woman as the protector of Ukraine is of the utmost importance. The woman is the bringer of harmony, the

⁹² Klumbyte, Neringa, Gulnaz Sharafutdinova. *Soviet Society in the Era of Late Socialism, 1964–1985*. (Lexington, 2012): 76

⁹³ Mudrak, MM. *Russian Artistic Modernism and the West: Collectors, Collections, Exhibitions, and Artists*. *Russian Review*, Vol. 58, No. 3 (Jul., 1999): 468ff

tender of the earth's bounty, and most importantly, is a doorway to the divine. The Mother of God remains the essential concept of womanhood for Shevchuk and Drach, as she has been a symbol of the Church herself. For many Ukrainian writers in the post Cold War world, the woman is the keeper of order. Underneath that fragile order stands chaos.⁹⁴

Similar to Drach is Vyacheslav Chornovil (d. 1999). A celebrated dissident, he seeks, like Drach and Shevchuk, to bring western institutions into Ukraine, but on Ukraine's terms. He views the creation of a yeoman landowning class essential to freedom and self-sufficiency. He is in favor of the market economy, but has no illusions about its limitations and problems. Seeking self-sufficiency is not autarky, and there is nothing irrational about it (except through the eyes of western multinationals). Self-sufficiency is necessary for sovereignty, since the negation of this independence is the radical dependence on commodity prices or the decisions of western bankers. social safety net. He advocated for a strong state to protect Ukraine's fragile independence from external pressure or dependency. Ukrainian Occidentalists look at western Europe for inspiration, but in a Ukrainian way and for Ukrainian interests. They also look to the west in a highly selective manner, taking from the tremendous intellectual history of western and central Europe what can be used to maintain Ukrainian independence.⁹⁵

Ukrainian modernization is, by its very nature, a western import. Yet, far from a "sister state" with Europe, Ukraine's immense poverty makes her fairly useless to the west except as a source of raw materials. At the same time, Ukraine's nationalism has always been basically

⁹⁴ Wanner, C. *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine*. (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009): 154-156

⁹⁵ Harasymiw, B. *Post-Communist Ukraine*. (Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 2001): 321ff. This is one of his main arguments

Occidental, and therefore, her role as an east-west bridge is something that is accepted by all factions in present Ukrainian society. One writer describes it like this:

Emerging from Soviet/Russian colonialism, contemporary Ukrainian literature tries to find its 'authentic' voice between European culture and Ukrainian tradition. This led to original experiments and the refusal of established literary forms, be it Ukrainian romanticism, socialist realism, or underground samizdat. But it also led to fissions, fusions, and various attempts to legitimization in the 1990s, between nativists-traditionalists (narodnyky) and westernizers-modernizers-postmodernists.⁹⁶

The simple fact is that the western aspect in Ukrainian culture remains a minority faith. Ukraine is tied to Russia and the east through long historical intercourse, economic affinity and the huge Russian minority in Ukraine. Making matters worse, powerful eastern cities remain pro-Russia, as are the Carpatho-Rusyns. The pretensions of the CIA backed coups in 2006 and 2014 were mocked as the Crimea voted by a margin of 85% to rejoin Russia. The hackneyed accusations of “vote rigging” were made absurd by the fact that this area has always been pro-Russian.

⁹⁶ Naumescu, Vladimir. Review of Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe. In Zaleska Onyshkevych, Larysa M. L.; and Rewakowicz, Maria G., eds. H-SAE, H-Net Reviews. February, 2011.

**The Failure of Independence:
From the Second World to the Void, 1990 to 2015**

The resurgence of the Ukrainian idea after the declaration of independence in 1991 is a movement of global significance. Attempts to denationalize Ukraine has ended in failures, while being some of the most systematic and well funded forms of genocide in history. Given the almost omnipotent Jewish stranglehold on “victim” status, the historical truth of the Ukrainian genocide from the end of World War I to the 1950s is ignored and denied with impunity.

Ukraine in the first half of the 20th century has been the victim of open and public genocides from Hungary, Poland, Germany and the USSR. Only specialists and people of Slavic descent are aware of this. The Jewish claim to be the victim of the world is dishonest and elitist. “The” Holocaust suggests a) that this is the only one, since Jews alone are worthy of memory, b) that this was a religious offering, a sacrifice towards the “healing of the world” see above, and c) that it is a watershed event in world history. The fact is that Jewish suffering was minor compared to that of Ukrainians and Serbs. Lots of groups were targeted by totalitarian regimes in the 20th century, and Hitler's attempt to smash communism by singling out the Jews was rational to the extent that communism in eastern Europe was a Jewish movement. For Jews to claim “victim” status while acting as the executioners of Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin is sheer Chutzpah. Jewish suffering was real, but not constant nor systematic over generations like the Irish under the masonic British empire or the Serbs under the Ottoman empire.

This legacy of colonization and genocide created a vibrant, lush culture as a form of self defense. This is the

very definition of the “nation.” This, however, was aborted in the womb as Ukrainian activists of all stripes were sent to the gulag without a peep from the west. This might be because major American capitalists actually built the camps, its security systems and electronics.

Hence, the resurgence had to wait until 1990. Only this time, poverty, atomization and the total ignorance from the west has strangled yet another revival. The west remains unpopular – contrary to media myth –because it was western capital that stripped the country bare from 1991 to the present. Most Ukrainians see the western powers as a regime of hypocritical capitalism and just another imperialist waiting to sell of Ukraine's resources (see the section below on Maidan).

As the CIA sponsored coup that forced Viktor Yanukovich to power in 2006 created just more collapse, poverty and the shipping of value to the west. At the same time, the Eurasian and pro-Russian aspect of Ukrainian policy has gained confidence.⁹⁷

The eastern and western aspects of Ukrainian identity are not contradictory, but represent a skillful synthesis of east and west that goes back to St. Olga. Galicia was an Orthodox state with a mixture of German and Byzantine elements. Her liturgy was Byzantine, but the western rite could be found from German monastics. The problem is that only specialized study of these obscure topics can lead to any rational policy. Since there are few competent Ukrainian experts at the State Department, this will persist.

The westernizing independence movement was a failure. Ukraine's economy was dependent on being a part – albeit a dominant part – of the USSR. In the work of Bohdan Harasymiw, polling data seem to prove that few young people actually identify with being Ukrainian. They

⁹⁷ Wanner, C. *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine*. (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009): 23-25

have no identity at all.⁹⁸ He also uses polling data to show the generally positive Ukrainian view of Russia, which might come as a surprise to those in the west. Even in Galicia, as of 2014, only about 20% took a “strongly negative” view of Russia, the highest in the country by far.

