

NATIONALISM



DMYTRO DONTSOV

BERSERKER

BOOKS



CONTENTS

FOREWORD AND PURPOSE OF THE PUBLICATION.....6

IN PLACE OF PRADMOVI19

PART ONE - UKRAINIAN LAWYERS.....22

RAZZEL AND - NOTICEABLE INTELLECTUALISM.....22

SECTION II - "SCIENTIFIC" QUIETISM.....32

SECTION III - HUTARAN "UNIVERSALISM"37

SECTION IV - MATERIALISM (LIBERALISM, DEMOCRACY, PACIFISM,
PARTISANSHIP, ANARCHISM).....41

SECTION V - HUMAN RIGHTS AND POLITICAL SYMPATHIES, SOVEREIGNTY
AS A "FAD", AND THE PANDERING TO THE NATIONAL IMPERATIVE.....64

SECTION VI - TACTICS OF LEGALISM, ANTI-TRADITIONALISM.....81

RAZDZEL VII - PLEBS VERSUS NATION, UTOPIA VERSUS LEGEND,
HUTARAN "CRIPPLED"110

SECTION VIII - DEGENERATION OF LEGALISM.....133

THE OTHER PART IS NATIONALISM.....145

RAZDZEL I - PESSIMISM AND THE PAPERS OF THE MOST STATIST
NATIONALISM145

SECTIONS - THE WILL AS THE LAW OF LIFE. - ITS FORMS. - THE WILL OF
POWER. - THE ROLE OF THE ADJUNCTIVE MOMENT. - THE TWO FIRST
PRINCIPLES OF FREE NATIONALISM152

SECTION III - RAMANTISM, DAGMATISM, ILLUSIONISM - THE TRAGEDY OF
NATIONALISM168

CHAPTER IV - BIGOTRY AND "AMORAL" AS A FREQUENT OCCURRENCE OF
THE NATIONALISM'S DEFEAT.....177

SECTION V - RELATED HISTORIES - "RAMANISM" AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF
THE PRIDE - SYNTHESIS OF RATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM -
FIFTH PATRIOTIC VALUE OF NATIONALISM.....185

SECTION VI - THE CREATIVE AND ENTERPRISING MINORITY AS A PARADING FORCE - THE SIXTH REQUIREMENT OF A STRONG NATIONALISM	191
SECTION VII - THE WORLDVIEW OF THE "FAUVISTS" AND "BUDDHISTS" OF PEOPLES IS A DILEMMA: QI-QI.....	196
PART THREE - THE UKRAINIAN IDEA	202
RAZDZEL I - NEW NATIONAL "ERAS"	202
SECTION II - THE PLACE OF THE UKRAINIAN IDEA - BRIGHT, EXCLUSIVE, COMPREHENSIVE	209
SECTION III - "MYSTICISM" AND "REAL LIFE"	220
COMMENTS TO THE TEXT	229
YES PART ONE	229
AND PARTS OF OTHER.....	234
AND THE SHARE OF TREASURY.....	238

"Nationalism, which was published in its first edition (from the Icons-Basilians' printing house in Zhovkva) in 1926, was an ideology that opposed the worldviews of Drahomanov's "democracy" and Marx-Lenin's socialism and sought to attack masculinity. In that book, the author developed the ideas that were popularised by the First World War: As in the Kyiv "Word", in the brochures "Modern Masculinity" and "The New Era" published in Kyiv, "The Modern Political Situation of the Nation and Our Tasks" (read at a student congress in Lviv); during the First World War - "Ukrainian Political Thought and Europe" (published in Berlin, Vinnytsia, and Kyiv). in Berlin, Vinnytsia and Lviv), "International Situation of Ukraine and Russia", "Culture of Primitivism", "Mazepa and Mazepinism" (in Kyiv and Charkasy); during the First World War - "Fundamentals of Our Politics" and in Lviv "Literary and Scientific Bulletin".

The main ideas Nationalism were, first allfollowing antitheses Dragomanov's "Malarasianism". "Nationalism" was a prototype of the idea of a political nation, which was based on the interpretation of Ukraine as a rightful part of Russia, claiming only certain "pale" cultural and social characteristics, The idea of political state separatism, the ideals and purpose of which were to break with the rest of Russia, and the cultural idea of the whole spiritual complex of Russia, that the value of socialism was an adjunct of socialism. This was a complete antithesis to the current "hermaphroditic" worldview of demossocialist scholarship.

ⁱ Drahomanov's - nicknamed Drahomanov Mykhailo (1841-1895) - Ukrainian publicist, historian, philosopher, economist, literary critic, falsifier, and public figure. In 1859-1863, he studied at the History and Philology Department of the St Uladzimir University in Kyiv. In 1870-1875 he was a lecturer at Kyiv University. Since autumn 1975. - he has been in exile. Together with his friends he worked on the creation of a printing house and the editorial board of the Gramada magazine. In 1889 he was appointed to the Department of General History and the Faculty of History and Philosophy and the Safi'i University of Bulgaria.

ⁱⁱ "Slovo" - daily, organ of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Labour Party. It was published in Kyiv from 11.5.1907 to 1909. At the beginning of its existence, the daily paid great attention to the political and social life of Ukrainian workers and peasants. Paznya also paid attention to Ukrainian national life. ⁱⁱⁱ "Literary and Scientific" - an all-Ukrainian literary and scientific journal. Ivan Franko was the actual editor of the first period of the LNV's existence. It was published in Lviv (1898-1906), Kyiv (1907-1914, 1917-1919), and Lviv (1922-1932). It was published by the Taras Shavchenka Scientific Institution. Its topics included literary, public and scientific issues. Dantsov also published the journal "Visnyk" under his own editorship instead of LNV.

The company's leaders.

To the question "What?" "Nationalism" answered: independence and full separatism, emphasising the apostasy in the adoption of the future slogans of "federation" and "independence", but... within the framework of a "common fatherland", Russia. On the question "How to achieve your goal?" "Nationalism" answered: by fighting; national revolutionisation of Muscovy's labour; no parallelism or evolution.

These theses were a perfect antithesis to Dragomanovism and socialism, because Dragomanov's ideology was expressed by him in his "anthem": "*Let the Ukrainian ask for much...*". The idea of "Nationalism" substituted "*much*" for "*everything*"! Instead of "*sow*", it was "*crave*" and "*get*". The same further Dragomanovian wisdom (from the same hymn): the pastoral of "love", "to all Slavs", and, first of all, to the masked men, as the "elder brother" among others, "Nationalism" added as the most naive and harmful cadetry. After asking "What?", "What is the purpose of the nation?", and "How to achieve it?", and the third question - "Who has this?" - Nationalism said: the time of a new spirit. What spirit? The spirit of the valuable and engaged spirit of the representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the twentieth century with "slave ointments" and "slave sirs" (in the words of Ivan Franko). Riven by the doubts of *the mind* of that intelligentsia, sure in its thoughts, "Nationalism" developed an unquestioning *faith* in its idea, in its Truth (denoted by workers as "dogmatism", "adnakovism" and "emativism"). The summer and essential love for the "motherland", the love of the family and the idyll of the proletarians, "Nationalism" by Shavchenko gave way to, more than once, "one love" for his nation, believing in the past and a strong future (which the workers labelled "fanaticism"). Instead, it was the flimsy will of the intelligentsia, "unsteady in its ways", that looked at the "abstractions", and thus at the foreign village that created them, The pro-papists of "Nationalism" were uncompromisingly creative, with their minds above the matter (which was an empty "mantra" in the minds of their workers, lacking "realism"). At the same time, in the special section of Nationalism, the mysticism of the European "realism" is the mysticism without which all politics is dead; the mysticism that unites the life of the nation and its villages.

"Nationalism", like the author's works that came it, is a
The latter provoked a sharp reaction both in the Muscovite political world (in Dziar

The Ukrainian Duma, in the press, P. Miliukov, U. Lenin and others), and between the intelligentsia, left and right. liberal Ukrainianska Zhyttia and the social-democratic Dzvinyi judged the independent and separatist ideas of nationalism as "harmful" and "unrealistic"; These ideas were also rejected by the monarchists ("Khliborobska Ukrainaiv"), who stood for the "union" of Ukraine with the Muscovy. Balshavitska also promised, and forty years after his appearance, to launch an angry campaign to promote the ideas of "Nationalism". Democrats, socialists, and Savetafists attacked Nationalism for "Hitlerism"; however, in 1926, when was published, there was no such thing as Hitler. He was attacked for "foreign influences" in the ideas of Nationalism; At the same time, the Kali Avtars often praised *the traditions of our ancient times* as the wellspring of nationalism ("Let us seek our traditions", "The truth of the great forefathers", "From mysticism to politics", "Longing for the heroic", "The innocent hid Kabzar", etc.). And for these "inflows of "foreign ideas", the authors are blamed by those "Maralists" who "have no place for other people's ideas": Marx, Lenin, Lunacharsky, Dastaevsky - the luminaries of Russian literature. Some of the workers on the ideas of Nationalism emphasise that its ideological influences were shared among young people only because of their "uncriticality", but not because of their interpretation, This is why the wise leaders of "respectable citizenship" could not influence this youth to remember the "critical approach" and give it a look. Some of them turned to silencing the author's ideas, or to finding new ways to express them: for example, they called the book "Nationalism" "brashurai" ("immoral" and "harmful"), or "evil" ("evil").

Pavel Miliukov (1859-1943) - Master of Russian History (1892), one of the well-known ideologues of Russian liberalism. In 1905 he became one of the founders of the Constitutional Democratic Party (the Party of National Freedom), and in 1907 he became a senior member of the Central Committee of this party. In 1907-1917 he was a member of the Third and Fourth State Dumas. In the first composition of the Provisional Council (Sakavik-May 1917), he was Minister of Foreign Affairs. From November 1918 he was in exile.

ⁱⁱ "*Ukrainian Life*" - a literary, scientific and agrarian-political periodical. It was published in Russian in Moscow (1912-1917). The purpose of the journal was to acquaint Russian readers with Ukrainian cultural achievements. The main editors were A. Salikowski and S. Pyatlyura.

ⁱⁱⁱ "*Dzvin*" - literary, artistic and civic-political monthly magazine, organ of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party, published in Kyiv in 1913-1914.

^{iv} "*Khliborobska Ukraina*" - an idealistic organ of the Ukrainian Union of Grain-Growers and Statesmen, a non-permanent collection, 8 issues of which were published in Vienna in 1920-1925, edited by V. Lipinski.

of Shavinism" (Lev Rebetv: Lights and Shadows of the OUN, Munich, 1964). Others, though looking for Maslow's caricatures of bolshevism, do not ignore the fact that Dantsov himself devoted a lot of attention to this problem in his "Fundamentals of Our Politics" (Vienna, 1921), as well as in his brochure "The Culture of Primitivism" (Kyiv, 1918), or in his book "Russia and Europe" (London, 1954).

The origin of this process of nationalism is not easy to find. For now it is clear to the blind that some of our ""-socialist or "modern" intellectuals are switching from nationalism to the old Soviet "democracy" and are now the work of the monarchist intelligentsia, and thus engaged (together with the Balchaviks) in a full-fledged anger and information campaign against "Nationalism" and the nationalist idea. This is because some of these intellectual groups *are infected with ignorant masculinity*, which I first spoke out against in 1912 (Modern , Kyiv). This is where the sabaka was "buried", so to speak! The reason for their antinationalism was hidden here! What a plebeian complex, not daring to wash a fish.

The "Radzians" (from the Kyiv-based "Ra-
) of the First World War, and the Savetafilsky "Radzians", M. ^{Grushevskiyiii}, U.
^{Vinnichenkaiv}, and M. ^{Shapavali}, ("Union of the Peoples of Eastern Ukraine").

Lev Rebbet (1912 - 1957) was a Ukrainian publicist and lawyer, a member of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists. From 1928 he was a member of the Ukrainian Military Organisation. In 1934, he took over the leadership of the OUN in Strvi. In 1935-1938 he was the regional leader of the OUN. After the proclamation of Ukraine's independence on 30 June 1941 and the establishment of the Ukrainian government, he became vice prime minister, and after the resignation of Prime Minister Jaroslav Stetsko, acting prime minister. In 1945-1948, he was the general judge of the OUN Pharmacists Abroad, and from 1948 he was a member of the OUN (Foreign) Political Council. Paznay became a kiruvnyk. He was killed by KGB agents.

ⁱⁱ *Rada* was a civic, political and cultural newspaper published in Kyiv from spring 1906 to January 1914. It was followed by another short-lived Stoic newspaper, Hromadska Dumka. It was published by Barys Hrynchan and, from 1907, by the general founder Yawgen Chykalenko. From 1908 it published the views of the Tavarystvo of Ukrainian politicians, whose founder and leader was Chykalenko.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Mykhaylo Hrushevsky* (1866-1934) - Ukrainian historian, political activist and publicist, senior member of the Central Council (1917-1918), academic, author of more than 2000 scientific works. In 1894-1914 he was a professor at Lviv University, general editor of the Literary and Scientific Bulletin. Founder and senior member of the Ukrainian Scientific Society. From 1923 he was an academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

^{iv} *Vinnichenka Uladzimir* (1880-1951, Mougins, France) was a Ukrainian artist, playwright, painter, political and state activist. He was a member of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (also known as the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party).

The rise of Europe"), and A. Krushalitsky, and V. Nazaruk (who links Pyatra and Katsyaryna and the neo-Nazis of the Cossacks), and V. Lipinsky ("The Union of Three Russias"), and U. Lyavinsky, and Bagrany, and renegades of nationalism, now

Party (USDRP)). He was repeatedly arrested for his pro-revolutionary activities. After the February Revolution, he was a member of the Central Council and the General Secretary of Internal Affairs. He was the author of all declarations and legislative acts of the UPR.

^{and} *Shapaval Mikita* (1882-1932) - political and public figure, publicist, sociologist, writer. Member of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (from 1901), one of the organisers and leaders of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries and a member of the Central Committee; member of the Central and Malay Soviets (1917-1918), Minister of Posts and Telecommunications of Uradze U. Vinnichenki, commissar of the Kyiv Pavet, general sacristan and later a senior member of the Ukrainian National Union (14 November 1918 - December 1919), Minister of Land Affairs under Uradze Ciechyvsky for the Directorate (January 1918 - February 1919). After the 4th Congress of the UPSR (12.5.1918), he belonged to the "central strand" faction. He died in exile.

ⁱⁱ *Krushalynitsky Anton* (1879-1935?) - Ukrainian writer, literary critic and literary scholar, teacher, Minister of Education of the Ukrainian People's Republic (1919), publisher and editor of the Savetafilm literary magazines "New Ways" (1929-33 in Lviv) and "Criticism" (1933, *ibid.*). When he and his family moved to the Ukrainian SSR in 1933, they were sentenced to 10 years in prison. He was imprisoned in 1935.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Nazaruk Vosyp* (1883-1940) - grammar and political scholar, journalist and polemicist. He was a member of the Ukrainian Radical Party (1905-1919). In 1915-1918, he was the head of the Press Quarter of the Ukrainian Urinary Strals. Since 1918, he has been a member of the Ukrainian National Council of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic. In 1922-1926, he lived in the United States. Arriving in Lviv, he became close to the Ukrainian Christian organisation.

^{iv} *Lipinsky Vyacheslav* (Vatslav) (1882-1931) - Ukrainian political , historian, historian, social scientist, publicist, theorist of Ukrainian conservatism. On the eve of the First World War, he took part in the organisation of the Ukrainian political centre outside Russia, which was transformed into the Union of the Liberation of Ukraine (1914). He was one of the founders of the Ukrainian Democratic-Farmers' Party and an author of its political programme, issued in 1917. During the Hetmanate, he was Ukraine's ambassador to Austria.

^v *Lyavinsky Uladzimir* (1880-1953) - Ukrainian political activist, publicist, theorist of the Ukrainian socialist movement. At the beginning of the twentieth century, he was one of the initiators of the USDP. In 1904-1914, he was the editor of a number of party publications of the USDP. In the 1910s and 1920s, he was a member of the Foreign Group of the Ukrainian Communist Party in Vienna, and together with U. Vynnychenko published the newspaper *Nova Doba* (1920-1921). From 1930 he lived in Lviv, collaborated with the magazines "New Ukraine" (Prague), "New Culture", "Culture", "New Ways" (Lviv) and others. He died in Vienna.

^{vi} *Ivan Bahrany* (1906-1963) - Ukrainian poet, writer, publicist, political activist. He was also known by his nickname Lazavyaga. He published his first poems in the newspaper "Chervonyi Kordon" (Kamianets-Padolski). It was published regularly since 1926. He was a member of the literary association "Master of the Literary Word" (MARS). During the Soviet-German war, he was in the underground, worked at the Department of Propaganda. He took part in the creation of the Ukrainian General Voluntary Council. In 1945 he went into exile in Germany. In 1948 he founded the Ukrainian Revolutionary Party.

supporters of "worldly evolution" or "our state of the Ukrainian SSR", or the Tsitava Ukraine, and enemies of the armed struggle for independence; M. Lazinsky, F. Fyodortsov, Yu. Bachynsky, M. Rudnitsky, and in his memoirs, Charnetsky, who says that he himself "gradually became a Savetaphile" and a part of his tavarish, P. Karmansky, V. Pachowsky, and

He was a member of the National Democratic Party. He was a senior member of the Executive Body of the Ukrainian National Council and a deputy to the President of the Ukrainian People's Republic.

^{and} *Mykhailo Lazinsky* (1880-1937) - Ukrainian political and state activists, blitzkriegist. After graduation, he was a lawyer. In 1914-1917 he worked with the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine. He belonged to the Ukrainian National Democratic Party. In 1918-1919, he was a member of the Ukrainian National Council of the ZUNR (after the ZUNR merged with the UPR - Western Ukrainian People's Republic). In 1921-1927, he was a professor of international law at the Ukrainian Free University Prague. Pazney moved to the Ukrainian SSR, where he became a chair of law at the Institute of National Economy in Kharkiv. In 1930 he was arrested and exiled to the northern Urals, where he was executed.

ⁱⁱ *Fedz Fyodorzav* (1889-1930) - journalist, publicist, student and public figure. He worked in Lviv. He was the publisher and editor of the *Novychna Biblioteka* (1912-1923), a member of the management and editorial board of the *Izmagrad* publishing house (from 1923), and an editor of a number of periodicals. He also initiated and supported various campaigns: for the establishment of the *Uchytse*, *My Brothers* publishing fund the *Prosvita* Publishing House, for the assistance of Galicia to the united Ukraine, and others. He was a co-founder of the Ukrainian People's Labour Party and its priest (1923), and later a member of the Ukrainian National Democratic Association. ⁱⁱⁱ *Bachynsky Yulian* (1870 - after 1934) - Ukrainian grammar school teacher and publicist. Member of the Ukrainian Radical Party, and from 1899 - the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party. In 1895, he published the work "Ukraine Irredenta" ("Ukraine Independent"), which substantiated the necessity of Ukraine's political independence. In 1918 became a member of the Ukrainian National Council of the ZUNR.

- THE UPR'S ZV. From 1919 he was the UPR's representative in Washington. In the 1920s he became a member of the Ukrainian SSR. Worked in the editorial board of the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopaedia. In 1934 he was arrested and sentenced to exile. His further life is unknown.

^{iv} *Mykhailo Rudnitsky* (1889-1975) was a Ukrainian writer, critic and . He graduated from Lviv University. In 1917-1918, he was a lecturer at the People's Ukrainian University in Kyiv, a sacristan of the UPR's diplomatic mission to Paris. After returning to Galicia, in 1922-1925 he was a professor at the Lviv (Taina) Ukrainian University in Lviv. In 1923-1939 he worked for Lviv newspaper *Dilo*. From 1939 to the death he was a professor of foreign literature at Lviv University.

^v *Charnetsky Anton* (1887 - 1963) - Ukrainian civil and political activist in the Gulag, journalist. Member of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, member and sacristan of its governing body, the Executive Committee. He is the head of the regional professional organisation of Ukrainian leaders. He edited the periodicals of the USDP "Land and Will", "Forward", and "Professional Bulletin". In 1918, he became a member of the Ukrainian National Council of the ZUNR - ZV UPR as a delegate from the USDP. On 9.11.1918, he was appointed a sacristan of labour and public appeal in the first Council of State Sacristans of the ZUNR. In exile Germany, he worked as a painter.

- in Switzerland.

^{vi} *Karmansky Pyatro* (1878-1956) was a Ukrainian writer, poet and translator. He completed his higher education at the Philosophy Department of Lviv University.

Dzmitra Dantsov

Shkrumialiak, whom he did not accuse of being "open-minded" and who were rightly accused of being "open-minded", although these wise men believed in the "attractive slogans of the Bolsheviks for the rule of workers, peasants, and the development of Ukrainian culture in Soviet Ukraine". Only the youth who followed the slogans of nationalism, which were immediately disseminated by the Muscovite brigade, were uncritical; not Czarnecki and his associates, who, in complicity with the Muscovite perpetrators (and themselves), attacked the avatars of "Nationalism" with fury. In the footsteps of the Galician Charnetsky followed some of those who emigrated after 1945, such as Sharakh-Shavialev, who argued that Ukraine "has now taken a different path from the one it took in the armed struggle of 1917-20.", and that these paths (this is the meaning of the Maskowski-Balshavian) have a place, and in the organ "MURiv" (editors - Sharakh, Dyvnychy, U. Samchuk and Y. Kosachii) in

He studied at the University and at the Vatican Collegium. In 1907, he took part in the struggle of young students for the Ukrainian university in Lviv. He was a member of the literary group "Young Muse". In 1922-1932, he lived in Brazil, where he edited the newspaper "Ukrainian Farmer". After returning from Brazil, he worked as a gymnasium teacher and taught at Lviv University. In 1940, he joined the Writers' Union of Ukraine. In 1944-1946 he was the director of the Ivan Franko Memorial Museum in Lviv.

and Vasyl Pachowski (1878-1942) - Ukrainian poet, historian and thinker. He was a member of the literary group "Moloda Muse". During the First World War, he worked in Peramyshl and Lviv at the call of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine. He took part in the meetings of the Organising Committee of Writers of Lviv at Writers' Club. In 1940, he was appointed to teach Ukrainian at Lviv University. He died in the spring of 1942 from a cold.

ⁱⁱ *Yurii Shkrumialiak* (1895-1965) was a Ukrainian journalist, poet and writer, translator, and urinary therapist. He graduated from Lviv and Prague universities with a degree in history and philosophy. He began his literary career during the First World War in the ranks of the Legion of Ukrainian Urinary Striders, publishing his works in the Ukrainian press in Vienna, in newspaper Svoboda, and others. In 1920-1930, he worked as an employee of the publishing house "World of the Child". In 1945, he was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment, during which time he was held in the Piachor lager. In 1956 he was rehabilitated.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Shavyalev Yurii* (née Sharakh) (1908-2002) - Slavic linguist, historian of Ukrainian literature, literary and theatre critic. He graduated from Kharkiv University. Lecturer, then director of the Institute of Journalism (1933

- (1939) and Kharkiv University (1939-1943), professor at the Ukrainian Free University (since 1946), lecturer at the Russian and Ukrainian universities in Lund (Sweden, 1950-1952) and Harvard (USA, 1952-1954), Professor of Slavic Philology at Columbia University (New York, 1954-1977), head of the senior association of Ukrainian writers "Artistic Ukrainian Movement" in Germany (1945-1949), President of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in the United States (1959-1961 and 1981-1986).

^{iv} The *MUR* (Artistic Ukrainian Movement) was an organisation of Ukrainian writers in exile in Germany the 1940s. The *MUR* was founded in spring of 1945 and existed the end of 1948. During this time, three acts were committed

in 1947, he published Kosacz's purely Balchavist attack on the Lviv-based Visnyk, on nationalism, and on Dantsov, and claimed that Kosacz's writings were "demagoguery" and "bullshit". Dantsov's attack on Kosacz was published by the editors of MUR in the "discussion organ", MUR, whose truthers were praised by Sharakh as the great nostalgia of the new couple, as "the sons of modernity" (the attack appeared in ^{Orlikiv}).

"Malarasianism", which flourished both in the 1920s and in our days with great flourish both in Ukraine and in emigration, was the main reason for the association of these circles with "Nationalism" then and now, their masculinity - this destruction of all national traditions, cultural, everyday, social, political, moral and religious! And the fight with him now has a distinct form of a fight with the village children. No wonder - in the process, perhaps, inter-freedom

congresses and several theoretical conferences. The organisation brought together writers with different literary views. A large part of MUR's activities was spent discussing ways to modernise Ukrainian culture and bring it closer to the world.

Yurii Dyvnych (born Yurii Lavrynenko) (1905-1987) was a Ukrainian literary critic, publicist, essayist, critic, and scholar. He studied at the Uman Agricultural College. In Uman, he joined the literary organisation Pluh. After graduating from Kharkiv University in 1930, he became a postgraduate student at the Kharkiv Shavchenka Research Institute. In 1934, he was exiled. He spent five years in exile in Narylsk. From 1944 he lived in Austria, then in the United States. His major work is the anthology "The Executed Administration".