In the (2011) work by Bruck and Hartmut, the argument is that any cultural developments in post-Soviet Ukraine will be based on western economic models. The USSR was fully integrated, with each region having its own specialty. This meant that Ukraine began its economic life as a partial, dependent economy focusing on one area of Soviet empire's needs. This not only meant that privatization was the order of the day, but the very nature of the private sector needed to change and become more locally integrated.

The authors are quite naive in their view of the results of this change. In the 1990s, Ukraine lost almost 70% of her GDP and exports shifted to raw materials. 11 million jobs were lost and have not been replaced. The ratio between the rich and the poor, using GDP figures, is 74:1, showing a deeply divided society. Add to this ethnic division, religious rivalry and regional differentiation, the western vector of Ukraine is inherently compromised. The “shock therapy” imposed by the west ultimately led to out-migration, population decline and lowering of the national lifespan. Far from being “efficient” or praiseworthy, this economic genocide turned Ukrainians against the west, at least in the political and economic spheres.

Ukrainian nationalists argue that their country is neither western or eastern, but a Central European nation. Ukraine has more western elements than Belarus, but these are not merely western concepts grafted onto a Soviet core. These are integral to her mission in the world.

Terms like “western” are overused and often a

⁹⁸ Harasymiw, B. Post-Communist Ukraine. (Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 2001): 228-230

disguise for ignorance. To be clear, the basic, general “westernizing” elements in Ukraine are mostly in the growth of individualism, Florentine and Baroque artistic forms, the greater penetration of classical and romantic music, greater trading relations with western powers, a greater connection with Czechia, Germany and Poland, and a strong Catholic element.

The Ukrainian Orthodox church uses western style paintings and often, western liturgies tout court, or more commonly, western usages within the Byzantine forms. Poland and Lithuania have played a huge role in Ukraine's history, manifest in an aesthetics, such as painting, to be more realistic and less stylized than among the Byzantines. They use a diversity of facial expression and the natural world of flowers and greenery are a part of the iconography. Finally, a certain idea of a free market, strong private (that is, individual) property rights and a populist mindset are also more general aspects of “westernization” that have taken Slavic form.⁹⁹

Of course, these are generalizations, but it is not difficult to tease out how these factors would unfold into the Ukrainian mind. With this in mind, westernization is a mentality that has been a part of the Slavic identity there for some time.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, “westernization,” or sometimes, civilization itself, just means liberalism, which celebrates the lack of any culture. It is a self-negation when used in this jejune way.

⁹⁹ Hnatiuk, O. Nativists vs. Westernizers: Problems of Cultural Identity in Ukrainian Literature of the 1990s. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 3, Special Forum Issue: Contemporary Ukrainian Literature and National Identity (Fall, 2006): 435

¹⁰⁰ Riabchuk, R. Culture and Cultural Politics in Ukraine: A Post Colonial Perspective. In Taras Kuzio, Paul J. D'Anieri, eds. *Dilemmas of State-led Nation Building in Ukraine*. (Praeger, 2002): 54-56

The Novorossya Crisis and Ukraine since 2014

The “gas crisis” between Ukraine and Russia was the proximate cause of the present escalation of western attacks on Russia. Thus far, there is no evidence that anyone other than the endlessly suffering Ukrainian citizen will be affected. Worse, the west has put its bet on Ukraine: a fourth world basket-case. This, more than anything else, shows what can happen when energy interests control foreign policy in this regard.

In late 2013, the world was shocked to see popular protest against the Kiev government reach a level of violence thought to be seen only by elite college students in Seoul. Strangely, the police forces, regardless of the attacks on them (often suspiciously professional) received no response. However, once the coup was complete, the new “government” then used extreme levels of violence to defend its ill-gotten goals.

A small minority of Ukrainians removed the President, Viktor Yanukovich, whose views represent the overwhelming majority of Ukrainians, and accepted the installation of a Washington-approved prime minister, Arseniy Yatsenyuk. Soon after, he received loans from the IMF, the EU and the US and enforced the liquidation of Ukrainian firms to repay Kiev's debt. He was immediately dumped as soon as those bills were signed, his usefulness spent.

In a report from the Kiev Institute of Sociology (2013), Russia is not seen as an imperialist monster by Ukrainians. Generally, Ukraine is pro-Russia. Western Ukrainians are also pro-Russian, but few desire any reunification with Moscow. This proves that the simple-minded “east-west” divide reported in the American media is false. In the east of the country, positive views of Russia are almost at 100%. Western Ukraine, especially given the different economies of the two countries, a generally pro-Russian position is held by about 75% of the population.

Between 10-20% of Western Ukraine has a negative assessment of Russia.

Upon witnessing the disintegration of the Ukrainian economy while that of Belarus and Russia continued to grow, Ukraine needed to find a way out of this embarrassing mess. The first step was for Kiev to declare itself an enemy of Russia. It did not take long before the west's NGOs moved in. Often omitted is the fact that Ukraine has, for decades, paid below market costs for gas. When Moscow, seeing an enemy across her southeastern border, raises the price to market levels, Kiev accuses Moscow of price gouging. Yet Moscow had continued to subsidize Ukrainian gas even after independence.

From 1991 to 1996, Ukraine has been shedding its GDP from between 10% and 25% yearly. She suffered hyperinflation, and monstrous concentration of wealth in a few families (only a handful of whom are Ukrainian). Infrastructure fell to pieces, and few roads are presently reliable. After losing over half its GDP in the 1990s, very little developed in terms of recovery since the lack of confidence encouraged bandit behavior rather than investment. As of 2012, Ukraine's capital depreciation is about 300% more rapid than in the west.

Less promising for Ukraine is that its relationship to Russia is based on natural gas. This is about half of the total economic relations between the two countries. All of Ukraine's manufacturing is dependent on Russian components, and most of these concerns are situated in the east and south.

Yet, the problem for the junta is the fact that Russian nationalists control much of the eastern manufacturing. Hence, the hapless Yatsenyuk was ordered to appoint regional bosses to oversee the liquidation of these companies. Needless to say, the natives got restless and began arming themselves, as any rational people would do. The Ukrainian army is poorly equipped and has never

reformed itself to be anything other than an important appendage of the USSR. Most Ukrainians are refusing to fire on easterners, and some estimates put the number of desertions at 500 daily. What is being created before our eyes is a new Russian state of “Novorossya” or the “People's Republic of the Donbass.”

So what happened? Julia Tymoshenko is the primary oligarch in that country. For the second time, she has relied on the west to place her in power. Convicted more than once on numerous corruption charges, the US immediately declared her innocent regardless of the actual facts of the case. The US position is that, because these charges came from Russia or a government that is dominated by the Party of Regions, they could not be accurate. However, when former President Yushchenko, her former ally, repeated the same accusations, the west fell silent.

She was convicted of using government funds to bail out her gas monopoly. Once her enemies and her allies saw her as a criminal, she made a well publicized trip to Moscow, claiming that “she was pro-Putin all along.” Once the protests turned violent, Tymoshenko was released from prison and then claimed that she was for the “movement for freedom.” As soon as Yatsenyuk was installed, the Ukrainian criminal code was simply rewritten that decriminalized only those crimes that would affect the oligarchy.

The violence in Kiev was financed by the US, and had been planned for some time. Ambassador Victoria Nuland had been captured on film passing out cookies as the Molotov cocktails were hurled. She also openly admits to spending \$6 billion to organize the opposition, hence putting an end to that debate. Groups like these need to be organized artificially because of their small numbers and lack of any unifying vision.

John McCain told the protesters to step up their

violence upon his arrival in Kiev last month, yet complains when military forces the world over say the same about the US. Having dinner with protest groups long claiming to demand the ouster of the government by force, the US promised to pay the new government a substantial sum. This is the sole foundation of the present government in Kiev, or what remains of it.

The ideology of this movement has been a bit of a mystery. First, there was the claim that the protesters were “fighting for liberalism.” Every major American newspaper had originally argued this, including all neo-conservative outlets. The problem was the clear self interest displayed by this dishonesty. Moreover, since very few Ukrainians accept the liberal view, and that western liberalism is almost universally blamed for the crisis that began under Kravchuk and has yet to end, this was quietly scrapped.

Then, there was something about the European Union being at the heart of this. The problem there was that a) this is not an issue that usually causes violence, b) this is just another variant of the liberal theme, c) there is no reason to believe that a population willing to “rebel” over Yanukovych's decision to move into Eurasian markets would also believe that Ukrainian goods have any chance in the west and d) that 70% of Ukrainian exports are to the east. The west has hardly the market for its own goods, let alone those created in eastern Ukraine (which are made from Russian components regardless).

Finally, there was the “nationalist” opinion. This was intriguing, except that Stepan Bandera, his movement in the OUN, as well as Dontsov, Poltava, Gogol, and the rest rejected any interaction with the decadent western European powers. In fact, no nationalist of any consequence in Ukraine had nothing but contempt and revulsion for the west. Hence, the western world, whose knowledge of the Ukrainian economy is equivalent to their knowledge of cellular antisense transcription, was yet again

sold a bill of goods.

The local elites financing this coup were Sergey Taruta and Igor Kolomoisky. They have been appointed by western capital to take control the eastern industries and sell them to pay debts to financial capital and major western energy firms. Kolomoisky was a long-time ally of Tymoshenko and in the early 2000s, was involved in her notorious gas-siphoning operation. In brief, these oligarchs can sell off Ukraine and pocket all profits before the currency completely collapses. Since corporate debt at the time of the coup was a full 14% of GDP, they needed this violence as the last hope of making some money on the failing Ukrainian experiment.

The west, yet again, promised aid, credit and trade with any government that would take over from Yanukovich. Now, it is not like there are no good reasons to protest against Kiev, but the hijacking of yet another mass movement by NGOs and western capital could not but lead to the same disasters as 2004. Of course, Ukraine cannot receive credit, since she possesses no functional capital. She has no money, little income and an impoverished population dependent on the black market to survive. There can be no trade since there is no demand in the west for Ukrainian goods. Aid is not forthcoming from an indebted, oligarchic western world whose banks are quite busy foreclosing on its own middle class. Hence, even the American population could conclude that this is no concern of the American taxpayer.

As all Russian commentators predicted, the western promises were cynical, false and easily repudiated. Aid quickly became “loans” and “loans” really meant selling chunks of Ukrainian land to Shell and Exxon. Naftogaz, the bankrupt Ukrainian gas organization, immediately increased its rates by 50% starting on May 1 of 2014. Government workers will be receiving withholding rates of between 40% and 70% of salary depending on rank. The

typical middling Kievan civil servant makes roughly 1000-2000 hryvnia monthly, which is not a living wage. All remaining social services will be slashed and its government reorganized by Kiev's creditors.¹⁰¹

Even worse, Kiev, one of the most glorious cities in European history, is now Europe's Detroit. That comparison is pathetically apt because Kievan state will be governed by Brussels according to EU law. Decisions in Detroit are now made in Ann Arbor: that's what being in receivership means. Kiev is now a colony of Brussels in the same manner as Kosovo. The only problem is not how this will affect Moscow, but how a completely bankrupt EU will now take on the additional burden of a financially non-viable Ukraine. The only solution is for western capital to buy up Ukrainian assets at next to nothing prices and liquidate them. This would mean the end of both Ukrainian political and financial sovereignty. The result was the perfectly rational and quite noble uprising of the two eastern industrial regions of Donetsk and Lugansk who would rather not be so absorbed. Their goods are not only accepted in the east, but are in high demand.

In their July 4 declaration of independence, the new government stated:

¹⁰¹ The major works used here:
Швецов, Святослав (March, 2014) Между Майданом-2 и революцией: логика разрушения Второй украинской республики. Новости Днепропетровска и Украины за сегодня 23 May, 2014 Экономика Украины переживает жесточайший кризис и процессы системного разрушения – народный депутат. «Корреспондент»
<http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/3367715-ekonomyka-ukrainy-perezhivaet-zhestochaisnyi-kryzys-y-protsessy-systemnoho-razrusheniya-narodnyi-deputat>
Sulimenko, Andrei (July 17 2014). Кабминовский "план" разрушения Украины. Глагол-инфо
<http://glagol-info.com/news/90022-kabminovskij-plan-razrusheniya-ukrainy>

Ukraine has been the victim of a coup with the support of all elite bodies and paramilitary forces. The new government is frantically searching for legitimacy and has, as a result, gone to the west for protection. Worse, they have signed all manner of agreements that eliminate what independence remained with western capital. In the process this new “government” has severed itself from the rest of the Slavic world. They have instituted a massive program of media censorship and use anti-Russian prejudice as their local propaganda. They created a “Russian image” that is now an enemy. Today, Kiev is a colony of western capital.

The people of the Donetsk region sees Eurasia as the future, not the west. There can be no cooperation with an illegitimate government run by criminals. We support the essential principles of international law and human values, which presently cannot be observed after the coup. The will of our people is clear and the Regional Council of the Donetsk Region proclaims the official establishment of an independent state.¹⁰²

¹⁰² For this and below: Мы строим новую Россию! «Русская весна» (Russian Spring) 2014
http://rusvesna.su/recent_opinions/1401885234
Декларация о суверенитете Донецкой Народной Республики: Малороссия Украина как часть Русского Мира http://malaya-russia.blogspot.com/2014/04/blog-post_894.html

Paul Gubarev's article "We are Building a New Russia" (2014) (Мы строим новую Россию!) lays the groundwork for the ideology of the Donbass state. "Our land should become a clear testament to social justice. The massive gap between the rich and poor needs to be eliminated. . . .Offshore business will be banned and taxes reduced to 10% across the board." There is little to argue with here, which is why this author is the first to translate it.