ⁱⁱ *Samchuk Ulas* (1905-1987) was a Ukrainian writer and journalist. After graduating from the gymnasium in Kramianytsia, he studied at Bratslav University and the Ukrainian Free University in Prague. He collaborated with the Literary and Scientific News, Dzvon (all in Lviv), Samostiiny Dumokay (Charnavtsi), Rozbudiv Natsii (Berlin), and Surma (Berlin-Kovna). In 1941-43, he was the editor of the newspaper Volyn, published in Rovne. In 1944-48 he lived in Germany. In 1945, he was one of the initiators of the literary and artistic association of Ukrainian writers "MUR" and was elected its first chairman. In 1948, he moved to Canada, he founded Slovo writing organisation.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Kosach Yurii* (1909-1990) - Ukrainian poet, writer, playwright, editor. He was Lesya Ukrainka's nephew. He received his higher education at Warsaw (law faculty) and Prague universities. In 1928, he became a founding member of student organisation Party of Ukrainian State and a member of the cultural and educational association Asnova. He collaborated with Dantsov's Literary and Scientific Bulletin. In 1931, he was awarded a year's imprisonment for his nationalist work for the Polish state. In 1943-1944, he worked in the editorial office of the Lvivski Visti newspaper. In 1949, he moved to the United States, where he edited the literary newspapers Horizons and Beyond the Blue Ocean.

^{iv} "*Orlik*" - a magazine published 1946 in the camp for prisoners of war "Orlik" (Bavaria). Among the articles of the camp's activities were political and scientific ones.

Dzmitra Dantsov

The scholars - one of the "MURAvtsy", one of the worshippers of the truth of our "major" masculinity, those Tychynaevs, Sasyuravs, Rylskys, Bazhanovs, Skrypnyks and Katsyubinskys - admitted that we need to start

and Pavlo Tychyna (1891-1967) were prominent Ukrainian, academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (since 1929). He started publishing in 1912. From 1913 he lived in Kyiv, in 1913-17 he studied at chamber institutes, collaborated with magazines *Svitlo*, *Rada*, and the Ukrainian theatre of M. Sadousky. In 1918, he published his first collection "Solar Clarinets", which became a landmark of literature. From 1923 he lived in Kharkiv and worked in the magazine "Chervonyi Shlyakh". From 1925 he was a member of the Free Academy of Proletarian Literature. In 1943-48, he served as Minister of Education of the Ukrainian SSR. In 1953-59, he was a senior member of the Supreme Council of the Ukrainian SSR. He was awarded the T. Shavchenka Prize of Ukraine (1962).

ⁱⁱ *Sasyura Uladzimir* (1897-1965) - Ukrainian poet. He was published since 1917. In 1918-1919 he was a Cossack in the UPR Army. In 1919, he was captured by the Jews, then in the Red Army, and took part in the battles of the Polish troops. In 1922-23 he studied at Kharkiv Communist University, and in 1924-25 - at the labour department of the Kharkiv Institute of Public Education. He was a member of the literary association "Hart". During the Nazi occupation of Ukraine, he worked for the Ukrainian Council of Ministers in Moscow, and later for the franchised newspaper *Za honour Batkivshchyny*.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Rylsky Maxim* (1895-1964) - Ukrainian poet, writer, cultural and academic scholar. Academician of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine since 1943. He completed his higher education at the St. Uladzimir University in Kyiv (from 1915 - In 1915, he studied medicine, and in 1918, histories and philology (he did not graduate). In 1923-29 he was a supervisor, and in 1929 he began his literary work. In 1943-46, he was a senior member of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. From 1944 he became the head of the Institute of Art, Folklore and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. In 1957-64 he was the general editor of the journal "Folk Art and Ethnography".

^{iv} *Bazhan Mykola* (1904 - 1983) - Ukrainian writer, philosopher, public, translator, poet, academician. After graduating from the Uman Aeronautical Technical University, he continued his studies in Kyiv, at the Aeronautical Institute, and then at the Institute of Foreign Affairs. He was 25 years old when the Free Academy of Political Literature was established. He was awarded two Stalin Prizes and the Orders of Lenin, the Order of the Red Cross, and the Order of the Red Labour Flag. He was a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Councils of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, a member of the Academy of Sciences, Vice Prime Minister of the Ukrainian SSR, and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

^v *Skrypnyk Mykola* (1872-1933) - Ukrainian SSR statesman, one of the founders of the Communist Party (Balshaviks) of Ukraine. A member of the Balshavik Party since 1917. During the Castration Revolution, he was a member of the Petrograd Revolutionary Committee. He was a member of the first Soviet of the Soviet Ukraine, from December 1918 he became the chairman of the People's Council, in 1919-20 - the head of the State Control and Labour Inspectorate. In 1921 he worked as People's Commissar of Internal Affairs, in 1922-27 - People's Commissar of Justice and Prosecutor General (from 1925). In 1927-33, he was the head of the People's Commissariat of the Soviet Union. He committed suicide.

^{vi} *Yuriy Katsyubinsky* (1896-1937) - Balchavian statesman, party and military activist. Son of the famous Ukrainian writer Mykhayla Katsyubinska. Member of the RSDLP 1913. Participated in the Balchavik powwow 1917. He joined the People's Sacerdotal at first as a vicegerent, and then as an assistant to the People's Sacerdotal for military affairs. He was recognised as a

The "campaigns of the dumb". Their masculinity was simply the fear and fascination of a slave for all the recognised worlds.

By bringing his ideology of nationalism out of the bankrupt ideas of our era, out of "modern democracy" (including both the USSR and communism), out of communism and socialism, out of supranational internationalism, "Nationalism" is out of their "reason without faith" and into faith; against their spirit of idealism, love of profit and material "time" - idealism; against the spirit of circularity and "measured evolution" - competition. This had to happen to people of a new spirit, not to people of the dying pseudo-elite of "sophists, calculators and economists" (in the words of E. Burke); not in the Russian language. Burke); not in the hands of the idle lot and materialists, but to men of the new elite, men with the basic characteristics of the new chivalry: *wisdom, nobility and courage. This was the thesis of Nationalism.*

Dvupadzel? Perhaps the "dvupadzel" for which "Nationalism" was called out.

He drew the most anger from both "progressive" and Russian ballet scholars. We cannot argue with the thesis of "dvupadziel", because this idea has a red thread running through all the works of R. ^{Skavarada}, I. ^{Vishanskaii}, T. Shavchenka, Ivan Franko, Lesya ^{Ukrainkaiii}, Alena

He was appointed general commander of the armed forces of the so-called Savetska "Ukrainian People's Republic". From December 1918, he was a member of the Balchavik Central Executive Committee, People's Commissar for Internal Affairs, and from November 1918 - the Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Council of Ukraine. In 1920-30, he worked as a diplomatist. In February 1930, he became a deputy chief, and in February 1934, a chief of the State Planning Commission and deputy chief of the People's Commissariat of the Ukrainian SSR. In 1934, she was dismissed from work and removed from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine. In 1935 he was expelled from the party. In February 1935, he was arrested and exiled to Siberia. Executed in 1937 on charges of leading counter-revolutionary organisations.

ⁱ *Skavarada Ryhor* (1722 - 1794) was a Ukrainian , philosopher, poet, and campaigner. In 1734 he entered the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, where he studied until 1753 (with interruptions). From 1741 to 1744 he served in the court chapel of Empress Elizabeth in Pechersk. In 1745 - 50 - at the piano. In 1751, he taught poetry at the Periaslavl College. In 1754 and 1755-59 he worked as a householder. In 1759-64 he taught poetry, rhetoric and the Greek language at the Kharkiv College. For the next 25 years he lived in Ukraine, writing and advocating his philosophical views.

ⁱⁱ *Ivan Vishansky* (born between 1545-50 - died after 1620) was a Ukrainian Palestinian writer. He was a member of the Lviv Brotherhood, lived in Lutsk and Assisi. From the late 1580s he lived on Mount Athos, which was the centre of the Orthodox community in the East. Adtulus wrote his passionate epistles addressed to Prince K. Astrozhsky, brotherhoods, and saints. In 1605 he travelled to Ukraine and lived in Maniavske Skice. In his writings he criticised the Union of Belarus and Catholicism, the entire tsarist and secular system.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Lesya Ukrainka* (pseudonym - Kosach-Kvitka Larysa; 1871 - 1913) - Ukrainian poet, artist, playwright, translator, literary critic and

Dzmitra Dantsov

Goals are the overriding concern of the authors of the Lviv-based *Visnyk*. Not only I, but also they call people "pairs", agreeing not with their social status, but with their spiritual nature, with their spirits; they call them different categories: "nobleman" and "man", "Cossack" and "soldier", knight and "plebeian", patriot and "soldier of a foreign country", competitors and "party member", heroes for the nation - and "dumb, useless slaves", "the city of Moscow" or "toadies begging for a mite", martyrs for the faith - and "a sleepy bunch" of traitors, Ardents and Izagens, people of "chivalrous, honourable, holy" wings and "supreme" wings of slaves, "cavaliers of beasts" and "human rogues" (they compete with other people's "idols", other - "dividing" the nation), on the "spirits of the islands" - and the Jews, the tribe of Nun - and the Danites and the Avirons, "people of heroes" and "namadalians", etc. (a topic for special research!). There are no hard social class distinctions here, I think, but rather *distinctions of spirit*. Because in Shavchenk there were "plebeian kurashchups" and "Raman halls of plebeians"; he had "Israeli bishops" in the time of the Iranian king, and those who "licked like sabaki abutak lizali" in someone else's valadar, these were the times of both the emergency of Yarma and the findings of the nobility. These were the "Tatar people" and the , Barabashis and

falselist. The cottage of the well-known writer Alena Pchylka, sister of M. Drahomanava. She has a background in history and philology. She translated works by Heine, Hugo, Byran, Mickiewicz, Hamer, and others. In 1890, she wrote (for her sister) the book "Old History of the Eastern Peoples" (published in 1918). Lesia Ukrainka's poetry is characterised by intense emotional tension and deep patriotic sensations.

ⁱ *Tsialiga Alena* (née Shavgenava; 1907-1942) was a Ukrainian poetess and political activist. She was born in St Petersburg and moved to Kyiv with her parents in 1917. In 1920 she was in exile. - she was in emigration. In 1925 she became a lecturer in the history of the philological departments of the Drahomanov Ukrainian Pedagogical Institute in Prague. In 1929-39 she worked as a teacher at the Ukrainian school in Warsaw. From the end of 1920 she began publishing in the *Literary and Scientific Bulletin*. In 1932, she left the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists. From the castration camp in 1941. - in Kyiv. She edited literary and artistic articles for the newspapers "Ukrainske Slovo" and "Litavy". Aryshtavan 7.2.1942 and together with her husband executed in Babi Yar.

ⁱⁱ *Yarems* - ?

ⁱⁱⁱ *Tatar people* - Ukrainian gramads in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which came out of the fall of the rule of their princes and fell under Tatar rule themselves.

^{iv} *Igar Sviatoslavich* (1151-1202) - prince of Novgorod-Seversky (from 1178) and prince of Czarnigiv (1198). In 1169 he took part in Andrey Bagalyubsky's campaign against Kyiv. In 1174, he defeated the hordes of the Palawecki khanates of Kanchak and Kabiak near Perayaslav. After the death of his brother, Aleg reigned in Novgaradze-Seversk. He took part in the internecine struggle for the Great Duchy's throne. In 1183, the Poles made successful progress in their co-operation. In 1185, he organised a campaign of co-operation between the Poles together with his brothers Usevalad, Prince Uladzymir of Puściszów and Prince Sviatoslav Olgavich of Ryla. The princely friends of the princes were parallel to the ar-

And in most perverse era, these two twins Ivan - one of them was a torturer, the other was a torturer

The prince himself was captured by the Palawewski khans of Hza and Kanchak, and was later released from the prisoner of war (the attack on the servants is based on the story of the "Words on the Passage of Igarava").

^{and} *Barabash Yakav*, the kashava ataman of the Zaparozhets Sich (1657-58). Together with the Palatine loyalists M. Pushkar, he became a leader of the anti-Hetman opposition, which defended the pro-Moscow policy, based on the subordination of Ukraine to the tsarist government. In late 1657, he organized the 1657-58 conspiracy of Hetman I. Vyhovsky. After the defeat of the main villages of the Smushchiks on 16.6.1658 (according to other sources, 15.5) near Paltavai, he tried to help the Muscovite troops advancing on Levaberezhzha. In October 1658 he was captured by the Cossacks and killed.

ⁱⁱ *Khmielnitsky Bagdan* (born 1595 - 1657) - Ukrainian political and state leader, polemicist, Hetman of Ukraine (1648-57). Founder of the Ukrainian . He was admitted to the Lviv (or Yaroslavl) Jesuit College. After 1618, he joined the Chyhyryn Hundred, a Cossack army. He participated in the uprisings of Taras Fedarowych (1630) and P. Pavliuk (1637). In 1638, he was given the Chyhyryn stick to hundreds of men. He was at the head of the national liberation war of the Ukrainian people in 1648-57 and worked with the political government of the Rzeczpospolita. On 8.1.1654, he concluded a political alliance between the Hetmanate and the Muscovy in Perayaslav, but, concerned about the change in the foreign policy of Muscovy, which had made peace with Poland, he tried to secure the support of Transylvania and Sweden. He established relations with Moldavia, Wallachia, Austria and Brandenburg.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Ivan Mazepa* (1639-1709) - Ukrainian political activist, diplomat, and Hetman of Ukraine. He studied at the Kyiv-Magistral Academy and at the Jesuit College in Warsaw (according to other sources, in Poland). In 1656-59 he was in the service of the Polish king Jan Casimir, and in 1659-63 - in the service of the court of the Polish king. From 1665 he was a member of the Czarnigawski padchas. In 1687 he was elected Hetman of Ukraine. He tried to use his voyage to Peter the Great to preserve the rights and freedoms of Hetmanate. During the Night War in 1704, by order of Peter I, he ordered the Cossack army to take control of the Ukrainian lands that had been under the rule of the Commonwealth. The hetman's government was looking for the right-wing Ukraine. In the spring of 1709, a treaty was signed between Karl XII and Mazepa, which provided for the unification of Ukraine's state independence in union with Sweden. After the defeat of the Swedish-Ukrainian forces in the Battle of Paltava 1709. Ivan Mazepa settled in the land of Bender (then owned by Turkey).

^{iv} *Kachubey Vasyl* (1640-1708) - Ukrainian statesman of the 17th - mid. 18 centuries. He was the head of the General Chancellery under Hetman I. Samoilavych. In 1687-99 he was general scribe, in 1699-1708 - general judge. In 1706-08 he was appointed Hetman's orderly. He was a leader of the anti-Hetman's association, which supported the Ukrainian government in the Turkish campaign in the late 17th century. In autumn 1707, supported by the Paltava loyalists I. Iskra and some of the elders of Slabazhan, he wrote a letter against Hetman Mazepa to Tsar Pyotr I. He was sent to Vitebsk, to the tsar's outer chancellery, where he and Iskra went with the tribute. Peter I, without believing their words, put both of them on trial. Having failed in their trials, Kachubey and his henchmen resigned from the Hetman's office. For the riddle of the tsar, they were executed along with I. Iskra.

pamagazi..."

These two issues are the ongoing problem of the de-trannisation of our contemporary pseudo-elite (and not only ours), and the replacement of the "chivalry" envisaged by Shavchenko; This is the problem that was raised in 1926 in the book "Nationalism" as an expression of the spirit of our ancient Starkey and Cossack heritage, with its Barons, who, in the era of the struggle for Western civilisation and the labour of the anti-Russian villages, gave their lives to the cause of Ukraine's great mission, or to the Kyivan apostles ^{Andrei}. *The Mission of the Wing and the Ball*: "A kryzh is a kryzh, a sabre is a sabre". It involves competition in the mental and physical spheres.

This, in general, is what I would like to say in the words of this third edition of my "Nationalism", and in doing so, I would like to thank all those like-minded people who have contributed to this edition in one way or another.

D.D.

¹ Words from T. Shavchenki's The Big Cellar.

Apostle Andrew, one of the two national apostles, brother of St Peter. He was a patron saint of Christianity in the countries of the Black Sea region. In the floods of the historical tradition, he was near Kyiv and on the banks of the Dnipro River. The Andreev Church was built on this site. He is commemorated by the Packettsia deaths, crucified on the roof in the shape of an X, in Ahai.

Instead of pradmovy

Our time is the time for the occupation of the bogeymen that the nineteenth century was known for. The catastrophe of 1914 was not without reason: all the "inviolable" principles and "eternal" laws of civilisation crumbled in the pores, opening up brilliant prospects for the freedom of the people.

Only *one* law emerged unscathed from the catastrophe. This is the law of war, which Heraclitus called the seal of all things, the law of eternal competition of nations, which now dominates the world as it did in the history of nations and states.

The age that was bloody well fuelled by the first world war, the age of superstitious "laws" and legal "prejudices", is over. And in its other half, our age has forgotten that this essence is *the will*, remembering only the right to *reason*; that this essence is the *struggle* and that this essence is *the nation*, as one of the best emanations of the will to struggle and the struggle for freedom. *Reason, evolution and caspianism* were the values of the nineteenth century, which were terribly attacked in the fall of 1914.

That year reminded us of a long-forgotten truth: that the world belongs to those who can do it; that every living person is a nation, independent of what class sees behind them. It is true that some of the problems that have been facing the people have been expressed, but others have come forward to take their place. A new range of new tasks is emerging for us, which will be solved by our future generations. Tsarism is gone, but so is Russian imperialism, as well as its worker. The caliphate disappeared, but it was followed by the regeneration of Islam, an explosive force that we know so well from history. The creative spirit of the West is still alive and well in the Far East, with songs of the same offensive being sung, second and third world powers claiming their rights to equality or even hegemony, and Europe's position in the uneasy movement of peoples and lands.

As in the three-hundred and one-hundred year old vaina, as in 1648 and 1709, as in Under Kannam and Salamis, an idea that will drive conflicts that will be sung, an idea of a nation, an idea of a partisan society that exist or at least be organised into a separate political unit...

ⁱ 1648 - the *siege* of , 1709 - the defeat of the Swedish-Ukrainian forces in the Battle of Paltava.

And at such moments, our people became defeated and "décérébré" (dumbed down), as Barès would say, without a national "I believe" and without the will to fight for it; Instead of the national ideal, the overthinking hid old weathered "wisdoms", a sluggish mess of "pride", "evolution", "international fraternity" and other "internationalisms" - a fertile ground for the building of popular organisation, principles that are beneficial to the *peoples* of the right and their ideologues of the right, but not to the peoples of the nation.

In this book, I want to analyse the concept of Ukrainian nationalism as I understand it. And I understand it not as this other programme, not as an argument for the task of the present (and therefore, let those who will look for arguments for this other "orientation", party "programme", or form of government not open this book), but as a *worldview*. As a certain worldview, I owe my respect for nationalism to our present-day nationalism of the nineteenth century, to *nationalism of the decline, or to right-wingism*. And this respect for legalism includes (excluding what should be excluded) a zany mishmash of ^{cyrillism} and dragomania, legalistic Ukrainism and nationalism with their extreme strains, Marxism and communism on the one hand, Socialist-Revolutionary Socialism and radicalism on the other, and finally, right-wing ideologies ranging from ^{Kulish} to non-amanarhism.

^{and} Kirill-Methodism - a term derived from the name of the Kirill-Methodist Brotherhood (society), a Ukrainian secret political organisation that emerged between 1845 and 1846 in Kyiv. In the autumn of 1846, the total number of members, according to the investigation, was 12 people (including P. Kulish, M. Kastamaraev, and T. Shavchenka). Its main task was to a civil society on the principles of human rights, by enhancing the pace of reforms; to create a democratic federation of Slavic nations, including Ukraine, on the principles of regionalism and sovereignty; the end of tsarism and the abolition of the chivalry and estates, democratic rights and freedoms for citizens, and equality of rights for all Slavic peoples. It lasted for 14 months. In December 1847, the activities of the brotherhood were exposed and its members were expelled.

ⁱⁱ *Kulish Panselaimon* (1819 - 1897) was a well-known Ukrainian writer, historian, ethnographer, literary critic and translator. He studied at St Uladzimir's University in Kyiv, first at the philological and then at the law department (he did not graduate). At the end of 1845 he became one of the founders of the Kirill-Myatodyev Brotherhood. In 1845, he was appointed a tutor of the Russian language for foreign students at the University of St Petersburg. He was expelled from the fraternity in connection with the massacre. After the investigation, he was sent to Tula. After arriving in Pechersk, he became active in literary and publishing activities and founded his own printing house. He collaborated with the *Osnova* magazine. In 1867 he was elected . He left the state service and emigrated. In 1868-71 he was abroad (mainly in Galicia). From 1871. - he lived in Pechersk.

These circles differed from each other, they competed with each other, but *nevertheless they all developed in the same worldview, which, as a worldview, is the same as the worldview of the other circles, which I will be discussing here.*

I've been developing the principles of what I'm developing here since I started writing; so what I'm writing is essentially the same as what I wrote before. This time I tried only to bring into the system what I had written in passages or hints before. What is the purpose of this book? To sail on the formation of a Ukrainian national ideology, which I believe will emerge from the mental chaos of our times, and thus sail on the run of future pagans. Whoever doubts the power of such a swim should remember the words of Emerson:

"All revolution was first thought in the strokes of a single century."

The negative part of this book had to be the negative part, the criticism of our "legalism", although it is possible to understand this criticism only if the other part is understood. *I had to defend the characteristics of our legalism in such words and expressions, not because I wanted to overload the book with these quotes (which I use not as evidence, but as illustration), but because it was simply impossible for me to formulate an ideology so completely alien to me with my words.*

He worked in the Ministry of Railways and edited the ministry's official magazine. He also published his historical work "History of the Reunification of Russia". In 1876, he published the study "Painted Haidamachyna", in which he harshly condemned the Cossacks and the Haidamak movement. After returning to Ukraine, he moved away from the political scene.

PART ONE - UKRAINIAN RIGHTS

RAZZEL AND - NOTICEABLE INTELLECTUALISM

What images do we conjure up when we imagine *a Ukrainian national ideology*? What emotions do the names of Kirill Mamatoda, Drahomanov, Franko and the leaders of modern nationalism and socialism stir in us? Certainly not the same emotions as those associated with the names of Dante, Machiavelli or Mazzini. It is a product of different schools, different styles and - what a different worldview!

If we were to put the difference between nationalisms and nationalities in a few words, we would find it in two distinct light perceptions: the light dominated by the *will* and the light dominated by the intellect. Two temperaments: chan and narrowing, intuition and logic, aggression and passivity, dogmatism and relativity, faith and knowledge. This is how this difference can be characterised in a nutshell.

The nineteenth century was the founding age of reason, and at the same time the founding age of our decadent nationalism. Schopenhauer, who was the most ardent hater of the free market and, at the same time, the best, albeit unknowing, of its supporters, was the most important shaper of the coherence of two views of the world: the free market and the intellectualist. For Schopenhauer, it is the era of "the village that lives and thrives in the world, that creates a roof, that is not a magnet at the north pole," that is "in the matter as "utterances and noises, separated and united," rather like a fire, which manifests itself in every object, turning stone from earth and earth from sun", just as the immanent chalavecca is a woman, all of which are "only different forms of manifestation" of what "we call *will*". But this "will" is perceived in other goals only by analogy with our will, the goals themselves being known to us only as *representations* of our consciousness, as the light of special phenomena, and in this light not the will but the mind of a universal nature, devoid of all mysticism and all mystery, reigns.¹ This is exactly how the nineteenth century saw the world: it was not the world of those who create, but only the world of those who name it, not of those who act on the machine, but only of those on whom it acts and its mechanical "law". It was not the mystical will that drove the woman, but the goals of the practical, revealed to the mind "faults". It was only necessary to understand these principles and laws, and we would reign over the world, over the physical, and so on.

as well as over the public. "Vedanta is the village," Beckan's rule, which was accepted by the majority of men of science and politicians of the last century, was a common one. The right of knowledge is to master the villages of nature, so that they serve humanity and its purpose. The time of the veda is the time of the development of the community. These were the slogans of the new religion of reason, which in the seventeenth century had its own prophets, in the eighteenth century its first "saints", and in the nineteenth century, it was from the mountains to far reaches of the countryside, and, being harassed and slandered, fell into the hands of Ukrainian democracy.

In this form, our democratic "nationalism" has adopted this religion. The pit, like any other, was deep and thick. In the heroic seventeenth century, which ended for us in 1709, from paradise to the uninformed villages that ruled the *world*, it was a reverse of the tired, analytical generation's quest for *the light of facts*. For them, the students were not pupils, but only pupils. The mind, like a mother, was obliged to think through every action. The light of the mental scientists, like that of the physical scientists, was not the light of the unaware, where the whole of the mobile soul would be "automatically consumed by the fury that drives us to perpetual motion" (G. Simmel),² but the light of specific phenomena, visible actions, from which each derives a reasonable reason. For them, the age was not just about the good, but about the good that was good. For them, as for Wolf, reason was not just a good and a good thing, but they saw in freedom an unlimited "incomprehensible force", only special manifestation, "an extraordinary act of our judgement, which is subject to the influence of logical defeats" (Godwin).³ Chalavec, like the objects of the physical world, is in motion not by itself, not by the influences of the internal, but by external causes, here by "material impulses", here by "perceptions". *The basic idea is simple: it is only necessary to have an ideal system of society and to train people in its "meta-agreement", and all the confused public affairs, including national ones, will be resolved here.* As a proof of this magnitude, Hume did not fail to follow Huygens, who invented the "best model of the carbine," so why shouldn't we also invent the "best model" of the community of individuals or peoples? ⁴ This would be something like Beck's New Atlanta, a "normal" pattern of civil order.