He goes on to describe a full tax amnesty for small business and overall, a general spirit of Orthodox brotherhood. These elements will help make New Russia the very vanguard of Russian Civilization. Kiev was a state based on theft: if this capital had been put to productive use, Ukraine would be a European power of the first rank. That most of the high value-added exports from Ukraine came from the Donbass, their economic exploitation is a fact of life and hence, their secession is justified on these grounds alone.

Apart from the fact that "Euro-Maidan" was merely a debt collection arrangement by western firms burned yet again by Ukrainian insolvency, the devastated Ukrainian citizen, with more advanced degrees per capita than any other country on the globe, will see medical services cut, education intermittent and electricity and heat only on occasion. Even more, tax rates have been massively increased on diesel fuel while all previous tax reductions, credits and rebates have been canceled. Taxes will be levied on currency purchases, radio band usage, a increased VAT, bank deposits, the disabled and an endless array of additionally regressive, absurd and almost-made-up targets. No one who knows Ukrainian economics believes these can be paid or enforced unless the EU directly rules Ukraine, which of course, it lacks the resources to do.

On the other hand, the speaker of the Crimean State Council, Vladimir Konstantinov, now safely under the

powerful and dynamic economy of Eurasia, has increased pension payments to the level of the Russian. China has, almost at the moment the referendum returned the predicted 92% margin for joining with Russia, begun building a colossal energy plant offshore while Moscow has already laid plans for substantial investment in the region at about \$5 billion in agricultural, tourist and energy projects. Hence, Ukraine will see whatever is left being sold off at 50% market while the Crimea suffers a labor shortage.

Valentin Katasonov, one of the best political writers in Russia today, argues that Novorossya was necessary to protect Russians against the coming collapse of the hryvnia. Its collapse is a fact, but artificial injections of liquidity are presently keeping it afloat. The best thing is for Russia to float a substantial loan to jump start the economy and place the ruble as the main currency. At a minimum, a loan would permit an independent ruble in the Donbass, but there seems to be no rationale for that.¹⁰³

As of this writing, August 27 of 2014, the hryvnia is in a state of total collapse. The hapless prime minister called on western banks to, yet again, throw money at an unsolvable problem. The Ukrainian currency has now dipped to 15:1 against the dollar and is falling. Since there is no production or confidence in the system, nothing will give it strength except foreign aid. Thus, this can only be the beginning, since the political will to adopt a fourth world state with no prospects under western rule is not exactly politically popular.

In addition, official statistics released from Kiev are predictably depressing. Most Ukrainian businesses have recorded monstrous losses. As of late August, they amounted to \$140 billion since January. The other fact that the west probably cannot digest is that about 50% of the

¹⁰³ Katasonov, Valentin. «Экономику Юго-Востока Украины спасет рубль» Russian Spring, 2014
http://rusvesna.su/recent_opinions/1402321504

companies in Ukraine have increased profits substantially at the same time. It does not take brilliance to understand that these profitable firms are not Ukrainian at all, but represent the European or American buyouts of Ukrainian capital. These are ledger entries only. When the west streamlines a business, eliminates its capital and fires its workers, this is seen as a net gain since capital valuations will rise and depreciation fall. The mere movement of cash in an area is not economic growth nor profitability. It also has nothing to do with production. Profits in speculating on Ukrainian capital are not “profits” in any real sense of the term, but Kiev is not honest about this.

The worst part about having insight into these things is that you are almost always right. That does not sound like a problem until you add the fact that no one listens. The absurdly illegitimate government of someone named Yatsenyuk has, predictably, began calling the liquidation of Ukrainian assets “privatization.” The All-Ukrainian agrarian forum during the first week of July 2014, was the odd vehicle for this announcement.

Any profitable company will be privatized. He neglected to mention that the criminal code of Ukraine has been rewritten directly by western capital making it very easy for them to buy what they require to regain some of their bad loans. All state-owned companies are being sold. Ominously, “Ukrspirit,” the firm that produces 95% of all Ukrainian grain alcohol, will be sold off to western creditors.

Law enforcement will be substantially cut, with the Kievan authorities shedding over 50,000 personnel. While this is not normally part of the typical IMF austerity program, it will remove most of the irritations of law and order from oligarchical pilfering. All social services will be slashed over 50% over the next year. VAT taxes are averaging 20% and are increasing. Tobacco, alcohol,

engines, and imports will be taxes monstrously.

Almost in a mocking tone, this mouthpiece of the EU's coup in Kiev stated, "The main challenge facing Ukraine is to take the lead in the European food market. . . We need to feed its citizens with cheap, quality products and hence, take European food markets." Those who follow EU politics realize just how the agricultural lobby in Brussels will take such news. A few districts in Belgium can easily feed all the EU and beyond. Like all else, Ukraine is not geared towards a western market. Ukrainian food is no doubt of high quality, it's just that no one in Norway will develop rickets without it.

Similarly comical was his belief that "Ukraine will take over the American corn market." It is doubtful that this mouthpiece, hence callously discarded as useless, believes this nonsense, especially since the former "prime minister" called the future of endless cuts and high taxes the "most brutal economy" awaiting Ukraine.

One example might suffice. In Ukraine, roughly since 2003, the market for poultry has become saturated. Since Ukraine does grow and process high grade poultry, the export market was quickly developed. Ukrainian exports of this product went up this time by the summer of 2013 by about 250%. the problem was that it went to Russia and Eurasia, which, regardless, accounted for 70% of all Ukrainian exports.

There was a special "permission" granted from Brussels to Kiev that lowered tariffs for Ukrainian poultry, but this cost the EU in compensatory payments to their own suffering farmers. Even when the tariffs were dropped to zero, the total amount sold to EU customers amounted to 40,000 tons. Since Ukraine produces about 2 million tons of poultry product a year, this was not an impressive means of "taking Europe's food market."

This is significant because, quite naturally, President Yanukovich saw Eurasia as the future of Ukraine rather

than the EU. Math is after all, math. Yet the west, threatened by the loss of another debt-ally, balked and created the “Euro-Maidan” movement. The west took advantage of many legitimate grievances to be sure, but western NGOs are expert manipulators.

So far, the losses registered for Ukrainian enterprises in the first quarter of 2014 rose by 550%, while the total negative balance for the private sector as a whole is about 130 hryvnia, or about \$11 billion, according to the National Bank of Ukraine. The policies of the junta in Kiev have directly led to a drop in capital investment to about one-quarter of last year's.