It is true, say, that people and the state give themselves over to a variety of affects and institutions, but this does not mean that an appeal to their entertainment would not make them right, , or that it would not be easy to parallel their power. At the same time, the human being depends on the pride of the thinker. The fact that the minds of individuals are right

zealous, good and kind, must obey the laws of civil society. For the spontaneously creative figures of history have intellect, and what is history if not the refinement of it, if not the development of ideas, if not the victory of our "chalance" over our "living", of intellect over facts? Without appealing to the intellect, it is impossible to understand the "laws" of reasonable civilisation, or to parallel the apocalypse.

All of these simple entertainments were axiomatic for our legal system. That's what Goethe said:

"Was braucht er in die Ewigkeit zu schweifen! Was er erkennt, läßt sich ergreifen!"

And this is where the positivist disagreed with the right-wing. What could not be captured by was not a "will" for them, it was a whim. This whim was the main cause of all . Ignorance and ignorance are the eight universal traits of humanity. In the field of biology, ignorance was the cause of the chalers and other traits, such as mildness and bravery; ignorance became the cause of all social evils, ranging from war and social exploitation to national quarrels. What could be "ergreifen" - what could be taken - was an ideal, and it could be achieved by systematic use of the science of Veda and the understanding of nature. All social ills could be cured with a high degree of reliance on the knowledge of foreign culture, which causes a lot of mischief among the elite and the poor. The social problem was the problem of the material condition of the society of the time.

The same knowledge was to be transferred not only to social relations, as well in national relations, ignorance was the cause of *national quarrels*, because of the "incomprehensible" affect, which had nothing to do with the laws of logic. Along with Bockle, our nationalists thought that "the greatest workers of intolerance", like all the affects that make hell out of a human being, "know it all". In his view, we owe, for example, the abolition of the Inquisition, "the greatest evil that humanity has ever known," to the "loss of veda." ⁵ Why would humanity not succeed same way wholeand in international relations? After all, the supremus ^{motor} of spiritual and civic life is always

ⁱ *Was braucht er in die Ewigkeit zu schweifen! Was er erkennt, läßt sich.* What he knows, he can grab.

ⁱⁱ *supremus motor* - the highest motor .

Mighty intellect!" said.

This theory was so compelling for all democracies, it was so small and so vulgarly simple that it was immediately accepted by the entire country for a long time. Ukrainians were also "nationalists", but without the scream. For them, the cause of international disputes was not the eternal laws of recruitment between races, not the transfer from the light of organisational to extra-organisational struggle for existence; the cause of national quarrels was mental distance, the struggle of ideas, and the most important thing - incomprehension. Nothing less than misunderstanding, ignorance, lack of culture were the reasons why different races have been at odds with each other for thousands of years. These "abnormal" (and abrasive for "our cultural age") conditions must be eliminated, we only need to "scientifically substantiate" the ideal of humanity, we only need to open up to the rejectors and those who are rejected by this abnormality, and everything will be ! The jumpers - from their "Shavinism", the jumpers - from the false ideas of imperialism, and both - from national blindness. By what means? Obviously, by enlightening, enshrining and propagating the ideas of universal brotherhood... There are no reasonable reasons for variation between nations, and this variation is supported by only a handful of rulers ("tsars and lords"). History is the eternal movement of free thought forward, the constant competition with "prejudice", the free path to the triumph of reason over affection and will, over everything that is valuable, "unsaved", zealous and fanatical, - which guarantees humanity the gift of life and the earth, - we thought.

She dyed herself in untamed colours of the nation that was in yoke, This idea was not a fallacy, it prevailed over the aspirations of our nineteenth century and the part of the twentieth century. There was no such current, from the extreme left to the extreme right, that this idea did not prevail in one way or another. The first clear and unstated programme of the nineteenth-century country was that of the Kirillamyatodyevites. They acknowledged that Ukraine had been "covered and tortured" by its workers, but, attributing to its own forgetfulness and greatness, they claimed that it "does not remember evil", "is ready to forgive them all" and has the ability to "right its own path".

^{and} *Ukrainophiles* - representatives of *Ukrainism* (a term coined in the second half of the 19th century to denote love for Ukraine, the Ukrainian people, and Ukrainian culture). In the narrow sense, Ukrainian philosophers of the 1860s were called Ukrainophiles, and the period of their activity in the 1860s and 1880s was called the period of Ukrainianism.

for the enemy as soon as they "pride themselves" and know their "memories". Imperialism in Ukraine was alien to the "brothers" because they were ignorant of it. It was necessary to dispel it, "to work on sleep and slumber" and "to punish from the hearts of their *senseless* hostility" to other nations, and peace would come to the Slavic land.

It was not a mistake. It was a deep understanding of the people. The peoples' eternal desire for expansion was not inherent in their nation's nature, just as, for example, the inherent nature of gas is inherent in filling every void; the variation between peoples and not something artificial, sent to peoples by "czars and *popes* for an aggressive rally", as the martyrs expressed in their non-parliamentary language.⁶ "Reasonable" reasons - in the light of physical phenomena, and "reasonable" arguments - in the light of supernatural ones, only they ruled all of us, and they also had to rule all the "valuable" villages that were founded on the gift of the reign of pure reason.

The Cali Methodists were the first to formulate these ideas, and *Mikhail Drahomanov* became their most zealous promoter. Mentioned in the subtle association of Russian principles, the *gente Ruthenus natione Russusⁱ*, as Franco called it, seized on a thesis that was so profitable and understandable for every right-winger. According to him, "quarrels" between nations can only be explained by the fact that people are "unreasonable". There are no such quarrels now (I wish Drahomanov had been born in our time!), but if there was pain in the past, then this is explained, in the professor's opinion, by the ignorance of the times: "If people were *less intelligent* than they are now, then there were frequent quarrels between different nations. And the peoples were afraid of the adzin adnog or fought among themselves in the same way as, for example, a horse is afraid of a camel, or sabaki fight with katas, and ."⁷ And the basic idea is clear to every dramatist: just as the ancient man managed to compare the kata with the sabacas, so it is necessary to establish and measure the judgement of different races. The fact that this task as easy as comparing a camel to a horse, or a forest to a chicken or a wolf to a cow, was not by right-wing thinkers, because such a question would have destroyed their entire sense of the world, in which the mind, not their independent instincts and will, was the prize.

ⁱ *gente Ruthenus natione Russus* (Latin) - the Ruthenian family, the Russian nation.

ⁱⁱ *prius* (from Latin) - nesta papiaradnyae; peradumova.

At first, the world thought exactly like Drahomanov (at least, it seemed so to me), "and over time, the more intelligent people began to think that such exploitation of one (people - D.D.) by another is a thing that is , extremely *unreasonable*, and *impossible* for the aggrandisement of the ruling power".⁸ The noble task of the Ukrainian "nationalist" was, therefore, to convince the worker of the "futility" of his aggression and the disadvantage of the same system of rational arguments for him, especially as he was going to lead Russia in attempts to culturalise Ukrainian schoolchildren with "a single line of pedagogical arguments".⁹

One of the most important representatives of manism, *Oswald* (in a polemic with "militarism") wrote that relations between nations must be governed by the mental principles of the "energy imperative", which "scientific science commands them to sit down and not waste their time in a useless struggle".¹⁰ Just as from the point of view of the "energy imperative", the plough is superior to the hoe, and amicable separation is more profitable than eternal quarrels and fights, so, from the same point of view, the peaceful unity of peoples is more profitable than their differences.

Once this debate was over, it was only a matter of "convincing" the arguments of its absurdity! These naïve arguments were based on the treatment of a patient with a sick intellect. I believed in them and Drahomanov. Thus, the biggest argument against giving the country a "state-law character" was that these individuals could not withstand the criticisms of the "*enlightened*" world; that they were condemned to "*learning* criticisms and analyses". For him, what he has learned cannot exist in his life, because it "destroys the mind". Affect plays no role in social life and it is the reason for the "shift of the social and political movement in Russia *from patience and faith to science and reason*". Science, reason, criticism, analysis, and reasoning, not instinct and will, should solve the national problem.

It was a political national event. Talstoy
He also believed that it would not take a dreamer to believe that the brotherhood of nations would reign throughout Europe, and then the entire globe, as soon as they had a proper "righteousness" and understood the "foolishness" of their differences.¹² The trail of this thalassology, popularised by Drahomanov, was followed by almost all Ukrainian publicity. Galician young Ukrainians praised Drahomanov for not

and *Molodavshchyna* - a term derived from the name of an association of student groups in Galicia and Bukovina in 1899-1903, which united university students and high school students who were striving to change the ideology of the Soviet Union.

Menavita posed the Ukrainian "question from the formal-nationalist side" but only "from the pedagogical-practical side",¹³ meaning, not from the point of view of the national will of the nation, but from the point of view of logical reasoning. Menavita, who stamped his mark on Ukrainianism between the first and second revolutions, believed that the country's struggle was always an "ideological struggle", a battle not of two mutually exclusive wills, but a battle of ideas, in which the power of argumentation and logic was always at work.¹⁴ The Ukrainian *revolutionary* publicists were of the opinion that the "national question" (this means international difference - D. D.) was abnormal, unreasonable, and "invented" ("bourgeoisie", as the methodologists called it, "by tsars and popes") in order to *artificially* transform one nation into another.¹⁵ With the advent of the Enlightenment, the veil of secrecy placed over the eyes of the "people" (aka "the ruling class") will fall away, and, deprived of their "bourgeoisie" (aka "lords and kings"), the peoples will unite in fraternal union, in the eternal realm of the omnipotent mind.

In full agreement with the above opinions, one of the live Ukrainian magazines argue that we can only "defend the right to non-difference" of the Russians in a "pathological state". "Ignorance ('ignorance') explains a part of what Ukrainians have for non-partisanship, for a negative attitude Ukrainian national affairs."¹⁶ Therefore, the Dragomanovites were concerned that "*arguments of reason* and validity" would force the worker to change his negative attitude Ukrainian national cause,¹⁷ because such an attitude was caused only by the "uninformedness" of foreigners, a "sad *delusion* that is explained by very poor knowledge" of the Ukrainian struggle.¹⁸

This was more or less the pattern of the entire Ukrainian press. Drahomanov set the tone for it early on, and *M. Hrushevski* after 1900. For him, the aspirations Ukraine were dictated not by the spontaneous will of the nation, nor by the irrational impulse of the and ; Ukrainians were trying to achieve their own logical principles of *entertainment* over the *reasonable* management of social and international tasks. As such, these aspirations are basically

yami, problems and contemporary grammatical and political life of the region. The active members of the organisation were L. Tsagelski, U. Starasolski, A. Kruszalicki, S. Haharuk, S. Baran, M. Halushchynski, T. Melen and others. It advocated the idea of Ukraine's independence and published the newspaper "Moloda Ukraina". She established close ties with students in Kharkiv, Kyiv and Paltava.

The latter is not impossible for everyone, but only a humane and culturally minded person would want to be a lager. That's why we had to "*argue from reason*" in this case. It is true that these arguments were not listened to by the other side, and the papers did not go past the professor's parades, but that is a pot for papers! For in principle, the truth is that everything is not after the papers, not after that "dark" that dominates children's minds, students' minds, and their mothers, but after the tsudo minds. These suggestions from reason, "if they had been heeded in their time, would have formed a lasting moral bond between Ukrainian civilisations on the one hand, and Russian statehood and the great (?) aspirational civilisations on the other."¹⁹ For Drahomanov, as well as for Hrushevsky, the current non-existence of Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian nationalisms will thus become patalytic, caused by "ignorant" neo-nucla What a barbaric thing it must have seemed to the venerable professor of history, what a slave to Alexandra, Caesar, Cromwell, Napoleon, Madzia, and other "ignorant" and "uncultured" people who have been kept in a "pathological" state for several thousand years! Gandzi and Lev Talstoy must appear to people of this psychology as the only luminaries of humanity...

That same psychology were infected with revolutionary ^{Naddnprashchyna} circles. Alongside them were revolutionary-minded Galician circles. "Moloda Ukraina" wrote that to fight for one's revolutionary ideal one must "take up the weapons of the past, *adopt* the weapons of our times". And then: "the knowledge and *science*, which have now changed the whole horizon, are now available to us *as* a weapon to fight our enemies", and "sacred signs" are immediately added...²⁰ This credo is especially important given the time in which it was fought. This was the time of the first re- currency Eastern Europe, 1900, a time , after the recognition of this credo by the followers of this credo themselves, the state of the Ukrainian nation had never been so similar to the state of Khmialnytskyi's time.

This volatile and gentle prime ministerial ideology was so popular with us, so widely accepted by the people of the official Ukraine, so self-evident that we are constantly lamenting it in our poetry.

"If you love your homeland, then you should know that the sound of the vines is an agony.

^{and} *Naddnprashchyna* (*Naddnprashchyna* Ukraine) are appropriate terms to describe the share of Ukrainian ethnographic lands that were part of the Russian Empire, then the Ukrainian People's Republic (without the ZV-UNR), and in 1939 the Ukrainian SSR.

Peruna, - time, as well as the world, - and now it is not the brilliance of the ball - but the free *school and the fish*," - so cried the Dragomanov school, which was considered one of the top caricatures of our poetry of the last century.²¹ This passage is not excluded, it is as characteristic of Ukrainian poetry as the quoted passages from Dragomanov and Hrushevsky are of Ukrainian journalism. The whole recent worldview of those times was devoid of all the sophistication and powerful intellectualism of our *fin de siècle*. In the wake of the death of the will, which was assigned to the divine guidance, the organ of this guidance, the mind, was made a seat that builds and destroys worlds, hides evil and noise, steadies time and dread...

A typical representative of dragomania in Galicia (though in he was *Ivan Franko* and he expressed it) was *Ivan Franko*. For him, the rule of the mind is the highest law. For him, intellect is the weapon with which every united unit (and thus the nation) must fight for the desired order; the main lever of reforms. He tries: "And I will tell you how we are supposed to rule this system: I do not arm myself, I do not sit down - I burn, I pity and I fight, but I work and *learn*."²² As we can see, the Naddnipranets and the Galicians struggle with the same words to express their opposing opinions. And these opinions were not accepted in Galicia. In the second collection of the same author we read: "Let everyone take a sword in his hand - the time of glory is near - not think of steel sword - we are walking the path of peace; - only *science* and truth sword - the enemy will be burned to ashes."²³ "*Reason is ruled without faith*" is the eighth goal, and science is the "calm and pure truth-teller" who "seeks the way out of the paths of prodigality", which have been entered by individuals, nations, and all humanity, terrified by the scarecrows of "egoism" and "nianavism".²⁴

"Science, pride and all activities of the world" were important to him. The "kingdom of Cemra" was a ball and chain. The "high thought" of such a pacifism was his ball, and language was his weapon. With pride, the Neophyte declared that "there is no *more power than the power of the mind* and no more power than the world". "Not a foreign slave and not a foreign ball" are the slogans of steel: "light and science". The process of attacking evil, and cemetery, and bicha - this is the best hand in life." This passionate statement ended with an old saying, according to Ivan ^{Katliarevski} himself, "not a hetman of the Polish people, but the culture", which

ⁱ *fin de siècle* (French) - the end of the century.

ⁱⁱ *Ivan Katliarevsky* (1769-1838) - prominent Ukrainian writer, playwright, first classical Ukrainian literary figure, and an ideologue of the Enlightenment in Ukraine. He studied at the Paltava Theological Seminary, worked as a clerk and a house tutor. In 1796-1808 he was in the military service. From 1810 he worked at the

He "showed them the way of literature, the way of school and education, which has brought the nation since the beginning of time." ²⁶ This philosophy of such *saprudas* was aggressive, even if the shortcomings of the ministry were also reflected in these small verses taken from one Galician magazine for the purpose of this study (1924): "A sabre, a gun, and a pistol are mighty and foolish, but the mind, this gift of destiny, is the gift of the righteous Cossacks."²⁷ The realisation and the ongoing struggle for this "spiritual transformation" of humanity under the tides of reason were driven by historians!

This kind of "worldview" was also shared by all the Ukrainian political circles, all of which were imbued with the Dragomanovian belief in the power of reason and reasoning, and all of which were "bourgeois" as much as they were "socialist" or "radical". All of her writings, in fact, started from the idea that the immeasurable variation between peoples is a fable, a fiction, an artificial thing that can be eliminated by mutual understanding; She repeatedly appealed to the Drahomanian paradox of "sabaki and kata" to "ensure" that their "foolishness" of unequal attitudes towards us is not to be doubted, but to magic, mutual intimacies, modes of ^{life} between peoples, dreams of "autonomy", Ukrainian Switzerland and other utopias. Nothing was easy. These religious sensations, like the national one now, were not as terrible as explosive materials, or the cause of terrible wars? But, in the end, peace and harmony prevailed between different faiths. Couldn't they also have kept the power of reason and national feeling in check, as they had kept the enemies of humanity, slavery, the Inquisition and the Pagans? "And when the idea of religious freedom started to develop a long time ago, they did not recognise it at first, when intolerance reigned, then tsarism appeared, but with the wide margins of the ruling tsarist regime and only in the kings did a couple of freedom of conscience come to the fore, this is the very path of development of the price and the national idea from the moment of its initial triumph in the senses we have mentioned."²⁸ *Sapaveddy*, while the nature of the change is very volatile, but

to the audience of the House for the Nursing of the Poor *Dvorans*. In 1812, during Napoleon I Banaparte's march to Russia, he received permission from Governor-General Y. Labanav-Rastawski, he formed the 5th Ukrainian Cossack regiment in the town of Haroszyn of the Kharolsk Pavet in Paltava region (on the condition that the regiment would be accepted after the war as a pan-Cossack troop), for which he received the rank of major. In 1817-21 he was the director of the Paltava Theatre. Katlyarevsky's most famous works are the *Aeneid* (1798, 3 parts; 1842 - the first posthumous edition), the first works of modern Ukrainian literature written in the vernacular.

^{and} *modus vivendi* (from Latin) - reasonable *campanile*.

It could have been a "sticking point"! Only more goodwill and faith in the "triumph of the right".

Eight, this was their gift, the gift of Ukrainian nationalists from the same people who were deaf to the 1848 revolution.^{and}, from Drahomanov, who sought to provoke a fierce barbarianism of the Irish, Hungarians and Balkan Slavs, to the authors of the memoranda of Dzyanikin and Savetai, who were deaf to the noise of revolution that was being promoted in Ukraine in 1917. There was nothing of "smell", nothing of "will", no absolute national truths, only "science", "reason", "analysis" and "perception", which is the gift that is needed to know the truth and to conquer it in the world.

Both the question of this or that system of land cultivation and the question of national tasks was a question of consensus: as such, it was solved by reason and persuasion. The ascendancy to a higher state of a group or class, or a nation, meant only the world, and everyone was capable of doing anything socially useful. The truth about everything came from her own perspective: not only the problems of everyday life, not only petty disputes over the border, but also the problems of the world community were expressed by her through her grievances, her appeals to "common sense", and, above all, her calls for a trial...

SECTION II - "SCIENTIFIC" QUIETISM

Out of this imperious intellectualism emerges the absolute necessity and even more imperious, at least scientific, quietism, belief in the inviolable laws of the land: *another characteristic of Ukrainianism*. The early Ukrainians sought a "scientifically substantiated" and "scientifically davidzenny" ideal. This substantiation was sometimes done by deduction, sometimes by experiment. The mind was a ruler of the physical world, but it was also a ruler of the social world. Just as the earth moved in an established arc, so did social life, obeying the laws of "evolution" and "progress". All of this was clear and simple, like two pieces of paper, and therefore instantly assimilated as the deepest wisdom of our "nationalisms"; this "nationalism" firmly remembered that the implied nations themselves had their limits in "eternal" laws of the civilised progress. Kry-

and 1848 - the Year of the Revolution, also known as the Great Revolution - the series of that took place in 1848 in many countries of Europe.

tics and dubious substitutes for piety and "fantasy" were the hallmarks of the age of science, and they were also the means of our Ukrainians to combat national maximalism.

Neither doubts nor such scepticism (at least to this extent) were known to those who recognised the Schopenhauerian qualities of ^{occultation}, the "will" as the universal independent motive force in history, which works "from itself" (aus sich heraus), as Hegel said. But for our jurists, there were only phenomena visible to the light of day, special goals that were accessible to courtiers. These objects were "one of the places where they were tied or, if they moved, there was some *reason for the call*". And if this movement (as, for example, the movement of the planets) "did not depend on the ringing of a bell, it still depended on a *set of established laws*", both binding and .²⁹ The analogy with social life was so close and so tempting; what is so surprising that we have a social life in our minds? The occasional connections between different phenomena of civil life have been considered permanent, such as the statistical counts of a given moment, the current connections between villages and nations, and so on. These were established once and for all, and if they were subject to change, then the changes could only take place in a well-designed manner and in a manner that both the individual and the nation should have respected, and not imposed their own way on them.

A device in someone else's hands, with a broken will, a burnt-out past. They have always been about the smallest amount of cooperation: The lack of freedom of association, the pharmacy of self-determination, but in order to fix its own life it imposed on the community a whole series of "laws", less or more "eternal", less or more fantastic, which became the so-called "pitiful inadequacy" of history. For a nation that wanted to develop freely, the right-wing leaders of the country started rumours of "persecution" and threats of punishment for breaking the "laws" at every opportunity. Those who wanted to live and move had to obey these "laws". It is true that these "objective, empirical" laws would be superior to those derived deductively from the "laws of reason", but the chaotic magic of the jurist could easily overcome this superiority (as well as many others), because if some of the "objective" laws were also "reasonable", then the "reasonable" ones could not become "objective". Both were not disclosed to the public.

ⁱ *qualitas occulta* (Latin) - secret (hidden) quality.

to the most brilliant minds?

Thus, the national will, already a questionable thing for dragomaniacs, acquired new shackles - the "laws" of social development, which could not be violated without fear of being called an ignoramus or an "idealist". The most consequential transitions are the physical principles of sociology. One of these principles was the "energy imperative". According to this principle, the exchange between nations should be managed in such a way that in their interaction and cooperation it is the least energy. From this point of view, it was necessary to treat the relations between nations as the most essential. Thus, the programme of such national "energy" included the unification of the language, then the elimination of customs duties, measures at any cost, and, if possible, the elimination of interstate borders, or at least the "artificial" multiplication of existing ones, etc. The second such law was the obligation to use the nation for more development of the "whole", which had to be at all costs. "Each nation, according to its own temperature, climate and the productivity of its land, contributes its own different share to the aggregate cultural treasury and has a strong insistence on participating in the creation of a magical artistic creation"³⁰, - wrote the pioneer of marker nationalist socialism, and this idea has been firmly established in our country. Each nation was allowed to express its individuality, but only insofar as it was to the benefit of the "gun emperor" and did not contradict the "energy imperative". Maintaining ownership of the army, the government and the state was a major concern for the leaders.

Perhaps the most important "law" would be the "law" of histories to develop, which is otherwise known as the "spirits of the times". Relying on only a few - and only vague - "laws", Karl Marx abolished the Austrian Slavs' (with few exceptions) "duties" to the German and Hungarian nations. The expression of their will in the context of co-operative aspirations of the great nations was branded as "counter-value", going against "historical development", and there were fears of prosecution. A couple of decades later, the same struggle of the "Russian" nations was also labelled by Kramlov and our students of Marx as "countervalue" and "out of step with the spirit of the times".

Such "pitiful" laws prevented the evolution of social forms in favour of aggregate amalgamation, the fusion of small nations into large political states. The short-term equality of the

he pairing of the European powers at the Congress of Vienna 1815 was transformed into an "eternal" law, which, of course, was not about creating new states, but about the maintenance of existing lionised states. Those who have lived through this pairing, even during the First World War, the Turkish-Italian and Balkan wars, remember how "disturbed" the "disturbed" nature of the existing spheres of influence caused the addition of Norway, And how socialists, especially Russian ones, saw the "absurdity" of this step for Norway itself and the many workers who could not work with this "exception" to the rule... Some went even further and said that the modern type of state, which ends with a state, is a national state, that, therefore, the slogan of *every nation is its own state*, is a "hateful" utopia.³¹

In the nature of the "laws" that are supposed to regulate the judgement between the

These were, of course, also the so-called laws of public development, which would have required the enlargement, not the reduction, of public territory seized by one state organisation or another. Therefore, when our "nationalists" wanted to justify their "maverick" actions (they absolutely had to!), they referred to all sorts of "laws" that their colleagues were bound to recognise. For example, when Ukrainian socialists decided to adopt the slogan of autonomy, it was not enough to demonstrate the will of the nation on own merits, but to prove it, that "economic decentralisation must be followed by decentralisation of politics" and that "*the process of democratisation of the state system* (the word "process" had the character of a mystical inevitability!) *requires* the decentralisation of legislation, administration, and the judiciary," and that "in the interests of the development of productive villages" Ukraine's autonomy is absolutely necessary, their workers, however, also argued that "the development of capitalism is incompatible with the insecurity of national individuality".³² And none of those who did so noticed that the implementation of these "wretched laws" for each individual nation, which was narrower than these narrow ones, depended solely on the energy with which it claimed its right to exist, without clinging to any "laws".

Our "bourgeois" parties were not the same as the "socialist" ones and They also tried to create a "legal" to justify the damages to their nation. They "proved" the inevitability of national concessions by "violating" the same wretched "laws of cultural development" that "subtly" affect the upper class of civil society and the democracy. But, on the other hand, baronesses from "non-Tserkovian people" who

They accused them of separatism, saying that "only belonging to a large, well-organised state union can provide economic and cultural development of the nationalities and regions that are part of it with a lot of benefits, such as... the creation of more and more well-known educational and cultural institutions, greater provision of international cooperation", etc. n. Other people were ready to see independence, if someone said to them, "What will a patriotic independent Ukraine be like? Because such a Ukraine must separate itself from Poland and Russia with ties, and how does this compare to the work of internalisation?"³³

All of these laws, most of which were empirical, were adopted by the government.

The only facts that mattered for a given, very limited period of time were, like all these sick people with a perdition of the intellect, a worldview that surrendered to the phenomena, to the world of these facts, to the existing status quo; it was a taking of the world not in its dynamics but in its statistics. For Drahomanov's theory, there were no sacred imperatives that changed both temporal laws and the temporal status quo, no automatic will in either individuals or nations. All of this was superstition; for rule of law, there was only the light of *visible stars*, *fixed* goals, *fixed* majesties, or the laws of *the day*-in other words, the light of unchanging status quo, or its mysterious mystery of "evolution," which a couple of spontaneous national wills found laughable utopianism. "It is not military, not the origin of battles, but logical ethical principles and their emanations - the laws of the *commonwealth* and *international law* - that will be decisive for the future adjustment international tasks," he said, as he shaped his worldview. For him, the history was "a noble, mechanical one", it did not involve "noble competitions", and he mentioned his goal "I wish no one would have known about this".³⁴

That's how people understood the light, the noise of the national struggle, who looked down on him, who benefited from their "laws" and "patronising" of various "works" that caused them to interfere with the course of the pagans. Like Laplace, who "did not require" the "hypothesis of God" for his theory of the emergence of light, the dragomaniacs, in the light of their inviolable social rights, did not require the memory of freedom to which the most sacred of the general public had dedicated the brilliant old men of their philosophical systems.

These are the beliefs of people with a weakened will, in the power of the mind over the will, in their beliefs in "terrible laws" that do everything themselves without

our gardening and which is not to be neglected is a vain labour, the very *attraction of a vain impulse* is revealed. Zombart says that Marx's "'scientific' fatalism is nothing more than a simple, clear-cut indication of the forces that we must only know in order to master them. With this artificial construction... Marx tried to make his agreement with the theoretical view of the run of the beetle as an "ersatz" *unstoppable pit... of the political world* "³⁵, the freedom of the beast is new. The "laws" of our "nationalists" were nothing more than "ersatz" death sentences...

SECTION III - HUTARAN "UNIVERSALISM"

Intellectualism, which led our national thought to quantism, led it to the betrayal own national ideal, to a kind of "universalism" in which all national flavour perished without a trace. The intellectuals also sought a national truth, but their truth, as a result of the pure cognitive work of the intellect, was not subject to the feelings and desires that were so striking in different nations; their truth was independent of emotional and cultural factors; it was given to the minds. As a builder of society, as a device of relations between nations, as a marker of the boundaries of national identity - all of this did not express the rightness of the existence of each individual nation, but the power of reason. And since the laws of reason, like the laws of logic, are *aggregately applicable to everyone*, the truth that our nationalists claimed to know, which was entirely natural, was a *universal* truth; A special truth only for a *particular* nation, a truth that would be true for one people and false for another, did not exist for them. For only the truth felt, the truth of the believer is the truth of him and his brothers in faith, but the truth given to reason, logic, and experimentation is the truth that is relevant to all. Their truth was not revealed by our "Hachu", only by our "Vedaya". As G. Zimel said about this: "The place of *intellectual* centre in its essence is that it can master all; every sufficiently enlightened mind must give itself to its own intellectual centre (as he says). There is no analogy to this in the field of will and smell. "³⁶ The Zapavet - "Here is the Lord your God" and others - can be accepted by anyone, or imposed on anyone, but no one can be forced to accept it. This is a subjective, ad-

ⁱ *species* (lat.) - from.

The heard "truth". This truth is only true for those who believe in it. But the truth that a triangle has three angles, or that the sum of them is equal to two right angles, must involve everyone: This is an abstract truth, in other words, those who seek truth for abstract minds must start from the premise that there is *only one, total truth, aggregate and acceptable to truth*, based not on this or that sect, kingdom or nation, but on *the hearts*, not on subjective or national feeling, but on the aggregate hearts of the mind.

Our nineteenth- and twentieth-century methodologists came from this foundation, formulating various mystical "truths" and "laws" that should regulate "reasonable" life between nations and that should be punishable by all "narrow national" truths. Their epigones also proceeded from this premise, logically adding national truth and placing the truth of the caspian above it.

"The thought of a nation in itself," Drahomanov wrote, "is not enough to guarantee freedom and *truth for all...* We must look for something else, something that would *rise above all nationalities* and be the measure of them as they go against each other. We must look for *a universal truth* that would be common to all nations."³⁷ And then, referring to religious affairs, he said: "Even the most intelligent people in different faiths began to think that it was not worthwhile to fight each other for different royal affairs and that 'it is necessary to recognise all the churches of the world and all people of all faiths as brothers. Thus, the thought of humanity was elevated above the thought of nation and faith, with their own customs, organisations and institutions, and became the judge of the spat between nations and faiths and the basis for the will of each nation and faith within those boundaries."³⁸ For Drahomanov, "nationality" as a guardian of life and own truth was nothing to be with. At that time, "the thoughts of the world's people were clear," those national phantasmagoria of right-wing Voltaires... "These thoughts of the world's people were the only ones that could "give the most valuable ground to our imitation of national freedom."³⁹ Above nationalism, he placed "international, agulnachalavichnye interests". He was so greathearted that "it does not add to the nationality, but it adds to nationalism, especially those that are themselves procreative of chauvinism or casualism". This fantastic "humanity" exists in his standards of all times and all truths, including the national one. For Drahomanov the nation and its needs are the most real thing in the world. All manifestations of the national will, especially language, have no justification *in themselves*

Saba. They are right that there are only a few "humane or *agulhuman ideas*" among you or other people. The national idea can never be used to define the whole nation; for this purpose, one must seek the "universal truth" that is common to all peoples. For Drahomanov, the persistent sense of national self-preservation is absurd. He advocates adopting "all the instinctive and vague smells" of race and "rising above them" in solving everything, including the Ukrainian national question; "look at it from the original point of reference", from the point of "universal truth for ". Ukraine could not have its own purpose in it, because "the purpose of human labour is the same throughout the world, like a *science that is the same to all minds*".⁴⁰

Drahomanov's views in this regard in our non-

The damage to the civil society is significant. First of all, it was our socialist and radical intelligentsia. It looked for "aggressive principles" in national movements and expressed its sympathy for these movements as "a measure of adherence to these principles"; These "aggressive principles", this "aggressive truth" that was rising above the national one, were for the leaders "humanity", for the students either "socialism" or the same fantastic "humanity": Or the two are often mixed up. For the radical socialists, the "struggle for equality, fraternity and freedom of *all mankind*" was a struggle that had to be won by the "first principles", which dominated the national image.⁴¹ One of the founders of Galician dragomania proudly asserted that "national shrines" did not exist for him. He and his associates "do not pray to them". They do not stand for *the* rights of their language *because* they "stand for the equality of *all my people*", "for the development of Ukrainian literature *because* we are advocates of civilisation and flag... In addition to all the things that people do with the wings of a patriotic, we do *what is reasonable and practical*". This is the meaning of "*because*", because it is the sanction of the "highest" truth and reason. National patriotism and dreams, which would not contain these alien "*whats*", would certainly destroy the whole rationale of existence for our citizens.⁴² Similar rants of hurt, naked, boring and empty phrases can be found on the front pages of every socialist or radical . This pleated collection replaced the party ideology for them...

You are the socialists and radio personalities who only allow the nation to be

national slogans, only then do they fulfil their own national ideal, when it is confused with the "thoughts of worldcommunity", with aggressive

is the truest. Nationalism *is useful only* if one can "believe" that it "*does not oppose*" socialism, "but on the contrary, helps to develop".

The same idea is clearly evident in the poetry of Ivan Franko, who dominated the thoughts of several generations in Galicia. He only then righted the love for his native land, when it *did not see* anything wrong with (the same words!) "transcending" the idea of love and the same fanatical "chastity": "And these same *points*, he tried to say, "are the *same for* love (and the nation - D.D.), and for holy love - *for all those* who are being oppressed by you." If not, everything is good, but what about the *points*? The Avatar does not give an answer... In any case, the path to nationalism is only through casual politicalism, through these "higher" ideas, because: "Whoever does not love *all* brothers, as the sun of God, all nations, could not love you, this Ukraine." ⁴³Tychyna does not recognise love for the country without the sanction of national truth: "Paets, love your land is not a crime," says, "it *is* a calibre *for everyone*...". What an extraordinary unity of thought, expression and attitude of all three ideologies: Galician Molodist, Malarussian communism and the concomitant desire of the whole "progressive" Ukraine - Mikhail Drahomanov!

Here is a "relevant" truth for whole "chaos" that It rose above the national truth, and became responsible for the social and political situation. Once this "universal truth" was "progress", it was followed by "socialism", "development of humanity and civilisation", "fraternity and brotherhood of nations", "emancipation of democracy" or "rule of law", these "causes of Slavism", or even simple "culture" - but these "truths" are only marginally valid: They were the self, the nation and its rights to existence - the sons or the princes, the most prosperous national ideal - a harmful utopia.

For the natural philosopher, who feels in his life and in himself, as well as in his national community, a pulsating, undeterred will to give and expand, this philosophy will only cause regret and agony, but not for the enlightened philosopher of the nineteenth century, with its ideas of the right of sovereign minds to the law, let alone the citizen of Ukraine, who was violently integrated by the war into the alien whole of the great empires, whose authorities had to claim for themselves the "intentions of the people" as if they were ruling over the nation. It is clear that it was not in such areas that the idea of a self-sufficient and self-sufficient national ideal could emerge, which would find its justification in itself and would not need to look to national ideals.

neither a seeker of their righteousness.

"I've never seen anything like this before!" - this is the tragic reaction of a man's mind to anything that goes beyond the empirical, beyond his present experience. In such cases, the supra-Dniester tries to do so: "Have you seen this?" In either case, the whole country will be outraged, and the whole experiment will be out of the picture. This psychology was shared by the ideologues of the Ukrainian legal profession, and that is why they added the Iranian will as a prize in history; For in the light that each of them "saw", the law of "reasonable" cavalry operated, and most of the histories were about open-mindedness and the ability to cope with both physical and social chaos. He was also fascinated by the hype of social "laws", because it was a parade of things he "saw" and did not understand.

Take it as a starting point for the national and self-determination life, the presence of the will and the signposts from it, as axioms and eternal actual aspirations - this was the metaphysics for our "man", unwritten and written, all-round. This would mean knowing the truth in "supernatural" ways, for which not only reason itself, but also this vivifying spirit is needed. In order to avoid this absurdity, to recognise the national moment in history, lawyers had to finish and give their own national truth, because truth, revealed to reason and logic, is by its nature *universal*, aggregate and eternal, and in no way individual or "narrow" national.

SECTION IV - MATERIALISM (LIBERALISM, DEMOCRACY, PACIFISM, PARTISANSHIP, ANARCHISM)

The known "scientific" (deductive or experiential) "aggregate" truth was a *formal* attempt at the national ideal of our legal system.

Distilled into a *specific* national ideology, this "agrarian truth" has been expressed in our country in the form of nothing but *materialism* or social *utilitarianism*. Perhaps paraphrasing Goethe, Spengler said in his popular book: "The antique man knows only what he sees and grasps." ⁴⁴ I am far from thinking of paralleling our own legal system with antiquity, but I have taken a lot of it from the *ancient world*. The light of eternity has appeared in new ways, which is "grasped" by courtly smells and minds, which - in the form of

From the "laws" - dominating us and constructing our own, aggregate truth - the plan of the party, the active creative quality of commitment, of the individual, of the will, was on the track. The addition of this quality to the theory of the nationalist approach led to the practice of what I call *materialism*; Materialism was about this permanent, eternally self-sustaining, creative moment and its diminishing manifestation in a given moment; the supposed "aggregate" - the "individual" captured by the court's senses. *Given* a generation, *given a class* that represents, or at least is represented by, the nation, it *is now* and will be, not the eternal will of the nation, which is always perpetuating all the temporal forms above them; what is, not what should be, is what was important for our occupation with legalism. This was a theory born against the background of the attraction of the national valorisation instinct. For certain species of valorisation, the instinct is unlimited. The celebration of the right to life, the right to the family has an activist character for them, and is shared by all. This eternal national right of the nation and *the woman* will remain there forever, *phenomenal*, "*grasped*", *rational*: over the life of a single person, over the blood and deaths of thousands, over the task of generating, over abstract mental calculations, over "agulhala" ethics, over the combined powers of good and evil. The "eternal" was placed there above the "temporal", the essence above the manifestation, the will above its temporal abstraction, expansion above *the status quo*, dynamics above statics.

And now look at this, our old friend. For my car
It is only a "personalised sum of material things," as Spengler puts it. She is alien to our perception of the world, for which "everything seen as unseen is conforming to the unseen", which is as much a part of the soul of the individual as of the nation, and which is turned on by the need for accentuation. For the old man, the absurdity of the individual is "only courtly", partisan "sovereignty of the other", which must be "transformed" in the name of an intrinsic, if not idealised, ideal, in the name of "agulh"; For her, on the contrary, this courtly sovereignty is the only real thing in the world.⁴⁵ Just as for the antique world "appearance" was a "bare" thing (Hegel), so for our ancient age there was only the light of visible stars. He was far from the idea that the external was only "one of the moments of the boskogo", "the realms of the free spirit are the realms of the " (idem, which only has to come. Hegel called these mates.

The rationalist worldview is the "primal", "das nur ^{Sinnlicher}" of Spengler, which is the "totales Gan- ^{zesiii}" or "freie ^{Einheitiv}" of things; it is not a stand-alone entity over appearances, their agents and the soul that makes them...⁴⁶ All of this, at once, was metaphysical for our legalism. Special people, those atoms of the formless masses, were not here to *believe* that only those who take *form* can make things of superorganic light - they were from the real world. We didn't think that the essence of these supernatural things was only "potencia" (in magic), that it was only in their "actu" (in self). At the same time, we, this basiform mass, were seen by us as a separate reality. For us, the agitated masses were the enemy of empirical sociability, and this latter was the only reality. For the philosophy of national currencyism (which knows the "eternal" will of the species, not the temporal will of the individual), everything that is good for *the species* is good for the individual, for the population, for the "I" and for the "You" and for the "We". For philosophy of law, everything that is good for the "I" and for this "We" should be good for the rules of law and for the nation. There is the image of an ideal, the impossibility of its realisation, the realisation of something *that has not been seen*. Here is the image of the present, of "only hope" and "possibility". Both for Feuerbach and Russo, the basis of this policy and for our right-wing officials, the basis of the national policy was the accentuation of "me" and "you", "the *time of all*", which *at a given moment* occupy the national territory. It is time for them to be captured in the form of attacks, time for them to be quick and gentle because of their baseness.

This is how our nationalism came to its logical conclusion. *materialistic doctrines*, these doctrines, like the papist ones (*intellectualism, casualism and socialism*), asserted our righteousness over national truth, over the "unreasonable"; and those doctrines were: *liberalism*, which placed the intrinsic value of the mass as a collection of individuals above the intrinsic value of the nation as the highest value; democracy, which placed the intrinsic value of the "people" as an unorganised, loose-knit crowd above the intrinsic value of the nation; and *socialism*, which placed the intrinsic value of class above the intrinsic value of the nation. And then there are *pacifism* and *humanism*, anarchism (a kind of liberalism), and *legalism* (a kind of democracy), which put the intrinsic value of one right above the value of the whole nation. All the Yans

ⁱ *das nur Sinnliche* (in German) - only pachuco.

ⁱⁱ *Besonderheiten* (n.d.) - Asabilists.

ⁱⁱⁱ *totales Ganzes* (n.d.) - total goals.

^{iv} *freie Einheit* - freedom of association.

were strongly opposed to the idea of statehood as a value in itself.

In this way, the popular understanding of "freedom" and "*electoral egoism*" of the highest order became values in themselves. In this way, he was trying to replace the moment of *individual benefit* (individual, class, ruler) in the process of transition to the moment of aggregate, race, national *imperative*. The weakening of the importance of instinct - rather than strengthening, the affirmation of the hour, the minute, the given form - *in the pursuit of the "eternal"*. The two disciplines became one and the same: the setting of egoistic impulses, the principle of "*laissez-faire*" on the one hand, and the principle of the creative will of the individual, which is paralleled by the individual, the individual, class, their time, "freedom", "people", the sovereign "I", which does not resort to aggression and "imposition", to imposing on everything the will that has its own sanction.

These moments of underdevelopment of the valid *impulse* are also manifested in our legal system, first of all in the Occidental *"humanism"*, which puts the physical "I" above all else. Whoever does not see the forest behind the trees, the people behind the "townspeople", and the individual will of the human race behind the individual abstraction of the will of the spirits, for him, with the disappearance of this abstraction, the human being disappears. For this reason, physical pain and death will always be the worst thing; for this reason, the doctrine of *liberalism*, which has promoted "rights" to the *individual* over the rights of the *person* to whom it belongs, will always be an axiom, and its most extreme form is *pacifism*. Heroism, which encourages the masses to fight battles that are never justified for them, no matter how great a goal it is. This evil, "mass slaughter", which is inherent in them, regardless of its purpose, is equal to any judgement that attempts to attack the "most precious": the life of an adjunct. "We must be nice all life," Franko said, "because this is the key, and *is there anything that is greater than it?*"

For weaker races there is nothing that is higher than a woman's adjunct. For this "Chagossians" are ready to accept the fact that he is an adjunct. For the Ukrainian legalism, which was striving through the fractious ideals of bourgeois humanism, this adjunct was the highest "klyainod" that rose above all "metaphysical" values... "Oh, if only the bloody bargains would come," said another

and *laissez-faire* - the principle of non-interference - is an economic doctrine that states that state interference in the economy should be minimal.

the representative of our humanism - a weapon of complaint against all, - enough pain and blood, and glory - and timely miracles. "⁴⁷ And this was not an accident. It was a deeply felt "philosophy". I do not take the gift of the magician with pride, as the magician of the "ignorant soldat", not as an example of a valiant advocate for an idea that stands above the man, not as a celebration and exaltation of a character that led to an untimely death, but only as the sorrow of a touched sentimentalist for whom no idea can replace those "untimely magics". For the second author, the goal is, above all, "the slaughter of people." He tries to look at the battlefield with a helicopter: "O God, great goodness of God, where have you gone? Light up the sun, light up the night, let brother see brother". For the "God" of them was the God of the unbroken time under the dead. The one who brought "not a measure, but a sword" to the earth, who put the love of God above the love of men, the God of strong races, is a "terrible God" for the right-wing; he is the one whom the people fear, because he wants to be loved, and "has a small life, and a long life, and the existence of many individuals." We have a special novel, received with great praise, a novel-priest of works by "horrors of war", which not only conveys the pain of these horrors (it feels understandable and justified), But in which we can see the key perspective of a man who is not allowed to protect his life by grenades, and some consideration of the man who will be his master...⁴⁸ But the ramanas, selected from L. Talstog's *Vaina i miru. Talstog*, Sankiewicz's *The Lamb and the Sword*, or Balzac's *The Chouans*, which would show not only one but also the other of the war - the great exile of the nation in the name of an ideal that stands above life and everything - we still do not have.

For what kind or idea, is important, for that kind or idea
The removed adjuncts are to be used as affirmations, to be used as a language. A paraphrase of a philosopher of currencyism might say that "not he, the individual, but the nation is what is important for nature"; for a pacifist, it is different. Members of warring nations "have nothing to do with each other", dare not, therefore, speak against each other and *the nation*, because it is not their intentions but benefits that are the prizes for the liberal, and no councils can stand over the moral code of the individual".⁴⁹ For *the interests of the nation are* no different from the interests of each of its individual members. The notion of the "family", the "nation", as a thing that cannot be captured by courtly smells, that is more than the sum of its members, is for the right "metaphysics". What I find most gratifying is the "visible things": "I", "You", "We", the community or "people" and its goals and benefits, today and not tomorrow, matter, not idea.

This would be individualistic egoism. Then there was the egoism of the collective (*democracy*), though, of course, it is still difficult to distinguish between them. "The time of the one" and "the time of all", those whom Comte called the Grande être - the chalavets. But in either case, the intrinsic intentions of the day prevailed over everything, the "present" over "tomorrow," the time of the near over the time of the far, the intrinsic intentions of this punishment and its future over the cathartic riddles of the nation. For the collective egoism and its leaders (socialists and democrats), such attempts as those of the Right and Istanbul, the Colonies, Alsace, Crimea, the goal to achieve which the systematic attempts of *several generations* have been trying to achieve is this metaphysics. To achieve this goal, the personnel and material resources of *this* generation must be provided, and the paralysed will of the right-wing leaders could not reach such a level of tension and overreach beyond their usual tasks. Indomitable national ideals? "*only the whole is indestructible*, because no atoms will fall - for the ages of ages". Such goals as expansion into Central Asia, the conquest of Siberia by Ermak, the idea of retribution that France had for fifteen hundred years in 1871-all of these were chimeras, illusions of the politicians' imaginations. It was the paradise of the poets that "only the sphere of dreams, visions, illusions and deceptions... blooms". And the good thing is that "in the end we realised that these phantoms are phantoms, not worth the *torment and the wings and the packages*".⁵⁰ If only there were no such "packages" - this is the most important thing for the rule. As for these "deceptions", they are not pursued in the interests of the "people", but "in the interests of a group of adventurers". The long marches of the chosen races, which led to the creation of great monuments of great genius, such as the British Empire, the Europeanisation of Africa, the acculturation of India, and so on, were a great fun for Piracy's ideals, which was all about "who should take the lead... African niggers in aprons" and "give them alcohol". For the bourgeois who had been in the light of the Enlightenment, all these fantasies are still worthy of condemnation, as they "bring out the organism of the Slavic *world*" and smell of its many worldly abandonments.⁵¹ The abyvatsel is never guided by "illusions" in his life, but only by the intrinsic intrinsics of his own place and from this point of view he evaluates all the world's events and appearances. He is guided in his studies not by abstract ideals, but by intarses of the greatest number. These intarses are found in the free formulation (this is not the work of poets, but of economists and statisticians), and consist in multiplication of time and the taking of data

^{and} Piratsinsky - from the name of the town of Piratsin, in the Paltava region of Ukraine. This is where the meaning of "righteous" comes in.

The idea for the right-wing is that the pit is "something real", not the "torn edge". The idea for the right-winger is that it is "something real", and not followed by "ravaged lands" and "thousands of innocent victims", or, at best, by the of the Soviet Union. The building of pyramids, *medieval cathedrals*, weak empires, kryzhovy *pakhody* - all these are products of the "barbaric" era, which is a ridiculous remnant in "our enlightened age". Their ideal was to sit down in a bread-and-butter "worldly country" floating on honey and malak, and, God forbid, not to give themselves to any Macey with a signboard. "Illusions" are only for the benefit of the common people, and I am more concerned about those who invent them, the so-called "weak people". Because these evil people were either "different", which is our "indestructible" whole, or simple amoral people, and not cultural disseminators: For example, "let us remember the deeds of Uladzimir the ^{Holy}, his battle with his brothers... to imagine what culture the princes preserved" and other great people...⁵² This is what our socialists and democrats think. Their points of view are the most correct for all those who look at elderly people from the point of view of love, and at history the point of view of a loyal goal, That only the work of the councils is of concern, that there is no need to put the ball in the court of "further" international attempts, that there is parity between the people and goodwill between the people and the people's difficult path: It is too noisy and unprofitable for the peaceful soul of the humane fractional bourgeoisie.

This is how the work of this "theological spirit", which is said to be These people put their ideal above the intrinsic values of the "people" and its "dabrabet", and one of the most talented of the most volatile figures of our modern age, *Anatole France*, is perhaps the most talented: "Kali thinks about the misery that has been plaguing us since the fifteenth century until our own time (cynics and thinkers never talk about the nation, but immediately about "misery", the mechanical sum of adjuncts), then the reasons for it are all in false reasoning in some of these *theological doctrines*, which give light a rigid and idiosyncratic interpretation." He worries that in "our enlightened age" there are people who are devoted to these spirits, who claim to be righteous, who have made themselves into something, who have centred themselves on some higher idea - the essence of chastity. "Do not

ⁱ *Uladzimir Svyaty* (Uladzimir Vyaliki; after baptism - Vasil; ? - after 1015) - Vyaliki prince of Kiev, son of Svyatoslav Igaravich. In 969-78 he was a prince in Novgaradze. In 980, with the help of his brother Yarapolk, who was killed by warriors from his friends, he became the Great Prince of Kyiv. He considerably and strengthened the borders of Kievan Rus. In late 987 or early 988 he became an asylum seeker. In 988-89 he introduced Christianity as the state religion of Kievan Rus. They were canonised by the tsar.