Given the disruption of trade with Russia (not including the loss of the Donbass or Crimea) will be a minimum of \$33 billion yearly, about 15-17% of GDP. Of this, about \$15 billion is now based on losses from Eurasian trade. A further reduction will occur when Kiev finally admits that there is no market for Ukrainian goods in a western world that barely has a market for western goods. Often left out of these considerations is the loss of possible \$10-12 billion yearly from migrant workers in Russia and Central Asia, a fill 7% of GDP.

As Ukraine is mired in fourth world status, Novorossya, alternatively, is to become the heart of Eurasia. She is saturated with coal, iron ore, manganese, metallurgical and chemical industries and the strong ports of Odessa, Mariupol and the Nikolayev shipyard in Crimea to transport them. This also does not include the investments made by both Russia and China in this sector. One eastern firm, Novokramatorsky Engineering Works, comprises a full 6% of Ukraine's exports. Novorossya's path is going to be prosperous.

Further, Transnistria, which is largely a small region of mostly Russian professionals, will be free from the rest of Moldova and then, along with Carpathian-Rus, Crimea

and New Russia, will create a new industrial hub of the Eurasian economy.

Hence, New Russia will be the center of inorganic raw materials for Eurasia, its aeronautics and shipbuilding hub, be the site of Russian forward bases on the Black Sea against NATO and into the Mediterranean. Her future is bright so long as Putin or those thinking as he does remain at the helm. Russia is largely immune to western pressure, since she is deepening her relationship with the east rather than the west. Thus, Russian policy has no reason to even use the window dressings of liberalism.

Conclusion

In 1986, Ukraine was changed forever. The old and obsolete Soviet nuclear plant on the border of Belarus erupted, spreading radiation throughout Europe. This inspired the continuation of the “suffering Ukraine” theme, though now in a new form. In 2003, the famous “Chernobyl Savior” icon was painted by an unknown artist. Typical of Ukrainian Orthodox icons, it retains a realism and naturalism that Greek and Russian icons do not. Like all modern Ukrainian art, it blends western realism with Russian mysticism (see image).

The icon itself is striking. The bottom half shows the results of the meltdown. A single dead tree is the central object, with a falling star behind it. This represents Lucifer (Wormwood, the literal meaning of “Chernobyl”) falling from heaven. On the right side stands a group of people in medical and emergency garb. On the left, a group of hooded ghosts looks to the ground in grief and despair. In the upper half, however, salvation is present. A highly Ukrainian version of Christ stands in the midst, surrounded by God’s energy essential to icons of the Transfiguration. On one side stands his Mother, and the other, St. George.

In addition, the border around the icon is also inspired by the west in that it is made up of wild, floral colors and geometric designs. It is common in Ukrainian icons and churches to see icons that are packed with natural objects like flowers, clouds and detailed topography. In Greece, on the other hand, icons are often bereft of any additional objects, and when objects appear, they are not painted in a realistic manner and are kept to the bare minimum. Even in Ukrainian churches, flowers are everywhere, while in the more austere Russian parish, these are few.

The contemporary painter Kazimir Malevich is a

part of a distinctive avant-garde reflecting these sorts of tragedies in Ukrainian history. This should not be confused with the western idea. Even at a quick glance at his work, the color yellow is paramount. This is an ancient color for Ukraine with agricultural and solar metaphors. The steppe too is present in the skillful use of space, as the prairie is one of Ukraine's most distinctive features.

The Ukrainian avant-garde is a response to socialist realism and Ukraine's present poverty. Using western modernists in a Slavic context, works like Malevich's Peasant between Cross and Sword (occasionally called The Running Man) have developed. This painting is a sharp depiction of genocide in the country from Stalin's forced famine from 1933-1936. Its uses austere lines, vivid primary colors and simple, flat surfaces to emphasize the overwhelming sense of dread in the country. Heavily influenced by western futurism, this painting communicates a bleak, hopeless rejection of existence due to genocide, isolation and a lack of home.¹⁰⁴ The Running Man is trying to escape the country, but the figure is aware of its futility. Futility however, makes no sense to the dying.

What do these have to do with concluding a book? Chernobyl is emblematic of Ukrainian history.

Several facts can be deduced from the above. First, Ukraine sees itself as both a Slavic and a central European state. Second, since the economic meltdown that still has not been arrested, the west is commonly seen by Ukrainians in a negative light. Third, Ukraine's history has provided far more western influences than in Russia or Belarus, and finally, the basic Ukrainian approach to art is to maintain a Slavic identity while borrowing selectively from the west. Since much of Ukrainian art is expressly national, it expresses precisely this synthesis.

Most important of all, Ukraine has spent much of

¹⁰⁴ Kotsarev, O. Kazimir Malevich and Ukrainian Avant-garde. Ukrainian Week, August 19, 2003

her existence under foreign rule, warfare and depopulation. This requires a strong national ethos by which the country can rebuild, remain secure and, possibly, become a strong regional power. This precludes any substantial western interference in her culture, politics and economics. Art, quite often since 1990, has sought to reveal the essence of both Ukrainian suffering and Ukrainian rebirth. The present crisis is not the time for abstract cosmopolitanism or oligarchic capitalism, it is a time of rebuilding and reorientation.

The examples detailed above have shown that both nationalism and sovereignty are the cornerstone of international politics. Even the most predatory empire needs to use these symbols when it is in their interests. Even more, as the economies of the small Slavic states continue to spin out of control, internationalism, neoliberalism and empire are seen more and more to be illegitimate and in fact, rapacious. Belarus and Russia are exceptions, showing basically healthy economies based entirely on a rejection of IMF demands.

This writer agrees that the most successful economic policies come from a strong state and ethnic unity. Examples include including Japan, Russia, South Korea, Taiwan and Belarus. All of these states are examples of economic successes based around the rejection of neoliberalism and in favor of state-centered investment policies and long-term employment. The death of neoliberalism—outside of Washington and Harvard—will be missed by few.

Bibliography:

- Bruck, Tilman and Lehmann Hartmut. In the Grip of Transition: Economic and Social Consequences of Restructuring in Russia and Ukraine. Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke, Hampshire, GBR, 2011
- Chernetsky, Vitaly. Mapping Postcommunist Cultures: Russia and Ukraine in the Context of Globalization. McGill, 2007
- Hnatiuk, O. Nativists vs. Westernizers: Problems of Cultural Identity in Ukrainian Literature of the 1990s. The Slavic and East European Journal, Vol. 50, No. 3, (2006), pp. 434-451
- Harasymiw, B. Post-Communist Ukraine. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 2001
- Klumbyte, Neringa, Gulnaz Sharafutdinova. Soviet Society in the Era of Late Socialism, 1964–1985. Lexington, 2012
- Kotsarev, O. Kazimir Malevich and Ukrainian Avant-garde. Ukrainian Week, August 19, 2003
<http://ukrainianweek.com/Culture/87314>
- Mudrak, MM. Russian Artistic Modernism and the West: Collectors, Collections, Exhibitions, and Artists. Russian Review, Vol. 58, No. 3 (1999), pp. 467-481
- Naumescu, Vladimir. Review of Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe. In Zaleska Onyshkevych, Larysa M. L.; and Rewakowicz, Maria G., eds. H-SAE, H-

Net Reviews. February. 2011.

Rubchak, MJ. Ukraine's Ancient Matriarch as a Topos in Constructing a Feminine Identity
Marian J. Feminist Review, No. 92 (2009), pp. 129-150

Riabchuk, R. Culture and Cultural Politics in Ukraine: A Post Colonial Perspective. In Taras Kuzio, Paul J. D'Anieri, eds. Dilemmas of State-led Nation Building in Ukraine. Praeger, 2002

Wanner, C. Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine. Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009

Reient, Oleksandr. 2006. "Ivan Franko: Creator of the Nation." The Day, 27

Shkandrij, Myroslav. (2001). Russia and Ukraine. McGill-Queens Press. (Section on Franko, pps 192-196)

Stech, Marko (2007) "Ivan Franko" The Encyclopedia of Ukraine. The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. (<http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/pages/F/R/FrankoIvan.htm>)

Skovoroda, Hryhorii: Tvory v Dvokh Tomakh (Gregory Skovoroda's Works, Vol I and II)

Marshall, Richard H., Thomas E. Bird. Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles. (Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1994)

Ciapalo, Roman T. The Neoplatonic Dimensions of Skovoroda's Aesthetic Theory. Neoplatonism and Western Aesthetics. Aphrodite Alexandrakis, Nicholas J. Moutafakis

(eds). SUNY Press, pps 165-186, 2002

Klein, George. "Skovoroda's Metaphysics" Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles. Marshall, Richard H. and Thomas E. Bird, (eds). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, pps 223-239, 1994

Zakydalsky, Taras "Skovoroda's Moral Philosophy" Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles. Marshall, Richard H. and Thomas E. Bird, (eds). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, pps 239-250.1994

Zakydalsky, Taras. The Theory of Man in the Philosophy of Skovoroda. Master's Thesis, Bryn Mawr University, 1965 (<http://www.ditext.com/zakydalsky/skovoroda.html>)

Shubin, Daniel. 2005 History of Russian Christianity. Algoria Publishing.

Sire, James. 2004. Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept. Intervarsity Press

Taras Shevchenko Museum. Shevchenko's Poetry (Online Anthology).
<http://www.infoukes.com/shevchenkomuseum/poetry.htm>

Luckyj, George S.N. "The Archetype of the Bastard in Shevchenko's Poetry." Slavic and East European Journal. vol.14 no. 3; Fall 1970, p. 277-83.

Rousseau, J.J. The Social Contract. Trans GDH Cole. Cosimo, 2008.

Plokhly, S. Ukraine and Russia: Representations of the Past. University of Toronto Press, 2008

Plokhyy, Serhii (2005) *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History*. University of Toronto Press

Shkandrij, Myroslav. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*. McGill-Queens, 2001

Nahyalo, B (1988) A Glimpse of Soviet Reality. *Ukrainian Weekly* of July 3, 1988
http://ukrweekly.com/archive/1988/The_Ukrainian_Weekly_1988-33.pdf

Jones, E Michael (2003) *The Revolutionary Jew and His Impact on World History*. Culture Wars

Szporluk, Roman (2001) *Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union*. Hoover Institute

Wilson, Andrew (2002) *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*. Yale

Doroshenko, Y. (2000) *After the Patriarch is Gone*. Young Ukraine

Yelenskyy B. (2001) *Religious Institutions and their Development in Ukraine: General Characteristics*. RISU

Kohut, Z. *Mazepa's Ukraine: Understanding Cossack Territorial Vistas*. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1/4, 2010, pp. 1-28

Sysyn, F. *The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising*. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, Neue Folge*, Bd. 46, H. 4 (1998), pp. 531-545

Basarab, John Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study. Edmonton 1982;

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. Vol. 8, pt. 2. Reprint New York 1956, pp. 21 1-224

Janusz Kaczmarczyk Bohdan Chmielnicki - Szatan czy mesjasz?, in: Studia Historyczne 34 (1991) no. 3, pp. 369-385

Doroshenko, Dmytro. A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography. Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., 1957

Doroshenko, Dmytro. Narys istoriï Ukraïny. Globus, 1991

Doroshenko, Dmytro. A Survey of Ukrainian History. Humeniuk Publication Foundation, 1975

Serhii Plokyh The Symbol of Little Russia: The Pokrova Icon and Early Modern Ukrainian Political Ideology, in: Journal of Ukrainian Studies 17 (1992) no. 1-2, pp. 171-188.

Himka, John-Paul. The Ukrainian Idea in the Second Half of the 19th Century. Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Volume 3, Number 2, Spring 2002 (New Series), pp. 321-335

Almond, Mark (2008) "On Ukrainian Nationalism." Russia Behind the Headlines, 28 November (rbth.ru/articles/2008/11/28/281108_nationalism.html)

Beiner, R. (2003) Liberalism, Nationalism, Citizenship: Essays on the Problem of Political Community. UBC Press

Hobsbawm, E. (1991) Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality. Cambridge University Press.

Pavlychko, D. The Ukrainian National Idea. Inaugural Lecture honorary doctorate of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, 2002 (Інаугураційна лекція почесного доктора Києво-Могилянської Академії, виголошена 1 вересня 2002 року)
Originally published in the journal Young Ukraine (Молодь України” 2002 10 and 12 вересня, 113-114).

Кук, Василь (Vasyl Kuk, 2008). Життя і діяльність Степана Бандери: документи й матеріали. (Редактор: Микола Посівнич). Астон.

Посівнич, Микола. Степан Бандера — життя, присвячене свободі. Літопис УПА, 2008, III (N. Posivnych, from the Collected Works of the UPA, vol 3).

Павличко Д. (2012) Українська національна ідея : ст., виступи, інтерв'ю, док. Дмитро Павличко. Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи»

Stoyan, D. (2012) Проблема визначення поняття «нація» в контексті філософської спадщини Ю.Вассяяна. Publications of the Dmytro Dontsov Research Center.

Stoyan, D. (2012a) Шевченка в історіософській концепції Ю. І. Вассяяна. Publications of the Dmytro Dontsov Research Center.