Listen to the popes - at least these communists - who believe that this is the most important thing. Our instincts, our organs, our physical and moral nature, our whole being, advise us to seek a *place on earth*. We must not abandon it." Old Hedonism is the spirit that France gives us. This is his ideal. Our methodologists are more noticeable and naive in their formulation of it. In their case, the ideal becomes some kind of rustic materialism, the materialism of the kurashchup, but it manifests itself in the same forms: in the form of "fears, self-confidence, and weakness", and everything that is "beyond the dream, beyond the dream of murder" in terms of "abstract" values. This was the philosophy of those who "look up at them with no eyes", who did not want to know any righteousness, "holding on to one treasure - a *private woman*" (^{Chayka's} Dneprova - "The Plains Are Burning").

We read from the Galician Mala-Ukrainians: "The masses of the people The first goal... of the programme. What is this gift to the masses? First of all, it is the fact that all people see the basic and necessary conditions for this task: *the material needs* of a sane and honest citizen. *Good food*, bright and spacious rooms, adequate water, proper rest after work - basically everything that people for their *physical life*. This is the most unnecessary national task. To protect *the physical assets* of the masses and to develop *them is the first task of the masses, the first task* of the national struggle." ⁵³ How much than this credo of Myashchenko's socialism was the credo of the ^{Haidamak} ataman, who wrote to the Russian investigation commission in his last days: "We are not worried about our possessions, only that the *Ukrainian* faith... would not be threatened."⁵⁴ But the ataman still could not read Drahomanov or Young Ukraine... For these apostles and their students, these "*faith of the Russians*" and other romantic or "*traditional*" values, as France said, were superstitions or "worked-up nationalism".

ⁱ *Dnipro Chaika* (Liudmyla Vasilevska-Byrezina) (1861-1927) was a Ukrainian writer and poetess. After graduating from the Adeska Gymnasium in 1879, she worked as a teacher. The main themes of her work are the fate of the peasantry, the life of intellectuals, the revolutionary period of 1905, and works for children. Published since 1887, it was widely circulated in Western Ukraine. From 1909, in connection with the Khwarobai, it practically stopped writing (except for the period of 1918-20).

^{The second} *Haidamak movement* - from the *Haidamaks* - were the leaders of the national liberation barracks of the Ukrainian people against the Polish uprising in the 18th century in the Right-Bank Ukraine. It was first mentioned in historical documents in 1717 (according to other sources - in 1712, 1714).

mum", with whom "we must compete", because "otherwise there will never be peace in the world, but only crookedness and poverty"; because otherwise there will be no quarrels between peoples, but they will be unbreakable, because "*quarrels and gnawing will destroy the race*". This value is placed on *this* generation and it will continue.⁵⁵ Rightly so, these "quarrels and strife" between peoples pushed the Anglos to take over the American palace, and the three African and the whole of the Austrian cantonments, Russia to conquer Siberia, and Ukraine - for causing a step from the students, but these consequences appeared only in the future, and in fact, the rightness of the situation can be assessed from the point of view of the "*flour and packages*" of this generation. This was their ideal - to make the place "easier", or, as we used to say, "if the bread was easy, the Cossack would lie down". Bread and butter or "good food" was the "national ideal" of the Maladavians. In recognition of Drahomanov's merits, one of his students wrote: "*Only humanism, the greatest sum of the time of the greatest number of people, can be the criterion of social ethics*" and of all politics.⁵⁶ In Drahomanov's view, those of us who are "*immune to national freedom*" should never be separated from the duties and aspirations of the "*greatest number of people*". The people of Armenia should not have an abstract "nationality", but only "the idea of universal humanism".⁵⁷ It should not be forgotten that our entire socialism was nothing but a variation of the "nationalism" that Drahomanov, the Galician Maladavians, and other prominent poets and writers of the Soviet ^{Ukraine} had in common; Some of them identified the nation with the "peoples" and their reference to "good food", others - with the "workers", who in their imagination captured the majority of "all the people" in socialism, the majority of the masses, or even the existing generation and its perceived material needs.

Pharmaceuticals for nationalism, the French political elite

The writer *Charles Maras* wrote that "the intentions of those countrymen who will be living" (*des nationaux à vivre*) should be placed above the intentions of "those who are living" (*des nationaux vivants*), and the *dubro* of "eternal France" (*France éternelle*) above the *dubro* of "all Frenchmen of this era".⁵⁸ How far from this concept was our true nationalism, which appealed to the currency-loving figures in history, for whom the will of the people was exhausted by the needs of their aggression, this kind of punishment, and even in the most immediate and vulgar terms, was most understandable! For example.

and *Saborna Ukraina* - a governmental organisation for all Ukrainian ethnographic lands (*sabornas*); all Ukrainian ethnographic lands.

Not to give up the "present" in the name of the ideal of the future, but our rightfulness has not been violated at this highest level of abstraction of the nation's will.

Yano, in fact, brought materialism, which was fashionable in the nineteenth century, into the realm of national ideology. For *Feuerbach*, there were neither Platonic "ideas" nor Hegelian "spirit", which were insignificant attributes of sovereignty. For him, there was only the "Einzelne" (das Einzelne) in sovereignty, available to the courtiers. The "All-gemeine" (das All- gemeine) was just an abstraction. This "Agulhnae" in the life of the peoples, which inspired the "Boskie Shalam" of Maisey in his vandals' countryside; which is achieved through the efforts of a few individuals who are not even close to the ideal, all of which are, in my opinion, only "pointers" to *deception*, not worthy of being placed above the "Individual" and his kingdom. For Feuerbach, "spirit" is an illusion of an adzinka, for Ivan Franko, "the soul of the unmortal" is a "wild fantasy", as well as "*the spirit that has been creating from nothing for centuries*", because "only the eternal, without seal and stamp... this is matter"... For materialism, there is only the ethics of des Diessesits, the *moment*. "no data, no nothing, only the atam, the *moment*"⁵⁹, that which is worthy of respect, of his tears and packages, and not the data of those "leading" ideals that are paraded on the parade of the day over the principles of the moment. And from Feuerbach's maxim "der Mensch ist, was er ^{ist}" came the whole ideology of socialism, from his teaching that only "good food" can make a person noble.

There is nothing inherently wrong with recognising the size of the chalice and its mechanics.

national election, the dignity of the group and the dignity of the generation over the durable, over the species, our legal system has come to *emphasise* (openly or disguised) the *idea of statehood*, which is the meaning of the form of national will, which is not only the immediate, the present, the "phenomenal", but also the lasting one, which lays its hand on a chaotic collection of "independent" individuals, which is, as I would say, following Schapenhauer, "the highest degree of will projection".⁶⁰ This highest stage was the lowest for our jurists, and the lowest is the highest. For those who create history, national conquerors, the main goal is to dominate and control life in their own thick, no matter how much people's energy it requires, no matter what means it . These nations have developed a proud mantra: Navigare necesse est vivere non est necesse: essential , benefits and profit are nothing. In the na-

ⁱ *der Mensch was er ißt* (German) - chalavek ist what he is.

The "vivere" was not a strong organisation of the nation that ensured its freedom in the fight between races, but only the "freedom" of the individual and the agul. *Hobbes* identifies four tasks of the state: 1) protection from strangers, 2) peace at home, 3) enrichment of the subjects, and 4) protection of their freedoms. Of these four, we understood only the last three, and the most important task of the state was to ensure the fourth - "freedom". Abyvatsel looked at the state from the point of view of the needs and goals of the individual, from the point of view of the "natural rights of the individual", which had to be respected first and foremost. Not from the top down, but from the bottom up. It was not the power of the state that mattered, but only the provision of a time for the adzinka or adzinak. The state was not an apparatus for achieving the goal of the nation, but for the benefit of the individual.

It is clear that when you look at the subject in this way, *the adjunct or "na-* The "family" has been in competition with states or nations - state-national ideals have been relegated to the background. A nation has no right over an individual, which is sovereign to the extent that it has the right to *secede* from a given nation or state association. Anyone who was happy with should be happy with Ukrainians - this would be unheard of for human rights activists to clamour for "free individuality", because "such views are contrary to the very psychology of nationhood and deserve to be condemned as a result of the very destruction of nationhood and *individuality*"; "it is necessary to establish the principle of political freedom of the national identity of the *individual*". Subjects of nationality "should recognise not a tribe, but an individual person", and "national rights are nothing but the rights of individuals".⁶¹ Thus, in the case of confusion between the individual and the nation, the former should give way to the latter "The first and foremost public task, which is the only way through the entire history of humanity, is to cause a *human* being to free himself from all confusion", and "every *human being is the highest goal in himself*".⁶² As a national ideal that demanded full obedience to its orders, as a national ideal whose "fetters" became "unbearable" for our "sovereign person", the nation and the state were being transformed into the "phantom" that Franco was laughing at. Pravansalets knew only the "*will of the people*", not the "will of people". He was just one of the typical progenitors of the banal "people's love". "If *the will of the people* is ensured by statehood (national-statehood), then we must fight for statehood, if the will of the *people* is ensured by association (federation) with other nations, then we must use the federation"⁶³ The point of membership of a member of a tribe rather than a nation, a human rights activist, the guarantee of a "piece of angry bread" ("*social freedom*" in the language of human rights activists) is given

political weight on a foreign demagogue. That is why, among other things, the question of the form of censorship plays such a crucial role in all segments of our political ideology. Both domestic and foreign policy makers are looking at what form of government, in general, which of the neighbouring states will be the best for the independence of the region. For the ideologues of our felicity, a "federation" of neighbouring republics is better than a powerful state with monarchs on the throne (these are the fervent leftists). If they are right, then we will add a "cooperation" with the neighbouring monarchy, which is the same as the republican independence. In this respect, the ideology of the black felahs is no different from that of the white felahs. Some are ready to defend the independence of the region, as a "union" with its red neighbours will ensure the "achievement of re- currency", while others are ready to go for "federation" with a neighbouring monarchy, if only it will ensure the civil order desire in the region, because national rights are not the rights of a nation that is at least independent, but only the rights of individuals who care about "bread and butter" and getting rid of "confusion". Because the sum of the interests is much higher than the interests of the electorate.

Both, right and left - these are the modern "Bolahov people".

The Left is the representative of the "Tatar people" who put their own (asocial and class) benefit above the interests of the nation. The leftists are the representatives of those "Tatar people" who, when Ukrainian statesmen were rescued from the Tatar invasions, were glad to see them, first of all, for their economic concessions, and then as foreigners; They claimed that under the Tatars "they *had a harder time* than princely people". For our socialists, the cities of "Tatar people" who, despite recognising *a foreign* power over them, were "the traditions of the Ukrainian people's power". After Drahomanov, the main representatives of the Ukrainian legal establishment also praised the "Tatar people" and the state struggle of Ukraine, as it was carried out by means of social "evocation" of the masses or simply defended them from their attacks. "I was remembered - a foot soldier of Ukrainophilia - and

^{and} Bolahava *people* - hence the name "Bolahava" - in the region of the upper basin of the river Slucha and Bog (eastern Valyn). The Bolakhava people were engaged in agriculture, but at the same time had some qualities of a cultured people. They were defined by their apathetic attitude towards the Galician princes to whom they were subordinate. At the time of Batu's invasion of Galicia, they sided with him and were later found in Tatar practice, paying tribute to the Tatars. For example, the Bolahavtsy and some towns in Kievshchyna and Padolli also left the princely government and moved to the Tatar government, preferring to pay easy tribute to the Tatars than to lose the benefits of being a servant of the prince.

in the strict traditions of the radical Ukrainian nation, which maintained its ideology from the Kirill Methodist brothers and firmly insisted that in conflicts between the people and the government, the latter would be on the side of the people, because the interests of the working people are the highest law of any elected organisation, and if the state does not represent the working people, it is their right to *differ from it.*" not with this or that form of government in it, but with , *with the state...* This is the genesis of all our "associations", "federations" and other "unions", which is why - despite the quaint phraseology - stateist thought is still alien in our political circles.⁶⁵

Mutatis ^{mutandis}, the same psychology is shared by ours right-wing "Bolahovites". If their public image is still unclear and if, among our uncritical government, they are still considered statesmen *par excellence*, it is because they hide behind public phrases of statehood and because they are not "free", but rather, because they are anarchists, that their group interests are not "freedom", that they sometimes turn into anarchy, but the most powerful state organisation, but *without regard to the fact that they are alien.* This was the programme of Kulish, ^{Lokatsiya} and the ^{state} farmers. From this point of view, both the Bolakhovites and ^{Saveniev} and his ^{Baghdanovites} can be called statesmen, because they both stood for a powerful state power (one Tatar, the other Russian), as long as it provided them with their individual or group "rights".

A typical Bolahovite was, as Mikhail Drahomanov knew, the spirit of which will be more harmful to Ukrainian nationalism in death than it would be in life. In the spirit of those "rights" of a person who had the right to choose his or her nationality, in the spirit of "bolahavshchyna", he fought, for example, for the sake of their Germanness during the French revolution, because France "caused the Alsatians to be

ⁱ *mutatis mutandis* (Latin) - with some changes.

ⁱⁱ *par excellence* (lat.) - superior.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Elbow* - ?

^{iv} *state farmers* - members of the Ukrainian Union of State Farmers (USFD), created as an association of Ukrainian anarchists by V. Lipinsky and S. Shemet in Vienna in 1920. In the winter of 1920, the members of the initiative group signed a charter and regulations that defined the orderly nature of the Ukrainian World Congress. V. Lipinski became the head of the union, and from 1921 Hetman P. Skarapadski was also a member. As a result of the disagreements with the Berlin Hetman centres, Lipinski's abvs. liquidated the Ukrainian World Congress in the spring of 1930. Most of the active hetmans did not agree with Lipinski's decision, and after his death (1931) the union resumed its existence. The pharmaceutical USSD was liquidated on 1 July 1937.

^v *Savenio* - ?

^{vi} *bohdanivtsi* - ?

popes!" For a politician with a Felician psyche, being "caused" by any cause is the most important thing in the world, for which one can change one's homeland not once, but even ten times. "National unity can always be achieved *with more freedom*".⁶⁶ Kali is going to "more freedom" - hail her! Kali is not the same pot for me, but for the "bolahavets" one horn: this or that khan.

This ideal of "Tatar people", "black people", "sovereign individuals", or whatever else you want to call it, took the form of "nationalism" or "socialism" on the extreme left. There, the state (or nation) was the adzina or "people", here it was the class, the "workers", "workers" or "working" people. The essence was the same: *an initial antipathy to the heavy organising electorate*, which, in its threefold intrinsic nature, requires the will and imposes its burdens on the community, the nation, and the individual classes.

For socialists, "the highest goal is to give and develop the *child*" (this is the meaning of adzinka). They are also, of course, statesmen, but they need their own state to ensure that "our man and our adventurer have a *loaf of black bread*". That's how socialists write, and the same phrase "if only bread were free" is implicitly used... But what if this bread not available every day, as, for example, was the case with the German "adventurers and husband" during the First World War, and what then? - Then, , comes the right of secession and the "self-determination" of one's state affiliation for the class, as we have seen above for the individual.⁶⁷ Drahomanov's comparison with the Russian state is that it served the "agrarian interests of the peasants". For him, it was clear that for this price, the Ukrainian intelligentsia had entered the service of someone else's state idea and "became a servant of Tsar Alexander II". This happened "because at that time it was the duty of the "nation" to "be at odds with the people". The same goes for those Ukrainians who were called "peace mediators" under the tsarist order, for they "have the responsibility for the fact that they have scattered *the land of Sialian* in three different provinces for about two million morgans".⁶⁸ - As we can see, Kurashchuk's philosophy is that all political affairs are viewed from the point of view of "ploughing the land". It turns out, therefore, that "people's love" is logical to cooperation with tsarisms, and that this cooperation is nothing more than "loyalty to the peoples". Do these sovereignties mean this? The nationality, due to its political goals, the *political* goals of the class, on behalf of which it may speak, but such a society would not exist, just as the "nationality" of the Russians did not exist

of the people's liberators who were punished by the Tsar for the "enclosure of the peasant land" in the Act of 1 December 1881. But the "people's movement" was apolitical, accepting, and ready to cooperate with any government. The distinction between the two "nationalities" is best used in this antithesis: On the one hand, the ideology of political activists, which is primarily about political *power*, and on the other hand, the ideology of peace mediators, "men and adventurers" (even if in a professional sense), the ideology of "our brotherhood", "the blacks", which goes no further than apolitical social hunger, and which is so characteristic of every uncultured class or tribe. For the leaders of this state, "for a socialist, the state *can never be a goal, but only a kindred*, a form of civilisation". He considers the case of the Ukrainian state "*from this point of view only*". "The Ukrainian state is necessary for the Ukrainian working people only insofar as it is able to provide them with the best forms of public and *private life*." ⁶³ From the point of view of the intentions of private life, he looks at the light and politics of the bourgeois, bourgeois as well as socialist. It is not surprising that our socialist bourgeois have fallen to the same standard in the affairs of the state. For them, the interests of their family titles, their property values, and their livelihoods, even at the cost of submitting to the will of others, will always be more important than the will of their own species and the key to dominate their territory. Speaking about the Russian revolts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Drahomanov pointed out that these revolts were also for dynasty, but not for "pure dynasty, Dutchess, and statehood", not in the name of the eternal "republican" *political* ideal, but apolitical revolts "*for the reign of the workers' bayars*". In essence, these movements of working-class workers, "for the reign of the workers' bosses", for any state power, albeit a foreign one, were the basis of our entire socialist nationalism,⁷⁰ for which the state idea was a book with seven heels. It is not for nothing that these socialists identified the "national cause" with the "social cause of the Ukrainian demos", and it is not for nothing that "Ukrainian nationalism... is identical with the social cause of Ukrainian men and workers".⁷¹ This is what the Galician salon socialists thought a century ago, and this is what their Transdanubian counterparts think today. They think that the class of women is above the nation, that it can achieve "happiness" without creating its own political power, but only by de-legitimising another species. The basis of this formula was the golden illusion that a class that, although it stands for the nation, could give the material and human wealth of its land to alien "tastes".

and, nevertheless, will find them "in their old age"; an illusion that has led to the collapse of the whole country. Thus, the very "revolutionary" nature of our socialism was perceptible at first. It was not the last stand against the state abusing its rights of choice, as John Mill or Hobbes understood it, who in certain cases called it the right of revolt - not against the state, but against its form. We deny the right to revolt against the state, as such, the right of Darton, who also "in the interests of the working masses" of Poland wanted to take these lands from their nation. This difference between the theories of Milton and Hobbes, on the one hand, and Darton and the ^{Targavichians}, who praised the landownership of the region, should be well remembered in the context of the assessment of our "people's love" and our right to "differentiate" ourselves from the rest of the world in the name of the "working people". It is not easy to draw analogies between revolutionaries from patriotism and patriots from rebellion, between rebels with deep cults of the state and rebels who - as we now see - leaned towards pure anarchism; between those who valued organised elections and those for whom there was nothing beyond the "private" intrinsic interests of their rank, especially the individual, or their mechanical moulding to the whole, "people" or class.

Starting from this very psychology, Drahomanov became a change of heart. and other matters of national life, such as securing borders, ensuring the peaceful development of the nation's territory. The "sovereign" self, the "bread winner" for it, the people brought from the land, and the land (territory) itself - all that was "real". Everything is true, this is a foreign state, a foreign truth, this is a foreign state. To ignore the eternal intrigues of species, of will, of government, meant to chase "illusions". It was all about who, what state respected the will of the people, and it was all about who had the power to secure these borders. Therefore, Katsyarynai Chorna's conquest of the Black Sea is as old in "*Ukrainian history*" as the Russian-Turkish war 1877.⁷² The Ukrainians who served the tsars in these campaigns did "a national and national thing for their time". Here, whole

^{and} *Targavitsy residents* - members of the Targavitsy Department - conspired to reform the Fourth Diet and the Office on 3 May in Paspalitai; the department was founded on 14.5.1792 in the town of Targavitsy (now in the Kirovograd region of Ukraine), and the actual church was established on 27.4.1792. At the same time, Russian troops invaded Poland, which led to the Russo-Polish War.

The beauty of the psychology is not that of a member of a *nation-state* who counts as his only what he has done, but that of a member of *the public*, and that of a *citizen* who must count as his own what someone else has done for him; whose functions are limited to those of a saver and a producer - someone else's way of doing the most important task, organising power and its execution. Kulish stood at the same point. All his life he was concerned about "peaceful and prosperous life", about a world independent of the world, whether it be the world of Uladzimir Vālikäg, the king of Alaxey, the world of free Gaul or Iberia, or the Pax ^{Romanai}. If Kulish (or Drahomanov) had been pressured by some tsarist authorities in Spain, if had been a competition for his expulsion from the Moorshe would have argued that his action was ill-timed, pointing to the fact that the Moors were holding the reins of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean for the Spaniards... We thought, as the old verse says, that if our soldiers "sailed in cast-iron for the Russian monarch, stormed the seas and stormed Tsargrad", then this was as important for the region as if *the Russian* monarch *drove* us to storm the same Tsargrad...

For the Pravansalts, the essence is "the land of the radnusenki", "the land of the clear and people", with the understanding that the time that gives it "people", and who are the subjects of domination in this land - the whole nation.

The extent to which these points of advantage were respected by our jurists depends on the fact that Drahomanov, from his Bolahovian background, was a student of the same name, and his two Polish contemporaries (whom he calls "shmat"), who were in *favour* of maintaining the state independence of Poland, because "because in all the current disorders in Europe the break from Russia would be their rupture".⁷³ Perhaps because if the right-winger had to choose between the "abstract" ideals of national independence with "economic ruin" and the "economic growth" of slavery, he chose the latter. The memories of "physical fitness" and "good food" are the peak of national idealism to which the right-wing lecturer can refer... It was a manifestation of the struggle for independence of almost all the nations that had left the Russian Empire, and all in the name of the perceived intentions of the "black", who had no business in "politics". In the editorial articles of Drahomanov's edited ^{Narodii}, we read that "for example, the Serbs, Bulgarians, Romanians show us clearly" that political freedom in itself "does not mean the control of destiny".

^{and} *Pax Romana* (Latin) - the measures imposed on the Romans.

ⁱⁱ "*Narod*" - printed organ in 1890. The Russian-Ukrainian Radical Party (also known as the Ukrainian Radical Party).

of the working people", so it could not be a goal of ours. Similarly, in his opinion, the struggle for independence, "the struggle for the rights of the Czech people... did great harm to Czech society". He also had a critical view of the Irish nationalist movement, saying that "in that government, the economic cause was placed behind the state cause". At the same time, it is a principle of national demarcation of Ireland, because it protects the Ulster Ulstermen, and for him a handful of former governors have the same rights as the whole of Ireland, and there is no need to parallel the will of the whole nation every case. For the same reasons, the Hungarian Ruthenia is now being separated from the Ukrainian ethnic territory, because it "has nothing *economically* in common with Galicia". Naogul pazdel who agrees with the ethnographic boundaries does not understand the pit. Lepey, not stepping on *the status quo*, limited himself to "the aggressive laws of nationality and administrative autonomy of cities".⁷⁴

I'm going to write the above-mentioned introduction from Dragomanov, he need to fight for the state is replaced by the passionate intentions of the "people", and this is paralleled by the words of the famous Italian historian *Peter Orsi*. "Despite the good and administration, which other parts of Italy could envy, it was not fun (in Lambda and Venice) to have active opposition to the work of the rapid council for the *sole reason that it was subject to the advice of others*." And then there is the second part, the language of the "boor" and the language of the "master".

This language, after all, was not an aspiration of one or another of the founders of our legal system, but of its whole. We also find this in the writings of some of the Galicians: "We don't care what happens in the world", as long as "we" were under it, and in the memorable statement of the pro-war activists (from Ukrainian Life and Radze) on the outbreak of war against the Russian "fatherland", and in the writings of various ideologues of the right-wing. The absolute, absolute guarantee of the inviolability of the territory of this nation is already a higher form of the national will's expression than the "time" of this publication, in fact, the role of the actor in this implication is resembled by the role of a pole in someone else's hands, and it is not possible to call this implication a state.

I, We (people,), *dabraboť, class, land* (territory) - eight

There were those "realities" that our lawyer "saw" and in whose name he created all sorts of "phantoms". One of these realities was the country, the *local parish*, what he could see from above his own home town.

nics. Thus, along with the other participatory values that were promoted to the "agulum", the nation's electorate, another one appeared - *participatism* in the sovereign sense of the word. The Galicians have specific features of this partisanship (this one is in connection with the other), but the Ukrainians, who were passionate about the separation of Crimea, the creation of a humanistic "Moldavian republic" at the expense of Ukraine, and so on, also defend it. I do not need to say that this anti-state partisanship developed in our country in a big way under the influence of Drahomanov. He rarely thought of a nation, and there were only "lands" for him. Of the three factors that make up a mature political nation - *territory* (land), *population* and *government* - for himas for all socialists, democrats and radicals, the last factor was the least important. They did not care who held power over the other two officials. Their slogan was not "land and power" but "land and freedom". The most important factor was the "population", and only those territories, inform of securing the borders *by someone else* (morality for Drahomanov, "sabornness" for the Galicians) or in the form of "land" ("social cause"); finally, in the form of particular intersections of this or that rule, which either contradicted the intersections of the whole or were placed above them. As is well known, Drahomanov based his project of a Russian sub-zone in the area of the Drahomanovs on a territorial principle rather than a national one, with a mixed population, similar to the Swiss cantons. In the specific programme of Ukraine's self-government it has made *not one* state-right section, *not one* whole, but several. His priorities were not the interests of the nation, but the abstract "benefits" of this or that land. Thus, the state-national thought had to stay where the interests of this or that "land" were. And he was of the opinion that "Ukrainians, instead of trying to establish their own state... should try harder to dilute all state and to join the freedom of *the region and the city*, together with all other regions and cities. This view, the "land" of the ruling elite, which was concerned only with the affairs of its own pavet, was rightly held by Drahomanov. In other places, he joined his countrymen in the struggle for the national cause, but, by God, he did not oppose the interests and needs of the whole nation. On the contrary, "the most just thing would be to kill the barracks

^{and} *vylykavkratsyy* - here: Ukrainians of *vylykaya Ukraina* (the term used in this case for the former *Soviet Union*).

For example, we, Ukrainians, will build a spring on a state-administrative *rather than a national basis*, which means that we will put the needs for the autonomy of cities and regions, the autonomy of *cities, pavets and governments at the forefront*.⁷⁵ Here, the characteristic notes of anarchism, typical for an auteur, are already evident.

The path to it was quite easy for the Ukrainian legal profession. The first stage was the change of this parochialism, this spirit of legalism, which looked at the state from the point of view of "private" or tied intimacies, or "sovereign individuality" ("humanism"), Then there was the assemblage of these intrinsic values with those of the nation, which resulted in the emergence of *an apolitical country as a "cultural", "pedagogical" or "democratic" cause*, when the nation was thought of as a purely cultural or class entity. Instead, *anarchism* emerged in its purest form, when the lack of freedom of the collective power (which is the essence of the concept of the state) was covertly transformed into a "theory". It is clear that our own "anarchism" was not the anarchism of Grave, Malatesta, Rackle, or even Stirner, but was as small, as malleable, and as volatile as all legalisms, and, therefore, was not an expression of the will of *one*, but an expression of the will of *another*; the passive non-recognition of the moment of , which is completely alien and incomprehensible to the legalists. This anarchism was a logical outcome of the entire ideology of the Right's approach. This ideology had to end with it, because complete freedom of individuals and groups is *a measure of the state*, as well as of the time of that "worldly land", which *above all* was not even a little bit a wake-up call. We have already seen how Drahomanov righteously upheld the machnoist ideology of "diluting *all* state power". In the ^{pendant} to this geography, the professor calls for democracy to "differentiate between the states" (as well as between itself). Anarchist notes are scattered throughout his works, including in *The Free Association* and the preface to *The Public*. His followers and students followed him: "All people on earth-

ⁱ *pendant* (English) - a hairband. Here it is "dadatak".

ⁱⁱ "*Free Union*" (1884) - the first Ukrainian socialist programme for the constitutional reform of the Russian Empire under the leadership of M. Drahomanov. It aimed to ensure political freedoms and civil rights, reorganise the system of self-policing, and introduce a wide range of social and economic reforms.

ⁱⁱⁱ "*Gromada*" - a social, political and literary collection, five issues of which were published in Geneva from 1878 to 1882 by Mikhail Drahomanov with the assistance of A. Lyakhotsky, S. Padalinsky, F. Vavka and M. Pavlik. In 1881, two issues of a political journal were published in Geneva, including

We read from one populariser and vulgariser of ideas that "brothers are brothers, and only good and bad state parades are made between them and each other's enemies". A state is a state of compulsion - and what state is a state without compulsion, what state is not a "lordly" state? - is evil in itself, and therefore "all the nations of the earth must establish a *free* union among themselves." What should this "free" union look like? - In seemingly elegant "nationalist" style that Drahomanov introduced into our publicist literature, this union should be "without popes and without mistresses" (including the right-wing sect), "*without* bosses", because "bosslessness is the ideal of the mass", and the mass, in its absolute form, is the god of socialists and radicals.⁷⁶

The ideal of pure anarchism, pure plebeianism! For every plebeianwhole Some organisation that was part of it, that sent him - some kind of an army man - to fight with some Turks there for the rights, it's a waste, absurd, a couple of "freedmen". So he lied without any organisation. Let's follow the rules of the "I will love you, I will hate you" session! Let him lock himself up in his own house and be "free". Thus, in the "Capital" of the national bourgeois, we read that the state "limits the freedom of the people", and for this reason this institution is suspicious of every kind of people's lover. After all, any electoral organisation does not exist for any other purpose than to ensure our "will", and it cannot exist in the absence of will, because "only *small* states, or, to put it another way, *cities and towns* can be free"⁷⁷; And if the Ukrainian people - at least for a people-lover - cannot be reduced to the size of the Swiss, then it is best to create *several* autonomous groups from them (according to Drahomanov's suggestion), because "freedom" is above all! Or we can stop with independents and start with "cities and towns", as they are called in the law; let's get away from the "malignant" state centre, from which, as Gogol said, if we wanted to jump for three years, it would be impossible to jump. "Gramada" and "pavet" are the alpha and amega of our "state", the point from which it always falls, no matter how high it is raised: to "work", to "freedom", to the parish, it all comes down.

In this chancellery, the state without the state is being defeated inways measures of the wisdom of our socialists; this is, on the one hand (if we look at the Russian literature of Drahomanov), the writings of the national Russian "socialists", all those Mikhailovs, Lavrovs

titled "Gromada", edited by M. Drahomanav, S. Padalinskii and M. Pavlik.

and other "irreducible vadaliv", and finally Bakunin. The following words belong to this apostle: "If there is a state, then it is inevitable that *it will be dominated, and therefore slave*; a state without slavery... is impossible, and therefore we are enemies of the state."⁷⁸ I would like to compare this speech, which is as telling as it is stupid, with the above-mentioned statements of our Bakuninites, in order to see their virtue, or rather, their reality. We also have a starting point: the state, all state, is added in the name of purely particular values: individuals, groups and their "will", which does not impose any choice on itself.

Drahomanov's successor is equally vivid. For the cultural nations of Europe and America, *statehood* is necessary in intra-ethos of each group and individual belonging to a state union. For the mahnovists mentioned in the Gulyaypol steps (both with and without security clearances), this is quite different. A people-loving Makhnovist sees the state's acquisitions as nothing more than "his own stamps and money, his own court, army, his own tumas and his own genres"; for him, all of these are "such prizes" for which he is willing to fight tooth and nail to ensure that he is provided with "good food". All these dishes have become a meal for the lord (for the lordly peoples), "but less perturbing to the public is the arbitrary creation of these specialised places for labour, but also for ensuring *freedom of culture and public self-worth*", for "the ability to to dispose of their own, *meat dachas*"...⁷⁹ This is the same pillar from which the Ukrainian legal system had to start its "dancing" with the "dignity": "mestzovye dacha", "gramady", "pavet", native title; the state is not a delicacy for a man's steward or a man's mind... That the Ukrainian nation's halcyon ideology was essentially anarchist is a fact that is unquestionably recognised by both his students and . An ideal citizen, says Drahomanov, "will not care about how *the highest authorities* are organised, but will be more concerned with the fact that *the will of each individual* is respected..., the will of every part of a couple, *community, city, country*, - to *reduce the power of the state authorities* of the local , *city* and to give them more opportunities to establish *the beginnings* of the *original, untrammelled and unstated paradigms*", which means the *beginnings* of anarchism.⁸⁰ In this spirit, the leaders of the Paca

^{and} *Gulyaypolsky* - from the town (since 1938) of Gulyaypole in the Zaporizhzhia region of Ukraine. Nestar Makhno, the leader of the Ukrainian anarchists, was born and grew up in this town. In 1919-1921, the centre of the Silianska Provincial Army (Makhno's army) was located in Gulyaypole.

Not only the country's leaders, but also the entire Ukrainian activist intelligentsia. After the celebration of the greatest of our living historians, "the new Ukrainian historiography... sought to promote the rights of people's activity and, in particular, focused on *such performances of the masses* that reduced the *cooperation of the state*, and the name of the *state*: "conflicts of the time with the princes ineleventh and twelfth centuries..., opposition of Zaporizhzhia to the Hetman regime in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries..., all this was a favourite topic of *Ukrainian history, popular literature, fiction, theatre, etc.etc.*"⁸¹ This is recognised!

The state, as an agitated entity that stood above everything individual, took every rule, every socialist's right out of the equation. They invented the so-called "bourgeoisie", invented some *abstract* state, based it on the words "above all classes, estates, intrinsic values and impulses", that "the state is not even that, cannot be that, should not be that, as some supernatural, supernatural being, *an active force* that would be perfect in the idea of God"⁸² The whole soul of the socialist bourgeoisie was reflected in this angry speech. The "bourgeoisie", of course, has nothing to do with it, because this phenomenon of the state has existed as long as the itself, but the essence of the attitude of every bourgeois and state is here clearly defined! The bourgeoisie does not believe that it is "superior" because it is "superior", which means that it has its own purpose and ethics, which cannot be grasped by the ideologues of the "blacks" who care only about "measures", "benefits" and "a piece of black bread"; because it forces an anarchic, self-interested individual to be subordinate to itself; because it - as Drahomanov Iranised - exists as "God's mercy", a value independent of and above individuals. It does not reject the state for the characteristics that are appropriate for that state, but alien to it, an element of the government, what it commands. Moreover, it is an "acoustic", "abstract" village, a village that stands above the general causality of the world of special phenomena, that does not identify with the "minds" of individuals and its "abstract", long-term values stand above the specific "values" of individuals: those of people, of life, of concrete and, as Franco said, "eternal values", including the actual right to "good food".

The psychology of this anti-state, through materialist

This worldview and its general doctrines (liberalism, socialism, democracy, .) lead to very interesting conclusions about the ideology of our legal system; I will use them as a cover story, as a backdrop to the topic that is in close connection with the anti-dependence views of our nationalism. This topic is a topic of *symbiosis in political life*.

SECTION V - HUMAN RIGHTS AND POLITICAL SYMPATHIES, SOVEREIGNTY AS A "FAD", AND THE PANDERING TO THE NATIONAL IMPERATIVE

Whoever sees nationalities as a special species, which, like this entity and the organic world, are condemned to an eternal cannibalism between themselves, will clearly see that neither one of them can be moulded into one and the same paw under the sun, nor can they be moulded into any other, that neither of them can be moulded into a single paw of earth under the sun, nor can two different coloured pieces be moulded into a single square of a chessboard: The weakest one (at a given moment) has to give way, because the strongest one has taken up space. But for those for whom there is not this or that nation, but "chalavets", such "symbioses" are not excluded. This was the case with our Pratinzalians. For them, the nation was a mechanical sum of units; as such, *it did not have its own collective, independent goals*, so it did not need a body that was the subject of those independent goals - a state.

This acalic, as well as the agul variation of "free individual" The "minds" of all the attorneys, not only of the state authorities, but also of all the autonomous organisations, were implicitly given to the idea of *a political movement*.

What is symbiosis? It is the co-existence of two or more organisations without mutual harm, as they help each other. The symbiosis in these terms *is parasitism*, when one of the "sponsored" organisations lives off the funds of the other ("host"), when one effort has all the benefits and the other all the costs. If we take into account the relationship between these two organisms, then there are two types of parasitism: external, when the parasite outside the host organism (ectoparasitism) and internal, when the parasite nests inhost target itself (endoparasitism). The form of the so-called "kamsalism" is a form of boundary, which, depending on the addiction, approaches either symbiosis or parasitism, without allowing, however, to make a clear, sharp line between them, so that only "*sane parasitism*" and "*typical symbiosis*" are considered to be special appearances of the addict.

To characterise our right-wing "statehood", it is necessary to emphasise that not only the events of 1917, but also afterwards, when the idea of our own statehood, in the very course of the war, inherited and owned by a number of alien and varied pundits of our right-wing nationalism, did not die in us, but, on the contrary, bloomed in magnificent colours. It did not cancel the presence of posters.

The idea of independence was a clear and ^{controversial} idea, accepted by almost all parties; this idea was, as you might expect, combined with the old idea of "brotherhood of the whole world", with a whole range of "narrow" ideas - "autonomy", "federation", "union", etc. The Dziarzhava (in accordance with the existing parochial worldview) was something that had to be got rid of, not something that had to be included. We saw that liberalism, democracy, and socialism made our nationalists more open to the idea of statehood. But the cult of intellectualism, social "laws" and "principles" and the "universal truth" made this idea simply useless. If there was an international, "common truth", then the only basis for sovereignty was its foundation - "charity", in one form or another, which was a concrete realisation of this universal idea: At times, this "community" replaced narrower categorisations - the "union of Slavs", as the methodologists used it, or the "league of nations", or the "soviet union", or the "European east" (for the "breadwinners"), in short, some form of political symbiosis.

The will without its manifestation is a futility. So is a nation. national will, which seeks to preserve only the villages it has created in the area of its sailing, resigning itself to both spiritual and material expansion. These are the nations in Europe, not all of them with brilliant pasts, not all of them sidelines of world political life, but they are the righteous of Europe. The nations that are deprived of their states and are unable or unwilling to claim their independence are also the rulers of the world, and are in search of their own powerful ideas and gifts. Unable to own ideas, such nations become satellites of larger ones, whose will to expand has not died. Such nations always live by symbioses, in one form or another, in line with foreign policy goals. Ukrainian nationalism has been well placed on this platform, identifying its foreign policy objectives with those of Russia or "Slavism", with "the times" or the parts that "replaced" it at the time. Instead of fighting for existence, the principle of unity of all was established. In place of the state, there is a supranational organisation as an ideal. I am not advocating the people's struggle for independence here: The chaotic, impulsive Ukraine has always been drawn to this ideal; I am talking about our national ideology, the ideology of truth-tellers, and it has never, at least in the moment when the white supremacists praised the national revolution, dared to clearly formulate an independent ideal, and has always been a pure flame.

ⁱ *contrecoeur* (French) - superior sir, non-accountable.

The vintage of nationalism has the disadvantage of "all-time", fundamentally consensual principles. They could call these chancellors as chancellors (they were, importantly, called independent and state), but all of them, at least in the introduction of their avatars, were ideologies based on the idea of symbiosis, and thus anti-independence.

This is, of course, what our methodologists do next. And nothing can be more characteristic of the spiritual impetus of the Ukrainian modern legal profession, whose freedom to create is as novel as the value that its methodology has found. I have already quoted one Socialist-Rightist who saw in the Boholakha *as a tradition of* Ukrainian zealotry, as they competed with the Tatars in the courts of their own princes. Now we see a "bourgeois" Bolahavets; from the methodologists (she says) we hear "the history of *Ukrainian* political development" because their main merit is that they did a lot for "*Slavic* understanding!"⁸³

For him, "the programme (of the Brotherhood) was a logical and inevitable conclusion to the development that had its roots in ancient times"... Ukrainian political thought has never seen the light of day, except for the ambition that its own legalism, reminiscent of the slavery of old, dared to impose its own brilliant past, power, creativity and freedom on our brilliant past. The idea of a symbiosis with a foreign nation was a very natural one for them. "Kastamarav... linked the cause of the union of Ukraine with Muscovy with *the arcane and eternal*", and in "The Committee that worked out the plan for the monument (to B. Khmelnytsky in Kyiv), including the inscription on it - "To B. Khmelnytsky, united, indivisible Russia" - there were well-known Ukrainian scholarly patriots: Maksymovych, U. Antanovych and K. Kazlovsky!"⁸⁴ As we can see, the patriot,

^{and} *Mikola Kastamaraev* (1817-1885) were prominent Ukrainian historians, ethnographers and writers. In 1832, he was released from the army. He studied at the Varonezh Gymnasium and at the History and Philology Department of Kharkiv University. He defended his thesis in 1844. He was one of the founders of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, the author of its programme documents. From 1857 he lived in Pechersk, where in 1859-62 he was an extraordinary professor at the university. In 1860-85, he was a member-editor of the Archaeographic Commission, one of the organisers of the journal *Osnova* and editor of collection *Acts of Southern and Western Russia*. In 1864, the Council of the Kyiv University awarded him the degree of Doctor of Russian History. In 1876 he was elected a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, in 1869 - an honorary member of the Serbian Academic Friendship, and in 1870 - a member of the South Slavic Academy.

ⁱⁱ *Mykhailo Maksymovych Maksymovych* (1804-1873) was a Ukrainian naturalist, historian, falclarist, ethnographer and writer. He received his highest education at the philological and natural history faculties of the University of Muscovy. In 1827, he defended his master's thesis. For some time he worked as a lecturer.

that even though the clerics were as shamefully free as the students who wrote these inscriptions in Kyiv in 1918, they had to defend not only the cause of Russia in Ukraine, but also the cause of its adherents.

The methods were different. Drahomanov led Ukraine in its own, separate from others, external political efforts, and thus in the need for its own statehood. For him, Ukraine was not a separate political organisation with its own tasks. There was no difference between the "national tasks" of Ukraine and the parasite (Russia) that sat on it. There was no parasitism, but rather a symbiosis, because "the Muscovite kingdom *has* fulfilled the elementary geographical tasks of Ukraine". The purpose of Ukraine was to become a subject to the state will of another nation (Russia). In 1878, the third tsarist council only addressed the fact that "hundreds of gadors of the Russian people..., including the Ukrainian Cossacks and then the Danish, were involved".⁸⁵ Thus, "in the person" of the Russian tsars, the Ukrainian people fulfilled their task, and "in the person" of the Ukrainian Cossacks, the Russian people fulfilled theirs, exactly as , as "in the person" of the Tatars "the Black Army" and "in the person" of the united Slavs - the Ukrainian "people" - fulfilled their histological mission and put a shadow over Ukrainian state traditions... A complete idyll, the mishmash is so confusing that it is not suitable for the "objective" mind of a lawyer.

Ukraine's own state-right ideals were "now

From 1833 he was a professor of the Department of Batany, and in 1834-35 he was the first rector of St Uladzimir's University in Kyiv, and at the same time dean of the Faculty of Philosophy. In 1845 he retired from the university. From 1871 he was a foreign member of the Academy of Sciences in Pecsarburg.

ⁱ *Antanovykh Uladzimir* (1834 (according to other sources - 1830) - 1908) - Ukrainian historian, archaeologist, ethnographer. He graduated from the medical (1855) and historical and philological (1860) faculties of Kyiv University. He was one of the organisers and elders of the Kyiv community, belonged to the group of the so-called Khlapamans. In 1863-80, he was a member of the Temporary Commission for the Review of Old Deeds in Kyiv. From 1878 he was a professor of history at Kyiv University. In 1881 he became the head of the Historical Society of Nestar-Letterateurs at Kyiv University. He was one of the initiators of the dialogue between the Galician people and Polish-Austrian political circles, which was called the "new era". Author of numerous works on the history of Ukraine, representative of the national school of Ukrainian history.

ⁱⁱ K.Kozlovsky - ?

ⁱⁱⁱ 1878 - in this year, in the wake of the Russo-Turkish war, the Berlin Congress signed the Berlin Treaty, which recorded Russia's conquest of Bessarabia and the annexation of Kars, Ardaghan and Batumi. The independence of the Baltics was confirmed; the territories of Serbia, Montenegro and Romania were annexed, and the Turkish Bosnia and Herzegovina was annexed by Austria-Hungary.

I will start the initial drafting by all enlightened Ukrainians. "86 Not only was it unnecessary to advocate, but even to simply promote independence as an idea. What was the meaning of the national affect, the immanent implication of the state and its highest forms in parallel with what "grew" the mind of the "enlightened Ukrainian"? If he had no political aspirations of his own, then his only task was, perhaps, to make small adjustments to the existing, from the outside, rather comfortable state of symbiosis. If Drahomanov had proceeded from the fact of parasitism rather than symbiosis in his assessment of Russian-Ukrainian relations (as he did in his studies of the Austro-Slavic and Turkish-Slavic), he would never have been able to identify the intersections of parasite and "host". But he believed that "now people have already transformed state unions and are moving towards other ones," he believed in the idea of symbiosis, and it required a different way of looking at it. Thus, Drahomanov came first, followed by all his former and current supporters, to the idea that the great power of the state-parasite on the Ukrainian target (Russia) is in the most vital interests of the nation-"host", An idea that still attracts our socialists and anarchists and which probably has no analogue in the most vigorous ideology of any other nation.

Drahomanov became an ardent propagandist of the idea of symbiosis.

The chairman of the Ukrainian parliament, as it was called from the beginning of this century until 1918, was the family man of Ukraine, *M. Hrushevsky*. For him, the identity of Ukraine's external relations and the parasitic state, regardless of the form of government in it, was an axiom. The "union" of the two national organisations should never have been broken, only modified in the extreme case, because the very state of symbiosis was and should have been protected, and it should have been protected by the other world, the world of both the "host" nation and the parasite. The name of this relationship between two national organisations of understanding was variously called "autonomy", or "federation", or "union" of two very independent members, - But all the same, they remained parts of *one whole*, bound by a sense of mutual love and solidarity, and the rest of the world was thought of only as a product of the two. The intersections of these "independent" parts could not be compared with each other. Only "people who are ... or enemies of freedom" can argue that they are . The fact that each of the peoples of these lands, members of this union, has its own state rights, and itself a state, does not weaken their inclusion in the union. Russians must understand that they should not trample on the organisational energy of the Ukrainian people, nor should they diminish it, but rather use every opportunity to

to develop it to the fullest extent possible.⁸⁷ Thus, the wisest Ukrainian jurists were not able to go beyond the "sibylline" view of the world. For them, independence excludes all separatism. The figures that deviate from the enchanted circle of figures associated with the ideas of symbiosis are figures transcendent to the Ukrainian legal system; it is not that they are not cultivated, but that they are not position to be cultivated. It is not the fact that every species has its own will; it is not the fact that the idea of independence is inherent in a particular external political ideal. For the right-wing activists, the independence of the region is never achieved ^{contra}ⁱ, but only ^{cum}ⁱⁱ, only with the help of the different villages, never ^{viii}, and always ^{consilio}^{iv}.

And you have rare moments of spiritual sanctification, such as the right The Ukrainians tried to go beyond the limits of their worldview when they thought about the law of national expansion, the essence of the spectacle as a kind of "agulhna", that stands above everything "special", that ultimately comes down to the activity of the individual, but even then they did not perceive this expansion as only something independent in methods and style. The Ukrainian nation is expanding (admittedly, in due time), but it is also bound by the same circle as a parasitic nation: I mean boring and naive conversations about the Green ^{cliffs}, Siberia, etc, which seem to give Ukraine no room for anybody in its development except its own village.

Our Ukrainian circles, both right and left, have not left this point of agreement. The right-wing, like the kulish school and the bread-and-butter "statehood", has certainly played a major role in the development of our national ideology, but this strand has not risen above ideology either.

ⁱ *contra* (lat.) - superior.

ⁱⁱ *cum* (laconic) - with, many times with.

ⁱⁱⁱ *vi* (lat.) - sit down.

^{iv} *consilio* (lat.) - consult.

^v The *Green Cliffs* - lands in the western part of the Far East, in the region of the Amur River and over the Pacific Ocean, covering an area of about 1 million kilometres? The first attempts at colonisation occurred in the first half of the 17th century, and in the mid-nineteenth century another expansion of Russia began; on the initiative of General P. In 1882, free transport of settlers (mostly Ukrainian peasants) to the Mors from Adessa and allocation of the best land in Usury-Khankava Nizhyn to them. According to the 1926 census, 303,000 Ukrainians lived in Zyalenyi Klyn (out of 315,000 Ukrainians in the Far East), or 24.5% of the region's total population.

symbiosis. For Khliborobovska Ukraina, a union with Moscow was indispensable even in the days of B. Khmialnytskyi; this union would have been a serious tactical issue for them in our time. For the right-wing, the case for the independence of this "federation" was not a question of principle, but of tactics.⁸⁸ The state farmers considered Khmialnitsky's step (union with Russia) "necessary for Ukraine". Similar to Drahomanov, for whom "B. Khmialnicki's surrender to the Tsar... was not only a natural step, but also a national one."⁸⁹

The symbiosis with Russia ("union") is one of the "categorical imperatives" of Ukrainian national politics. As a completely independent political actor in the world, Ukraine is as absurd to a state-breadwinner as it is to a socialist. It is only the vanguards of the "Russian (?) East" in its baronage from both Western democracies and Asian ahlakracys, with the difference that Ukraine is treated by these Western democracies as if it were a foreign country, and how the attitude towards "Asian ahlakra" is a "domestic dispute of the Slavs among themselves", an internalised case of the "Russian East" that requires a loving solution between "Vialikai" and "Little Russia". Ukraine's desire to be a *part* of this is not a counter-parasitic nation, but is in line with the national desire of all three Ruses.⁹⁰ It was only in the angry West that the peoples who were summoned had to break existing ties with others, to oppose the state ideas that had been holding them back (Ottoman, Austrian-Hungarian); In Russia, it was different. Here, the cause of the nation could not be fully separated from the ruling nation, but rather had to be a vigorous struggle against the ruling nation, For, as Tsyutchau wrote, "Russia cannot be understood with the mind, nor measured with a common yardstick, it has a special sex, and one can only believe in Russia, and our "statesmen" believed in it.