Швецов, Святослав (March, 2014) Между Майданом-2 и революцией: логика разрушения Второй украинской республики. Новости Днепропетровска и Украины за

сегодня

23 May, 2014 Экономика Украины переживает жесточайший кризис и процессы системного разрушения – народный депутат. «Корреспондент»
<http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/3367715-ekonomyka-ukraynu-perezhivaet-zhestochaisnyi-kryzys-y-protsessy-systemnoho-razrusheniya-narodnyi-deputat>

Sulimenko, Andrei (July 17 2014). Кабминовский "план" разрушения Украины. Глагол-инфо
<http://glagol-info.com/news/90022-kabminovskij-plan-razrusheniya-ukrainy>

Мы строим новую Россию! «Русская весна» (Russian Spring) 2014
http://rusvesna.su/recent_opinions/1401885234

Декларация о суверенитете Донецкой Народной Республики: Малороссия Украина как часть Русского Мира
http://malaya-russia.blogspot.com/2014/04/blog-post_894.html

Sotnickenko, A. Новороссия — шанс для рождения новой России. Russian Spring 2014
http://rusvesna.su/recent_opinions/1404123470

Katasonov, Valentin. «Экономику Юго-Востока Украины спасет рубль» Russian Spring, 2014
http://rusvesna.su/recent_opinions/1402321504

Dugin, Alexander. Надо не Новороссию присоединить к России, а Россию к Новороссии. Russian Spring, 2014
http://rusvesna.su/recent_opinions/1405082001

Drazhevska, L (1994) The activities of governments and civil organizations in the Kharkiv region, 1941-1943. Report of the Conference of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences
<http://uapc.org.ua/e-biblioteka/>

Сухомлинської, ОВ (2005) Українська педагогіка в персоналіях ХІХ століття. (A Textbook for University Students in Two Volumes). Либідь

Підкови, І. and Р. Шуста (1993) Довідник з історії України. За ред. Генеза

Гайдай, Л (2000) Історія України в особах, термінах, назвах і поняттях. Вежа

Апанович О. М (1994) Українсько-російський договір 1654 р.: Міфи і реальність.

Бандура О. (1992) Вивчення роману П. Куліша «Чорна рада»: Хроніка 1663р. Українська мова і література в школі (по 11-12)

Балтівець С. (1995) Психологічні особливості вивчення поезії П.Куліша. Дивослово, по 4

Вайтюк А. (1997) Символи віри П. Куліша. Віче 3: 102-128

Виговський Іван (1991) Гадяцький трактат. Україна. Наука і культура. Volume 25, pps 147-152 (full text of the treaty in Ukrainian)

Галей С (2002) Народознавча спадщина П.Куліша. Народна творчість та етнографія 4: 62-74
Very valuable work on the connection of Kulish to the folk

tradition

Гнідан О and Н Осьмак (1991) Світогляд Пантелеймона Куліша. Дивослово 10: 38-41

Гончар О. Роман (1992) «Чорна рада» П. Куліша в школі. Слово і час 9: 3-11

Грушевський М. (1992) З історії релігійної думки на Україні. К.: Освіта

Грушевський М. (2003) Переяславська умова України з Москвою 1654 року. У кн.: Переяславська рада 1654 року. К.: 16-21.

Бочковський О (1958) Ольгерд-Іполит Бочковський. Наука про нації та її життя. Нью-Йорк

Вишенський, Іван. Твори. Переклад з книжної української мови Валерія Шевчука. Київ: Дніпро, 1986

Антологія. Український націоналізм 2 том. Українська Видавнича спілка імені Юрія Липи, 2011

Бойко, Юрій. Проблеми історіософії українського націоналізму. УВС, 2014

Сарбей В. Г. (1993) Етапи формування української національної свідомості (кінець XVIII –початок XX ст.). Український історичний журнал 7-8

Tismaneanu, V *Fantasies of Salvation: Democracy, Nationalism, and Myth in Post-Communist Europe*. Princeton University Press, 2009

Shevchenko, Taras. *Poetical Works*. University of Toronto

Press, 1964

Kostash, Myrna Inside the Copper Mountain. In: The Doomed Bridegroom: A Memoir. New West Press, 1998, 34 -70

Davies, Norman Richard White Eagle, Red Star: the Polish-Soviet War, 1919–20. Random House, 1972

Whitney, Mark Oil and Gas Pipelines: Pushing Ukraine to the Brink. Global Research: Center for Research on Globalization, 2014

Pirani, S and K. Westphal (2009) The Russian-Ukrainian Gas Conflict. Russian Analytical Digest, 53

Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KIIS) The Dynamics of Attitudes to Russia in Ukraine's Regions. June 2013

Luhn, Jack. The Ukrainian Nationalism at the Heart of 'Euromaidan.' The Nation, January 2014

Lopez, Ralph. Washington Fuels Rise of Neo-Nazism and Anti-Semitism in Ukraine. The Role of John McCain. Center for Research on Globalization, March 2014

Kharkiv Regional Security (nd). The criminal case of Metropolitan Theophilus Buldovskoho. Case No 147900 <http://uapc.org.ua/e-biblioteka/>

Voloshin Y (1996) The Renaissance of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kharkov During the German Occupation. From the UAOC-Poltava Site 96 ch.7-9 (38-40)
www.hklib.npu.edu.ua

Skorobahatov A. (1999) The UAOC Relationship with APTS Administration in Kharkiv 1941-1943. Scientific and Scholarly Works of Sloboda Ukraine: Philosophy, Religion and Culture, Kharkiv
<http://uapc.org.ua/e-biblioteka/>

In Memory of the UAOC Patriarch Dmitri. UKR-Inform, 2000

Hmilovskyy, N (2011) Ora et labora - the vital principle of Patriarch Demetrios. Lviv Museum of the History of Religion
<http://www.museum.lviv.ua/novyny/9-novyny/39-ora-et-labora-zhyttievyyi-pryntsyp-patriarkha-dymytriia>

Yarema, D (1999) Testament Patriarch Demetrios. UAOC Press

Димитрій (Патріарх Київський і всієї України) (1999) Дискусійні думки про об'єднання церков. Прес-центр Патріархії Української Автокефальної Православної Церкви

Димитрій (Патріарх Київський і всієї України). На порозі 2000 року: послання до християн України. Прес-центр Патріархії Української Автокефальної Православної Церкви

Demetrius (Patriarch) Church building in Western Ukraine. Ed: Yu Kryvoruchko; International School of church architecture. Lviv, 1998

Romaniuk, Patriarch Volodymyr. A Voice in the Wilderness. The Society for the Study of Religion Under Communism, 1980

Metropolitan Basil Lypkivsky: Biographical Materials (The Central State Archive). Compiled L. Pylyavets, Ukrainian Institute of Archeology of Sciences of Ukraine., 1993