Our "democratic" and "socialist" Ukraine also believed in it of 1901-1918. They believed in her and the right, in the "fraternal powers of blood, spirit (or is it Asian ahlakracys?) and culture of the peoples of Great Russia (?)", believed that "three fraternal (?) nations will live in a common brotherhood. It is only necessary that the "bread-making Great Britain" (?) became "ruler of the land, not of the quality-expansion, do not hesitate, do not fail us", because only occasional reasons (an inappropriate system of government) spoil the relations between peoples intended for worldly cooperation, and one or another form of symbiosis, which Shavinists consider to be a relationship of parasitism.⁹¹

Just like the right, the left also promotes this "dying idea";

For them, "sovereignty is a full expression of will, but it is not separatism". Following their Galilean ideals, they admit that "there are no principal enemies of the federal principle in state building among us". For socialists of all sorts, the highest idea is "the right to independence for the federation"; and even so, these narrow ideas of independence are the only ones that have come from the facts, without their will, Russia will disintegrate. Whatever happened, their maximum slogan would have been "for independence and federation". They saw themselves as "a living, organic part of Russia."⁹² Just as for the right-wing, Ukraine was only the "vanguard" of Russia ("Russian East") pushed by foreign hands, so for the socialists, Ukraine was the vanguard of the same Russia ("vanguard of revolution"): it had no other role in their visions. The biggest problem for them was that the European institution of nations cancelled the most important issue for political Manila, the "national-state sibilance", from the agenda. And the opportunity was so good and it was so easy to come up with a "winning idea"! that was needed was for the "world conference... to be held... afterwards and only once all the peoples who were called upon (stupid!) ruled the rational reconstruction of the future of Europe", and as a rational development of commonwealth, "national dignity", because, after all, no nation can take the money of another or threaten another, but all are obliged to live in proportion and in agreement.⁹³

This young lady of the "avant-garde" is interesting because she is all Our right-wing activists are trying to fill the void of their "state" thought. The "vanguard of revolution", the "vanguard of the Russian East", is nothing more than a rehash of the old Kastamarava's chancellor's office. In Winnie the Pooh, "in this (Russian) federation, Ukraine had *one of the first places*", but it also appeared in the "Book of ^{Byzantium}" with Ukraine as "*an independent state in the Slavic Union*".

On the point of the "symbiosis" there was and Galician-Ukrainian political

^{and} "*Books of the Ukrainian People*" - general programme documents of the Kirill-Myatodyi Brotherhood, written in 1846 by M. Kastamarav. Two versions are known. The document was replaced by the historical and political canons of the "History of the Russians", the poetry of T. Shavchenka, the ideology of pan-Slavism, Western European ideas of romanticism, utopian and christian socialism, and the decabrist movement in Ukraine. The political ideals of the Ukrainian movement were denied by unification all independent Slavic peoples into a federation of states in Kyiv. "The Books of the Byzantine promoted a radical social programme that called for the abolition of the Pogrom and self-rule. The document had a significant impact on the ideology of the Ukrainian political movement in the former Soviet Ukraine. 19 - the first half of the 20th centuries.

thought. In general, in Galicia the idea of an independent state was not hidden in the thoughts of political ideologues, but was replaced by either narrow legalism or the so-called sabornism, which replaces the Dragomanov-Grushchev-socialist-worker "federation" or "union" with the simple idea of uniting with Russia at any cost and with any Russia, and not the purpose of avoiding the struggle for sovereignty (as we can see now, as we see now, is a princely adherence), but for the sake of only protecting their *highest* shepherd - unity with the Ukrainian state and all Ukrainian lands (this is the meaning of Galicia). For them, as well as for the grain growers and socialists, everything that breaks down the power and unity of the "European East" (meaning everything that undermines the vilification of Russia) is harmful, and therefore they condemned all movements that destroyed this unity (as the protests of late 1918.), as the socialists always pushing for separation, until bullet became a fait accompli. They believe that "Eastern Europe" (Russia) did not wait for 1919 "in any normal form" and did not "meet in a world conference", because it could have made it impossible to assess the "vital idea" of the development of the Soviet Union...⁹⁵ The Cabinets would be logical, they should, therefore, be judged by the Ukrainian revolution of 1917., because this same group, which was formed not as a special political community in Kyiv, prevented the Soviet Union from appearing "in its normal form" in 1919 at the Arcai Triumph in Paris! Any weakening of this entity, in the context of the "East of Europe" (Russia), was called the language of the Galician "independents" - the zdravda intarses of Ukraine (which were identified with the intarses of Galicia), as the language of socialists - "counter-value", and the language of bread workers - "anarchism". Here, the idea of "symbiosis" is so powerful that scientists do not see any difference between the ideals of separate (completely independent) and symbiotic existence, for them both Ukrainian and Russian revolutions have the same idea: They were also rejecting the idea of self-determination of peoples and furthermore, the prohibition of annexations.⁹⁶ Although this was not only factually correct, but also fictitious, because Russia was advocating the idea of self-determination of the nation and the idea of self-determination of the proletariat (danai nation), in particular those who were "the vanguards of proletarian revolution".

This young lady, of course, is searching for an idea right up to the very of further boundaries. As a result, we have developed a special theory that selfhood and sovereignty are not at all identical; that selfhood (as needed by right-wingers) can be very good without sovereignty. For *Polak, Badyn*, and other statesmen

sovereignty as a "touchstone of national independence", but this is a theory of national lords, not plebeians. At Drahomanov's initiative, the entire Ukrainian right-wing was bashing this idea of "independence" without sovereignty. Hrushevsky argued that "nationality for its development does not require political independence". This formula was, however, a little more abstract than the old one, since it did not include pure politics, but it still made U. Antonovych's theory of "ridiculousness and the value of any political name" for the Ukrainian nation famous. For one of the prominent, albeit unquestionably pivotal, ideologues of the Galician nation, the idea of Ukrainian identity "corresponds to the spirit of the times" - the spirit of the times that created a number of new states in Eastern Europe after 1918 - and prevents "the dissipation of the East of Europe." "Independence, self-sufficiency has come of age, and therefore we must compete with the 'vulgar understanding of self-sufficiency'... on which many Western states still exist, even if we do not remember on what vulgar basis they exist. The idea of Ukrainian sovereignty an idea that is "immoral, impossible, absurd" and "harmful to the entire Ukrainian tribe", which "*has lost its basis in its own sovereignty*". If this sovereignty were to emerge, it would be necessary to compete with !

So is the walking palitik, and so are the wuchons: "*The one who seeks The villages of the states in domination*. Sovereignty is a thing that is broken, lost and self-important. It is the missing link in a long and *fascinating* imperialist tradition of the Middle Ages and the beginning of new ages. The sovereignty of the state belongs to history. "⁹⁸ Others share this spirit: "First of all, we need to get rid of this stereotypical expression 'if only our own state'.

The same is true of the sentence: "The ultimate principles of state sovereignty must be replaced by the principles of state autonomy." It is true that we know that this last sentence frightens some fanatical independents, because autonomy, in fact, meant the denial of the independent opinions of enslaved peoples, But this is not the most important thing, the most important thing is "the establishment of international *solidarity of humanity*", "the realisation of its cherished dream, the *eternal measure*"; the "development of the highest electoral sovereignty", which would rise above the "possible sovereignties of individual states", is very important. Everything should be "in the public domain" (a circle of citizens that cannot be tampered with by the branch). Just as there, egoism and zealotry are limited to "citizens... of the whole community", so in

international life should be based on the principle of "*respect for the sovereignty of individual territories and peoples*". Full sovereignty will be attained only by the aggregate Union of Peoples". The idea of sovereignty is "the greatest evil in the given international law".¹⁰⁰

These are the conclusions of the truthfulness of the nation after many years of struggle for sovereignty; they came to the old Kulish view that "the Little Russian nation is completely devoid of the state instinct". As in the past it "did not constitute a separate state", so in the future it was committed to "the formation of such a state".

None of this was so illogical from their point of view. The task was not to "land" or "parish council". The task was to "*protect their land and their rights*". As a goal - "land", as a means of action - "baron". God forbid, there was no "expansion", no attack. The elements of domination are not the same as the elements of statehood, domination must belong some superstate organisation that would "protect" individual nations "from attacks by powerful neighbours with exploitative institutions and disturbed natures" and ensure "eternal peace". The basis of the idea that resembles the moment of domination and cares only about ensuring peace is not a person, a government, or a nation, but *a community, a class, or in the highest case, a tribe, something like the Brits or the Prussian*. And the truth is, our "self-made men" always aspire to this "ideal"; the idyll of a worldly tribe, without "exploiters" and "exploited", where all men are brothers, where the weak are ruled and the strong are abolished by the "golden men" - the ultimate utopia of the castrated bourgeois in literature.¹⁰¹

For the politicians, this mentality was not only a threat is not patriotic (the tribe goes without it), *and the very vision of the nation is blurred and partially compromised*. This is how it should be, because whoever adds to the panache of a political nation must also bring about the negative panache of the nation, which cannot exist without state-political competition. We have already seen from the grain growers-statesmen that the concept of the Ukrainian nation was becoming increasingly blurred in their minds in the context of one of the galleys of the "Russian East", for them a Ukrainian is no more distinct from the masses than a German is from a Prussian; like Drahomanov, he did not "channel science and practice". science and practice", that "Russia" and Rus' are two very separate national entities (like Rus' and Czechia or Germany). For him, we were simple Russia, "and what kind of Russians we are - we are different, we are special, , to tell the truth, no one knows the good." The essence of every

The idea of a *coercive* organisation (independent of the) is not clear to legal scholars in the definition of the state. Drahomanov's work "compel nationality" has been tested several times. For him, this compulsion is abnormal, created by "lich paradoxes", but in no way the essence of the national nature. ^{Kaniskagi} (Koniski) was labelled a "fool" by the latter for having written about this association, among other things, as a masked person.¹⁰² Forcing someone who belonged to the nation of which was currently a member to consider Drahomanov's "freedom-loving" "nonsense", "artadocy", and "fanatical exclusiveness". He was a right-wing national regressive, because he was against imposing "compulsory thoughts" and "compulsory feelings that must be imposed on the *will of the individual*". The words "renegade" "must be thrown out of the lexicon as the onset of religious fanaticism".¹⁰³ This is what Drahomanov thought, and this is what the later part of the country thought, which - as we have already seen - by asserting all the rights of the association of labour, was granted the right of the association of the movement, and this means - the approval of the kind of renegade that Drahomanov had advocated. For them, there was no nationality, there were "only *people of Polish and Russian* ", Adzinski; both Adzinski and the special grammar of the right to a national union were valid: "the autonomy of a political state is... the will of each state to identify itself to the peoples and to join the association of which it is a part".¹⁰⁴ The statement of the Marais that "the sum of electoral intentions (of a given nation) is not the same as the aggregate intentions" (*l'intérêt général*) was incomprehensible to the representatives. For one of the theorists of Ukrainophilia, "nationality exists only in mental form"... and therefore there can be two two nationalities, because "the confusion of two forms is not at all the same as the confusion of two elements of content that are mutually exclusive of each other, for example, two coherent beliefs, two passions that compete with each other".¹⁰⁵ And this was just as logical: if everything connected with wills and affects is excluded from the panic of the nation:

ⁱ *Kaniski Aleksander* (1836-1900) - a typographer, writer, lexicographer, pedagogue, public speaker of liberal bent. He began publishing in the Chernihivske Lystko (1858). He was involved in the organisation of secondary schools and wrote for their publications. In 1863 he was exiled to the countryside. From 1865. - he was in exile. He became close to public figures in Galicia. After returning to Kyiv, he worked for the Kyiv Telegraph. He was one of the founders of the Shavchenka Society in Lviv (1873), and then initiated its reorganisation in Naukovo (1892). He is the author of several literary works, the hymn "God is Great, Save Ukraine for Us", and a comprehensive biography of Shavchenka.

The thirst for "domination", "passion", religiosity, - on him, there is nothing; then - two peoples in one nation (for Dragomanov), two nationalities in one chalavek, and all the rest of the nonsense, How can there be sovereignty without sovereignty, selfhood without selfhood, independence with federations, a federation with identities, and a nation with a tribe...

This hopeless eclecticism was given by our political thought, which was born from a free moment, as a respect for the nation's panache. There, where there is no will, there is no expansion; where there is no expansion, there are only abarons; where there are only abarons, there is the ideal of peace and the ideal of an organisational and state centre, and when this ideal is found, the people transfer their highest functions to another nation and become that nation. This was a kind of political thalstoyism. L. Talstoy also started from the idea of nation building as an organised activity, which is a natural way to expand. For him, there would be nothing to hinder friendship between nations if there were no councils. "No matter who you are - French, Muscovite, Palacki, English, Irish - you will understand that all your interests are the : whether they are personal, intellectual, artistic, artistic or scientific... are in no way superior to the intrinsic values of other peoples... Understand that the task of taking away Wei Hai Wei, Port Arthur or Cuba - yours and others' - must not only be an extraordinary one, but every such task that yours will do, It is harmful to you that your council is bound to put all sorts of *pressure* on you, that *it is bound to force* you to take slaves and people necessary for conquests and their maintenance. Understand that *your life* will not be different from this, that Alsace will be German or French, *that Ireland and Poland will be free, that they will be in a yoke.*" The attentive reader will see how this agulhaga with the writings of our rights activists has three different versions! It is interesting for us because of its internal logic: whoever cares only about "life" and about not doing any "harm" to it, has no higher goals for it, nor ways to achieve them; whoever *has the nerve to lose something, has the nerve to lose the abolition of what he has*, and there is a lot of money *in* it. Talstoy logically believes that the apostles of the world's society should be any kind of person, and their edges should be free to be yoked. The logical next step would be to abolish the nation's monarchy as something that inagreementworld, and Talstoy is working on this. It makes "no sense" for a nation to share the intentions of another nation (as our human rights activists also say), "and so it would seem that *there is a smell of patriotism*, which is already a sign of

and the fact that if we had not managed to come to terms with the awareness of the brotherhood of people of different nationalities, *it would have become more and more admirable, and then completely disappear.*"¹⁰⁶

These are the conclusions of the first Yasnepalian "sages", and our lawyers have followed them - only not so cynically: First, their own patriotism, then the promotion of expansion and "Shavinism", and then - on the benefits of symbiosis, and the worldly life of the country "where everything breathes in abundance, where rivers flow cleaner than silver, where the steppe breeze is soft and the farms are buried in cherry groves," patriotism as love the physical nature of his land, its ethnographic, songs, customs, koratka, and law.

This was the evolution of our state thought. *The expression of the nation's will remained here at the first stage* - love for its land, simple and naïve, which does not imply any need for aggression, nor the significance of the moment of domination (sovereignty) and the subordination of the first two elements of a nation (territory and population) to the element of power, without which no nation can leave the sphere of law. The first one is a state, like the will of somebody else, it should be equal for, land and will, only with a different class content (now "steppe people", "city people"), without regard to who owns it. Later, the state's vision expanded a little, going beyond purely group or individual interests to the interests of the people as a whole and the territory, but not as a political entity, because politics was in the wrong hands here. Now Ukraine is supposed to play a political role, but not its own, but only as a supplementary role, as something attached to someone else. The unreasonable moment of, the unnecessary of it, when all nations principle solidarity, when the fight between them is unclear, gave the nation (at all stages of development) a fragile and vague character, The character of a vague and often vague entity that has moved from "nation" to "people", from "people" to "tribe", and finally to the diminution of the nation's power and its full support of the highest levels of organisation. The panache of the nation was largely replaced by the panache of *the plebs*, a group that was only concerned with the protection of its economic or cultural interests and that did not generally recognise the importance of the aristocratic element in organised society ("lords, popes and kings").

This can be interpreted as a speciality of the state-owned cannabis industry.

The principles of the rule of law. How can we explain, on the one hand, the anarchic nature of this concept, the lack of independence and the state as a

such, and on the other hand, simultaneous obedience to all supranational organisational forces ("Chalavets", "Slavs", "European East")? I interpret this as follows: putting the interests of an individual (or a group of them), "will" (and its distinctions - "dabrabut" and others) at the centre of his views on the state, the human rights activist had to engage in such a way that would ensure this "will" as the greatest. This led him first to abstinence, and then to the administration of the state. But, on the other hand, by giving more weight to the particular (his own self, his righteousness, the intentions of this generation, narrow economic work and unreasonable measure), he closed his eyes to the rest, many of the intentions of this party, which had once interested him, were somehow crushed, he no longer cared about "agitation", organising elections, the state and the king. If there was "land" and "will", then it was all the same as if there was "power". This, among other things, explains the extreme instability of the Ukrainian legal system, its scarcity, lack of long-lasting perceptions, . This all stemmed from the fact that, locked in narrow circle of its partisan intrigues, the legal profession had *no* interest in attempts at "high politics"; it accepted, as a kind of "abstract goal", any expression that would give it only a pitiful breath in its circle. But he did not think about the right to power, he thought only about the "lasses and pashas" and the world, the right to have one's own language, and so on, and who would give it all, "how the higher state authorities would manage it", as Drahomanov said, was not of interest to him.¹⁰⁷

For Feuerbach, "der Leib ist mein Leben selber"ⁱ and for Franco Only the "whole" was "eternal". For lawyers, it was the realisation of the reality of each individual citizen in a society with its fundamental principles. The nation was identical to its sum, and it did not have any specific tasks or goals, other than those of individuals, classes, or generations. Thus, it did not require a special factor for their achievement - neither the state nor the ruling class...

Now I can draw the conclusions that I mentioned at the end of last week's chapter. These conclusions are as follows: where there no "nation", where the "truth" of other groups ("tribe", "class", "section") is overridden by the national truth, this national truth is only valid for a few, because it does not agree with the apostles; there, without the "priusis not a just will, but an intention.

ⁱ *der Leib ist mein Leben selber* (in German) - the whole thing is my life.

ⁱⁱ *causa sui* (Latin) - the fault of .

lect, all "truth" must prove its reasonableness. This is how our nationalism (the unconditional right of a nation to independent existence) - in the eyes of our human rights *activists* - *lost its activist character*. The national idea has acquired a derivative character. Our nationalism did not know national pastoralists as individuals, as something that was not debated, was not a matter of faith, or a dogma. The imperatives of the nation were not *categorical*, but *hypothetical* imperatives (not "S is for S," but "if *they*, then S is for S"). From the point of view of not relativity but madness, their judgement of the nation was never *ad hoc*, but always problematic (S could be R). Orders of national importance did not matter if they could not be obeyed: *non sapit nisi datur ejus ratio*¹ (P. Bacon). The right-wing nationalists drew their decisions not from *themselves*, but from various *arakulas* ("chalavets", "dabrabyt") or, as Drahomanov puts it, "abvashchalis", they "abandoned all religious, *national*, political and social ideas that could not agree with the world's civil and scientific flags".¹⁰⁸ The nation did not derive its morality from itself, but from something else. The maral was not autonomous, but heroic. "This nation should exist not because I have a national feeling, but because I have been given the reason or the right to exist," was the thought process of the right-wing. Their national policies were not dictated by a feeling, not by a revelation received from the supernatural, but only by parades of reason ("this is good for everyone", "this is not in conflict with the intrinsic values of humanity", "laws of evolution", . etc.), they are not justified in themselves, but only in other means, or in the sanction of reason. The spontaneous will of the people, impotent and unreasonable, was the most real metaphysics for our jurists. We saw how one of the socialists argued that the highest form of the projection of the national will (at first) was to be characterised by the "Shavinists" as a kind of "acoustic village". Schopenhauer also spoke about this "qualification of the occult" when he wrote about the will of the people. It is no wonder, then, that our legal system, which viewed the act of will as something other than a state of mind, instinctively inevitable and in all forms of its manifestation, was the highest in the nation.

In its "Contrat social", Russia has focused every movement on "communication". and "spontaneous". In the first case, the motor system is *alien* to the whole,

¹ *non sapit nisi datur ejus ratio* (Latin) - this does not make sense, since it is not necessary to argue this point.

The first was the moving thing, and the second was the self *in itself*. Thus, the "enlightened" dragomania did not recognise any affective basis in the national mind, or gave it a tertiary place, and thus led nations into "spontaneous" movements, with the power of will and right (only the mind had the creative power), knowing only the "communication" of the power that stood above the nation from which it derived its right to move. The mobile village, which was in the national moment, was not in my nation; it had to act, but it had to get the bell rung. The idea of the nation has lost its own character and gained the character of a destructive one.

There were reasons that the national sense of smell had weakened on the The fact that the truth had the appearance of a sluggishness, a lack of vegetarian philosophy.

It is true that a number of other doctrines entered the arena of history and politics under the guise of "scientific" doctrines presented to the minds of the enlightened (such as French Jacobinism, "scientific" socialism and Balshevism), But they were essentially *theological* doctrines, which only supported their dogmas with logical proofs, such as the catalysts of the Middle Ages, which went back to Aristotle and for which philosophy was only a service to theology (*ancilla theologiae*). For our nationalism, it was different. You added the vital intellectual truths, which were superior to their dogma; our jurisprudence (as we have already seen) wavered in its dogmas, which were called "unbreakable".

In this way, our nationalism lost all aggressiveness. If only the other "truths" that he placed above the national one were for him self-sufficient values, dogmas of faith, he would have had a new aggressiveness, albeit in a different, non-national form. But even these supranational truths were not dogmas for him, but only truths that had to be known. It so happened that neither "the people", nor "sovereign individuality", nor "anarchism" - nothing in our legal system had the appearance of a living, exploding village. Everything was measured, neat, palavered, far from clarity and from strong affirmations. The God in whom she believed was a vague gentleman: there was no one, no two, no three. I believed in him more than I believed in her, their "aggregate truth" was not aggregate in the sense that religious dogmas claim, it was not aggregate because the truth was always true, but also because they were aggressive, because they found them *all* and accepted them, even if it took a lot of time to do so in whole pantheon of their own bugs. They have never, in fact.

For example, there is no place as dominant as Ruso (Social Justice): "If there is no one who says that he believes in these truths, then it seems that if he does not recognise them, he should be punished by death". This was not the case in the entire Ukrainian legal community, because what Ruso was punished with death for was hardly sacred to the legal community, it spoke of their "objectivity" and "critical thinking", or "reckoning with facts", which corresponded to the vague and obscure meaning of their ideology.

Having such a *place*, being moderate, moderate, moderate, untempered, our legal system could not manifest this aggressiveness in methods that it used to achieve its ideal. These are the "methods" of the bar association that I am using now.

SECTION VI - TACTICS OF LEGALISM, ANTI-TRADITIONALISM

The most important feature of our legalism in tactics was its principled variation in both *tradition and expansion*. Not recognising, in fact, the nation as an individuality, other than a given sum of its members, or a "count", we did not recognise *the continuity of the national goal*; Each generation was "self-sufficient", did not "value the system", did not search for fields of energy for future generations (expansion), and did not take over their goals from their forefathers (tradition). Those who are devoted to the original, have no respect for the dead or the unborn.

Drawing their own principles from reason, they did not listen to the "mystical" voice of the wing. No national electorate, neither present nor future, could dictate to him in the event of a flood. Drahomanov developed his historical programme for Poland "on a narrow regional basis, without any advance decisions about the *future* and without regard to *the historical zeal* of the whole of Poland and Ukraine". For him, "there is no sincere conviction, neither in the scandal nor in the national treasury itself, that this significance is not in any particular aspect of the nation's life, that the histories are not an idea, but... in one international science." Although he insisted that "it is not as real as the common man". This task "requires, first of all, a mind that can look at the matter without any prejudice, *free from all the legacies of history* and from the present *institutions* that have grown up on the basis of history, ... *intrinsic values, habits, institutions, ... institutions, institutions, institutions*."

Drahomanov's epigones also adhered to this ideology, and they did not care about the affairs of the "further future" or "histories" in defining their goals, abandoning themselves, to my miserable wires, to the histories of the nation and to the "imperialist" pallet for the future. For them, the national affair "had to be solved *in analytical (time) ways, not in synthetic (principles)*". The "temporality" part, free to depend on the goals of the present and the future, is fractional, polemical, and is reflected in the entire political tactics of the legalism step, which I am currently following.

All of this is not surprising, if I say that our right-wing politics has been thoroughly apathetic. But this is the left wing; as for the right wing, the pre-redrawing wing, the "Soviet" wing (from the Soviet Union), the first Galician nationality, I would have to say that this was an apartheid swim, it was not something like a Fabian ^{movement}, something like an "army of liberation", which thought it could achieve its goal by means of propaganda and the refinement of the people, by destroying the world.