Zinchenko, Arsen (2007). Metropolitan Basil Lypkivsky. Stozir'ya. B-ka ua

Zinchenko, A (1997). Delivered by Faith. The Life and Work of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi. Dnipro Publishers

Lypkivsky KO (2003) Shadows of Unforgotten Ancestors. Kyiv

Lypkivsky, Vasyl (2002) The Memorial Anthology of Lypkivsky's Writings in Two Volumes. Kyiv, Yevroimidzh, 2002 (in Ukrainian)

<http://lypkivskyivasyl.in.ua/index.html>

First Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. 14-30 October 1921. Documents and Materials. Compiled by GM Mickle, LB Pylyavets, and IN Prelovska. Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv, 1999

UAOC (2007) The Second Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church. October 17-30, 1927. Documents and materials. Compiled by SI Bilokin, IN Prelovska and IN Starovojtenko. The Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology, Lviv

UAOC (1987) The Martyrdom of the Ukrainian Churches in 4 volumes. Volume I. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church (documents, materials, Christian samizdat Ukraine). Compiled and edited by Osip Zinkevych and Alexander Voronin. Torch Publishing Committee

UAOC (1997) Ukrainian Church Liberation Movement and the Formation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. A.Zinchenka, ed. Logos Press

Kyrydon AM (2005) Time Trials: the State, the Church and Society in Soviet Ukraine 1917 – 1930. Stockholm Textbooks and Manuals.

IV Buharyeva, VM Danilenko, V. Okipnyuk, IN Prelovska. Repressed leaders of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (1921-1930). Biographical Directory. Kyiv, Torch 2011

Videiko M. Yu. Trypillia Civilization in Prehistory of Europe. Kiev Domain Archaeological Museum, Kiev, 2005

Franko, Ivan. (1876) “The Hired Hand.” Trans. Roman Kosarenko et al. Ukrainian Poetica. The Press of the Ivan Franko National University of Lv’iv Ukraine

Franko, Ivan (1879). “The Pioneers.” Trans Roman Kosarenko et al. Ukrainian Poetica. The Press of the Ivan Franko National University of Lv’iv Ukraine

Franko, Ivan (1880). “Hymn” Trans Roman Kosarenko et al. Ukrainian Poetica. The Press of the Ivan Franko National University of Lv’iv Ukraine

Franko, Ivan (2006) Behind Decorum's Veil. Trans: Roma Franko and Sonia Morris. Language Lanterns Publications

Франко І. (2004) Дещо про себе самого : Вибр. Твори. Іван Якович Франко, Дрогобич : Коло, volume 3, 27-33

Франко І. (1900) На склоні віку. ЛНВ 12

Франко І. (1900) Поза межами можливого. ЛНВ, 10

Франко І. (1904) «Східно-Західні непорозуміння. ЛНВ,
27

Франко І. (1895) *Ukraina irredenta*. Житє і слово 4

Франко, Іван. (1897) Соціалізм і соціал-демократизм.
«Житє і слово» 6(4): 265-292

Франко, Іван. (1936) Формальний і реальний
націоналізм. «Назустріч» (This also appears in his
Collected Works, 1980, vol 27, pps 355-363)

Stus, Vasyl. Твори : У 4т., 6 кн. / НАН України. Ін-ту
літератури ім. і. Г. Шевченка. Відділ рукописних фондів
і текстології. Львів: Вид. Спілка „Просвіта”, 1994.

Т. 4 : Повісті та оповідання. Незакінчені твори.
Сценарії. Літературна критика. Заяви, публіцистичні
листи та звернення. З таборового зошита / Підготували
тексти, упорядкували та склали примітки : М. Гончарук
(худож. проза), С. Гальченко (літ. критика та
публіцистика). -1994. - 544с.

Т.6 (додатковий), кн. Г : Листи до рідних / Упоряд. : О.
Дворко, М. Коцюбинська; Підгот. текстів О. Дворко;
Авт. приміт. М. Коцюбинська. -1997. - 495с.

Т. 6 (додатковий), кн. 2 : Лист до друзів та знайомих /
Упоряд.: О. Дворко, М. Коцюбинська; Авт. приміт. та
Словника М. Коцюбинська. - 1997. - 262с., [16] арк.
фот.

Не погасить свечи зажженной / Пер. с укр. Е. Санниковой. - М.: Возвращение, 1994. - 36 с. - (Малая сер. Поэты – узники ГУЛАГА). – На обкл. фот. В. Стуса. - Рос. 1995

Золотокоса красуня / Упоряд. Д. Стуса; Пер. з укр. Л. Рахліної; Передм. Д. Стуса. - Харків : Око, 1995. - 126 с.: портр. – Парал. Рос. 1996.

Василь Стус. Зібрання творів у 9-ти томах. – Львів, 1996-1997

Ліпа, Yuri. Призначення України, Part I. (Original text: Липа Ю. Призначення України.- Львів, 1991)
Online Edition, Ukrainian Center:
ukrcenter.com/Література/Юрій-Липа/19829/Частина-1

Билишевский М.Ф. Археологическая летопись Южной России.1999

Городцов А.В. Бытовая археология.-М. 1907

Гусева Н. “Арктическая родина в Ведах” Древность: Арьи. Славяне.-М., 1996

Николаева Н.А., Сафронов В.А. Истоки славянской и евразийской мифологии.-М.,1999

Залізняк Л.Л. Новітні міфи в індоєвропейській Східній Європі Археологія. 4, 2002

Залізняк Л.Л. "Свиня як критерій нордичних народів та семітів" Київська старовина, по 3

Залізняк Л.Л. Про трипільців, семітів та нардепів-трипільців Дзеркало тижня, 2004: 18-19

Кандиба-Ольжич О. Шипенці.-Прага,1937, Чернівці,
2004

Любар О.О., Федоренко Д.Т. Історія педагогічної думки
і освіти в Україні. Київ, 1993

Петров В. Походження українського народу. К.,1992

Спицын А.А. Раскопки глиняных площадок близ
с.Колодистого в Киевской губ. Известие арх.
Комиссии.-М., 1904

Шилов Ю.О. Чого ми варті Київ, Арата. 2006

Щербаківський В. Формування української нації.Прага,
1941

Кралюк. П. Мелетій Смотрицький і українське
духовно-культурне відродження кінця XVI. початку
XVII ст. Острог, 2007

Бабич Сергій. Творчість Мелетія Смотрицького у
контексті раннього українського бароко. Монографія.
За редакцією проф. Богдани Криси. Львів: Свічадо,
2008

Rudnynsky, I. Symposium on Mykhaylo Drahomanov.
Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1952

Ukrainian Statehood in the Twentieth Century: Historical
and Political Analysis. Kyiv: Political Thought, 1996