It could not have otherwise. As we have seen, the legal profession has not generally embraced absolute political goals, neither sovereignty nor self-reliance; if her goal was to "symbiosis" with parasites, if she did not process her range of ideas in such a way that only one of these ideas would have a place in this territory - *but principally considered the idea of a barracks to be powerful and patriotic - then the idea of a barracks fell by the wayside*. Yana felt like a ; not as an person, but as a person who needed to be treated as a magician. - If there was only one "universal truth" that the minds understood, if the law of struggle for existence in the extra-organisational sense was considered to be a "whim" or a development of "uncultured" times, it is clear that everything could be achieved by calls for the aggressive realisation of the worker, use of reason, and "flags" on the path of "civilisation".

and "Fabian *Society*" - a society founded in London in 1884, which combined the philosophical and economic strand of Fabianism, or Fabian Socialism. The name of the movement was given after the Roman ardent activist Fabius Maximus Kunktatar (Marudnagus). The Fabians believed that the transformation of capitalism into a socialist society should be gradual, due to the gradual institutionalisation of theft. They were distinguished from other socialists by the presence of a belief in social cataclysm, and by the fact that they neither needed nor wanted revolution.

The "foreign policy", which focuses on economic, cultural and "enlightenment" goals. At the same time, excluding, in essence, their own *goals of power*, without having the slightest understanding of it, they are right to ignore the natural underestimation of the nature of the struggle in *tactics*, since every struggle is first and foremost, a struggle for domination, for .

The dispute between our lawyers and the workers was first of all (we thought) *an idea* dispute, and as such, it could eventually end in a paradox. That's what Zimel says about this: "The presence of theoretical and logical controversies does not harm that intellectuality *was still such a principle of negation*, because it is only a matter of exchange between the sphere of cooperation of *sensibilities* or *values*, in the field of agreement between *axioms* that *are not stated but felt* - in the field of theoretical discussions, then it must be settled *inend*", because the laws of logic are applicable to .¹¹⁰ The Ukrainian legal profession has never understood the national idea as an axiom, but rather as a theme that had to be brought out, taken out of another context. That is why his national pastulates were always the subject of "theoretical discussions", so that "difficult" points of contention (not affects) could always be argued on the basis of pure logic and arguments that were recognised as valuable evidence.

The connection between "rationalisms" and concordances was also seen by Drahomanov, who said: "We are convinced that *harmony* among nations is possible only if everyone gives up *the right to reason*, which has brought and will bring humanity out of and darkness, - and science, which, like a *force whole world*, can persuade people who are not devotees of religion for the simple *reason that they are a piece of work, and one better than the other*."¹¹¹ That is why the Dragomanovites based their entire policy not on a national flavour, not on a spontaneous manifestation of an unmotivated irrational will: This was not a matter of religion (of "theology"); the will could only be concentrated in the struggle with others (for there were many of them, and each considered itself the best); here "consent" could only be achieved through expansion, through taking part in the war, through aggression. And this did not fit the mentality of the lawyers, it referred to consent and harmony and therefore appealed primarily to "reason" and "science". And secondly, because they recognised only reason as superior to the will, *they became the ultimate consenters, the followers of consent at all costs*.

And this prince's respect for the law inclined him *to agree with him* and It is a variant of "agulhag", providing only pregnant women and women with children

"partisan" (individuals, their groups, government, generation) in the right of the nation as an electorate and a state. Because the state of warfare and warfare is too vivid and clearly demonstrates the necessity of elevating the "collective" over the "individual", and this was destroying the entire philosophy of the rule of law. *Spencer*, who, as a typical representative of intellectualism, had a great deal of influence with us, was also a pioneer in this field: "The control of the individual can only appear by chance (?), because it comes only when the existence of society is threatened, which means that this *control depends on the existence of societies that compete with each other*. This must end if this fight disappears, because then there will be *no* public proposals that can be compared to private ones. Social life would have evolved to the point where it would have set *individual* goals as *its* immediate goal. In this way, the situation is accidental or extraordinary, and I have to keep my weight down to the extent possible."¹¹² I hold a different opinion regarding the rights of public claims over private ones (*Spencer* understands these rights to be limited, calling everything a case of war), but the facts are, that in times of war and the outbreak of the barbarian war, when the administration of all villages of the city is in need of more than just a few people, this provision of "special" support is needed more than anything else. We have seen how the right-wing, like every right-winger, hates every "metaphysical" idea that requires it to be defended by individual, class or economic interests in the name of the highest goals and long-term interests of the nation: The absoluteness of state, which is natural between nations, which is dictated by the universal laws of the struggle for existence, and which elevates the heat of the "agulhas" over the "individual". The whole problem is an Islamic one, because these laws cannot be abolished, and *the whole thing a simple compromise*, because they cannot achieve their goals not by fighting, but by thinking.

Darwin's theory that the interpreter of the prism is very important over the weakest in the struggle for existence - it was not a call to their tired and sleepy hearts, nor was it a call to strength instead of reason. We would never say to a worker, "Slave to this, because I think it is true," but only, "Slave to this, *because I am pressing* it, because it is true." Therefore, they never placed the limits of their ideas on the ruins of someone else's; the "tse-tse" mentality was alien to them at the moments of the highest tension between their own "ideas". Khmialnitsky's words - "let one scene or another gift, one fall, another pledge" - were an expression of a mentality that was absolutely alien to our legalism, an affective, impulsive, non-intellectualistic one.

And this psyche was common to all streams of Ukrainian thought, whether moderate or "revolutionary" or "socialist". All of them started from the premise that there was no need to draw a parallel between their national ideals and the ideals of the worker, and that parallelism between the two was possible. They were all based on three principles: first, that the national question is not the question of the village; second, that it is not grown by the smell of the village, but by the measured propaganda and "evolution"; it is not expressed by breaking down the varieties of ideas, but only by modifying them, not by cooperating with labour ideas, but by *helping them*, not by contra, but by cum. Thus, they thought about the right to revolutionise only when these methods were tolerated by the currency system, which would immediately attract others, The calmness subsided as the party was always ready to "face the facts" and shift from the role of a political party to that of a philanthropic institution. In the top of the Statist Party, the "Call to Brothers Slavs", the essence and philosophy of the political tactics of our legal system is softened. This Fabian philosophy has, of course, already been mastered by our methodologists. They are called "shazzidzyasatniks". They, like the "bastards", paid more attention to the vilification of men's liberty than to any "state parades", and as "Ukrainian men stood for the tsar, from whom they inherited their freedom", our "democrats", "happy that the bosses have satisfied at least a part of their desires". This was a programme of respect for the critics of the existing system and its free market.¹¹³

Then, with the help of the publisher, he put it on their chalice, which would be the master of des

M. Drahomanov's collection of all the "humane", "timeless", "progressive" and other statements of Ukraine. His thoughts on the

^{and} *Mykhailo Starytsky* (1840-1904) were Ukrainian writers, theatre and actors. He first studied at Kharkiv University (1858-1860) and then at Kyiv University, where he graduated in 1865 with a degree in physics and mathematics and then in law. He was one of the most active members of the Kyiv City Council. Together with M. Lysenko, he organised the Society of Ukrainian Stage Actors. In 1883, he became the head of the first Ukrainian professional theatre company, directed by M. Krapivnicki. In 1886-87, the company performed triumphant tours in Moscow and Pechersk. From 1893 he devoted himself full-time to literary work. The Russian Academy of Sciences awarded him a personal pension "For literary works and native languages". In 1903, he started to publish the almanac *Nova Rada*, which was published after his death.

ⁱⁱ *Khlapamany* - representatives of *Khlapamanism* - a national and cultural movement of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in the Right-Behind the Lines the 1850s and 60s of the nineteenth century - who sought to bring the people closer to each other. The ideologue is Ulazimir Antanovich.

ⁱⁱⁱ *maître des cérémonies* (French) - master of ceremonies.

he fight for autonomy and (scary story!) the right to freedom of speech is quite safe and important for anyone who judges with integrity. And in truth, this is the tone that makes the ^{chanson}. And the tone of these terrible slogans was measured and "trustworthy" for the reason that the most terrible, the best of Drahomanov's pastoral messages were *about the freedom and ways of respecting the communal space*. No wonder Drahomanov was revered all Russian patrons, from the Communists to the Catholics, who praised him for his "narrow Shavinism" and his "compatibility with intrinsic values", for "putting an end to all the independent tendencies that were respected in his time"; "he raised Russian culture to a high level"; for his "culturedness" and "scholarship" - in other words, for the complete harmlessness of his ideas to those whose work they would have been opposed to.¹¹⁴

His programme of "autonomy and federalism" (Drahomanov thought) "a lot of people from other countries and peoples", including Russia, are always distant. The variation between nations is not normal, and "systems for 'Russification' are not a *matter of nationality*, but of the global public parade". There are only appeals to the sense of the ruling people's righteousness and the national question of expression. incurrent status quo: there is no need to stir it up. This will be made easier by the fact that in the fight for its cause, Ukraine will have to fight with the help of "allies, among whom *the giants themselves will be the most important*". Drahomanov's programme would not want to see him fight, because "such a programme will lead all *intelligent people*, no matter what nation they are".¹¹⁵ This is a reminder of a quote from Zimel: Drahomanov illustrates his point that "the presence of theoretical and logical controversies does not prevent reason from being the same as the principles of agitation". No less frightening than Drahomanov's federalism was his individual socialism, but this was also an aspirational, fascinating science. The gift of his socialism was not for revolution, but for the "*evolutionary work of far-sighted people*", for "apolitical *reforms*". "Being a socialist in terms of my ideals (he wrote), I am convinced that the realisation of this ideal is possible only with the full *progression...* and development of the masses, and therefore it will be achieved more by *intelligent propaganda* than by bloody uprisings."¹¹⁶ Ideology

ⁱ *c'est le tone, qui fait la chanson* (French) - menavita tone makes the song.

ⁱⁱ *Unterton* (n.) - adventurous.

The "apocalyptic battle", owning all the revolutionary currents, is very much alien to him; if he thinks of this "apocalyptic competition", it is not as something that arises from *the nature of a clash of two ideas that are opposed to each other*, but as something that can be "done without". The nature of the percipient power of the old revolutionary movements and ideas was too "abstract" for his practical narrow mind. He was a principal enemy of "tyranny" and called it "cannibalism."

"¹¹⁷

He added the "*fanatical exclusivity*" of nationalism (the lever of all great movements!). The hatred of another nation is inadmissible "as the onset of religious fanaticism". To put forward such a vast right-wing idea that would have been considered a single person was the ultimate absurdity for him. There was no maximum programme for him, frankly speaking. One should always speak *with the "minimum" pragmas*, that is, with those "which can be used to gather the most people for a *given event* as the most powerful people..., abstracting the scope for the full point and those people who have other maxims".¹¹⁸ This was his politics, the politics of the "given gadzin", the politics of people with "*other maxims*", *even if it was achieved by implanting the quality of his own idea in the souls of the masses and by making sure that this idea was absolutely incompatible with another*, as it was, for example, when he gave our intelligentsia to the tsarist regime. Drahomanov himself gave his compromise policy a lowering criticism. In some places he gives a definition, more or less correct, of the abstainers and the compromisers, as people who "do *not change or reveal the quality of* their thoughts, but only, when they are engaged a certain moment in order to make these thoughts laws for the community, put in this moment such a *number of* them as the community can decide at that time".¹¹⁹ Drahomanov's compromise was of the highest order; He himself advised "not to tease the masks" by revealing our initial goals, and he advised to reveal the autonomy under the control of state decentralisation, so as not to "lose" anything that was not necessary; this value was the essence of his thoughts! For me, this was the worst incompatibility. The essence of his political tactics is this competition for what they can achieve, "political programmes should be related to the issues that can be resolved as soon as possible... *in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd convocation* (of the parliament). Otherwise, the other political party will be transferred to the Academy of Political Sciences".¹²⁰ Drahomanov's final remark is quite logical: without identifying any other power of histories than "reason", he could not identify the coherence of a propaganda of distant goals that would affect the masses; for him, this

The propaganda was "academic". He was critical of the revolutionary work of the emigration, calling for "gradualism" of his unconventional countrymen; "our main cause (was) cultural and literary".

The essence of his programme was, in fact, a man's naïve belief in the ability to improve his social status through reforms without eliminating the political system, which rests, must rest, on its political and national unity. It is also difficult to read such naïve thoughts from an author who was a contemporary of several European revolutions and the struggle of Russian revolutionaries against tsarism: "while giving some parade to Alexander III, Draga said that it would be good if the new tsar took all this into account and started to fight the issues that need time". In the honourable paraphrases of the "well-meaning" Zemstvo, the author states that the tsar, in fact, was not a labourer of political will until he "succumbed to evil parades". With this, Drahomanov supported for his authors the already popular legend among every philosopher that tsarism is not a system that is inherently bad for us, but one that can be reformed, and that the calls for the good of the sovereign are true to the weight of the monarch... It is only necessary that "those who respect the age and condition of the citizens" try to "clarify the new council" of his memoirs on "their zemstvo and other stairs... and print them".¹²¹ The programme of loyal and political development of the impartial Zemstvo liberalism indicated in the above speech was Drahomanov's programme, which became the desire of our radicals and socialists. For him, the essence of political action was not the complete (or even nearer) abolition of the existing system, but its "worsening" and progressive reform. He considered, in his own words, only "the Zemstvo-liberal movements of Russia, on which *alone* the political hope of Ukrainophilia could be based".

Menavita was very favour of this option. politics, which would have roused the masses to the "apocalypse of battle"; putting short-term chancellorships above all else, even if it was to the detriment of the capitalisation of the revolutionary idea. He had little understanding of the connection between the broader national programmes and the affairs of the nobility and the pashas that were important to him. The fact that the Ukrainian national villages of the time did not allow for the active implementation of the broader programme, that it required the right kind of direct educational work, was only an afterthought. Because nothing was stopping a *sincere* participant of the broadest national programme, even if in programme that was connected with the needs of the day and with the future.

The zenith of the masses, as he himself was a slave, for example, with the more abstract and distant idea of socialism.

He simply did not understand these further goals. For him, words such as "Russian state rights" were "valuable", and since this right was not possible "in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd century", it should not have been included in the political programme. In Drahomanov's opinion, "in Ukraine, the patriots harmed the Russian-Ukrainian cause with their incoherent advocacy of an independent Ukraine, and these speeches were against the interests of all Russian-Ukrainian development."¹²² As a good man, this *credo* a good example of the old , which aimed to "reconcile the government with itself" and believed that all bright people were to be reconciled, that any bright national pastoralism would only harm the cause of the nation, as it would draw the wrath of the authorities, from whom, and only from them, each partisan seeks protection. Far-reaching ideas (such as independence) could only be achieved by "world cataclysms", so why, then, did they have to be propagated?

After all, "real" palettes with cataclysms cannot be counted, and... are not loved

They inherited the pains of "normal life" and "pride". The belief in "cataclysms" was the same as the belief in revolutionary breakdowns, in scores, and this one was the law of "evolution". To speak with revolutionary nationalist ideas would mean to walk in the "proroks", and these Drahomanovs were not organically in the same camp, they did not contain the "humanitarian and altruistic thoughts" so revered by political vegetarians, but rather a collection of "furiously angry works of those who did not accept the faith of the prophets and apostles";¹²³ because such an absolute devotion to his idea was bound to impress the flat soul of the Orthodox philistine, which had been emptied of all powerful smells. It is aimed at the "enlightenment" and "civil rights" of all citizens in the state, who can already choose and set up any public parades they want, and conclude that "if life is not paradise, it is still *good and happy*".¹²⁴ This "good and fast life" of the slave people under the tentative wings of the invader people was the ideal of the Dragomanovs' education.

Drahomanov also propagated his partisan tactics in Galicia. Here, he thought, long-term national programmes were already unnecessary, because if the nobility had to assume dominance in the land of the "people", then "forced Polishness would disappear in Galicia, which *has no other support but the nobility*".¹²⁵ Just as in Russia it was necessary to share one's rudimentary ideals in order not to ignite the masked men, so in Galicia hetrying to put forward a purely "manifesto" logic.

The Ukrainians would have alienated their most natural allies, the Polish Ruthenians, and would have diverted the attention of the Ukrainians themselves from "real" everyday, everyday affairs. For him, it is clear that "Rusyns have an obligation to *engage in dialogue with the Palyaks*, as well as with other neighbours" and he welcomes the words of Gr. Yuriy Chartaryi's words that, in his opinion, "we should not be *talking about Vienna and Kyiv*, but rather about our local affairs".¹²⁶ The intentions of the "working masses" (he thought) of all nations were different, such that those "intentions of the barons would be very *easy to agree with each other*, if they did not remember either Poland or the dear Russia of *God*".¹²⁷ This was the justification (for him and for all socialists and radicals) of their risk of giving up the idea of independence and other "absolute ideals", and the justification of their partisanship; by dealing only with "local affairs", public education and improving the economic status of the people, considering these matters to be the most important, he lost sight of the larger goals of the nation, he ignored the principle of government (without which all affairs in the sovereignty of the state would hang in the winds) and therefore easily assumed agreement among the "working masses", which in fact was agreement with the existing political situation. The essence of his tactics was a barracks without a barracks, a barracks without fervour and without faith, because "faith creates agreement between people."¹²⁸ "Only (he wrote) this civil barracks (in Galicia) is necessary... ..to save the people from the same injustice that we are teaching to the burners and the people, *under other, more human conditions than religious and national fanaticism*"...¹²³ In other words, the struggle inname of some idea without love for that idea, without respect for another's idea, without that, without which no struggle of living ideas in the world has ever taken place. The simple philosophy of a political eunuch...

And the fact that this so-called Europe, which has been protested Russian rebellion, was, in fact, the progression of Russian-ska-liberal "gradualism" - the idea of all revolution, which was not alien to Europe. He protested against the agitational tone of political brochures and criticised Marko Vavchok for his "Ukrainian rebellious politics".¹³⁰ In this way, dragomania was a "good" thing for Kulishavage's "statehood", which opposed any kind of "order", even if it was someone else's, even if it was in the name of a national idea. He did not, in fact, have a national policy, because he always argued as the most articulate that the development of a global Ukrainian policy should be based not on the intrinsic principles of the nation, but on those of race, class, or government. He was also sceptical about the existence of a

dependence on Ireland, because a free Ireland would "steal" the Ulster; the need to separate Hungarian Rus from Ukraine was also favourable, because it was not bound to it by economic interests.¹³¹ He fought for his native school from the "pedagogical, not the national principle"; for the certification of knowledge not from the national, but from the point of view of the principles of decentralisation, etc. I always tried to keep national moments in mind. The nation was not based on any politics, instead it was "democracy", "adzina", "people", which were meant to not manifest a "nationalist" affect, but to propagandise and educate!

These opinions were only a publicist's opinion

Our cyrillic scholars, who knew only a few of their kindred - the youth and the world who thought of the pirates of Russia as Mikalai I's first attempt to create a Slavic Federation based on race and brotherhood.

The development of these ideas fell to Drahomanov's student, the second professor who dominated the thoughts of the official Ukrainian government until 1918, M. Hrushevsky. The autonomy of Ukraine (which, as we know, is "the common interest of Ukraine and the whole of Russia") should be prepared (at the moment of revolution!) "with a lot of fun and entertainment". The most important thing is that the annexation should be done "not in a hurry, *not in the heat of battle, not in the heat of competition*"¹³² (cf. Dragomanov's "step-by-step" and the condemnation of "fanaticism"!). This makes it easier to see that some of the Ukrainian pastulas are "incomprehensible to everyone, just the humane and cultural structure of the people".¹³³ He had to be treated only in the proper way; barbarism was unnecessary... Chalavek was pressured to become a part of the revolutionary country with these views. Allofficial , partly living and partly dying, shared his views. Ukraine wanted to try to find its own "inner truth", as the Quakers and Dukhabors thought of their idea. The "idea" of country (between 1905 and 1914) in the Central believed that if there is still "fist law" in the world, it is a remnant of the old times that needs to be eliminated, not used. There are two nationalisms - "good" and "bad", "enslaved and ruling". "The nationalism of the former is that of the people... they are creative and aspirational. The nationalism that speaks in the name of the ruling nation manifests itself in the soul of every other nation, an attack on the rights of *the other*".¹³⁴ Thus, the task of Ukrainian nationalism ("aspirational") was to try to "internalise the ideas of truth" - national nationalism, while the task of "aspirational" nationalism could never "break the relations" between the two nations.

nationalisms, nor rely on the "right wing". Ukrainian ideas, apparently, are suitable for all "sovereignty of the political elite in Russia, for the "sovereignty of state-thinking groups", first tsarist, then communist.¹³⁵

In such positions, it would be a good thing for the states to "deepen *national antagonism*, to seek respect for the principle of Shavinism."¹³⁶ The point of cohesion, which was based on the principle of an abstract conflict of opposing ideas, was considered "memorable and harmful" to the fragmented bourgeois Ukraine. The idea that the country "has its own enemy entire political activism of the Russian public" was disgraced as a good thing for the Ukrainian cause, which was detrimental to its free development.¹³⁷

How alien the psychology of unlimited activity was to such a country, the way in which Shavchenka was exploited is the best evidence. No one will admit to revolutionaryism among the artists. And in the twentieth-century Ukrainian truth-tellers' interpretation of the truth, "in most cases, Shavchenka's truth is not out of revenge (competition - D.), but out of mercy". The seminarian's spiritual growth, "mending beings with a butterfly-green"¹³⁸ is presented to us by Shavchenko's advice as those methods that target "enemies of the millennium". Shavchenka's *policy of* consent and "statehood" is also at risk of revolutionisation. For the Ukrainian "Soviets" (from the Kyivan Rada, 1905-1917), it was not the defence of Ukraine by its workers that was the goal, but "welcome". Understanding nationality as only a cultural and political entity, the Soviets could not find "any common history in the world... there is no example where the struggle between peoples would be based solely on the fact that they belonged to different nationalities."¹³⁹ There could have been a national "pickle" between the Ukrainian "hostile" nation and its parasites (Russia), but "national quarrels or antipathy... would have been out of the question". The Ukrainian cause was a "purely cultural" issue, and, therefore, required "cultural" ways of expressing itself. "If anyone says that if a teacher and a school do not speak the same language, it is absurd,"¹⁴⁰ and the judge did not understand the defendant. As a matter of pure reason and agreement (not smells and villages), the national cause could and should have been resolved by agreement for those "politicians". This was progress, in parallel with Drahomanov, because it excluded the "politics" of Sovietism altogether. Here, the Ukraine was "one of the Galicians of the Russian people, which continued to be a brother

The Russian nationalist movement has been trying to achieve an aggressive brotherhood of all peoples living under the wings of the two-hatted arl.¹⁴¹ It is not surprising that from such a starting point, any rapid change of the status quo or propaganda of taking advantage of the international situation was considered to be a crime of the "democracy", which was abandoning its service to the "common" interests of the Ukrainian people; These, on the eve of the world catastrophe, consisted of elections to the Galician parliament and in the Prosvita. There is nothing surprising that, true to its principles, this democracy was true to its foundations at the outbreak of war in 1914. The party called the imminent exploitation of the international situation for the national uprising of the nation "right-wing influences", and once again documented the need to fulfil "its civic duty to Russia".¹⁴² *During the revolution*, the main task of the "bourgeois" legal profession was to compete with the "demagogic slogan of independence", which put forward "unquestionable" elements, "deprived of wise memory and a wide (!) range of national and state tasks". The most important thing was to "avoid the dread of self-absorption", in an "exciting" way of doing things.¹⁴³ The worst thing for them was that if nationalism was "*turbulent and passionate*", then it was "not safe". "Instead of these unsuccessful (for whom?) old nationalisms, the work of *exclusiveness and egoism*," they said, "we must advocate the idea of justice, the idea of universal ideals and ethical norms (the very basis of the pseudo-right-wing 'ideas!'), which M. Drahomanov, the ideological leader of Ukraine, was absolutely right to put above all nationalist claims of individual peoples."¹⁴⁴

This ideology of the fractional bourgeois did not contain "radicalism" (ad Ki-Ki

The Soviet Union was a world and Russian-Ukrainian state, and in its most prominent leaders it was at the very point of the fractional bourgeoisie's reliance on political tactics. One of the most prominent representatives of this "Sovietism" (now the UPR), with his purity of mind and historical political psyche, which could jump from cannibalistic Shaivism to the sentimental and balanced weight of non-worship of the sovereignty of other people's ideas, thus formulated the tactical tasks of the country: It should first of all involve an "eternal measure", and if it had to compete for full national freedom, this did not imply the immensity of its ideas and variations, but rather a truly massive primitivism of thinking from which all our fellow countrymen *were* sheep", but from which it was possible to work and cure. In this way, our slogans should not be learned.

Ukrainian peoples and himself as a "participant" (this does not allow for the "public" of the fractional bourgeoisie), but - to try to promote the "*spiritual guidance*" of the Muscovite people, which would lead them away from "egoistic" and "ethical" thinking, from "brahminy" and "truth-value". At the moment, this is exactly where the "chalavets" are coming from! This is the most important thing, not the fact that not enough people in Ukraine have shown it. It is true that in this context there is a "preference for rude or material strength", but it will never be so, and the country is not at a point where it has that strength, but where it has "truth, fairness and the overall protection of morality". The principles of the "brute force" had to be abolished, as they were contrary to "democratic principles, freedom, equality, law, justice, fairness, civilisation and respect for human rights". If this is not understood, then it is purely a case of chance; it is clear that "if one nation organises mutual relations... the physical fist and the other the internalised truth", then we cannot do it. But this inherited minute will come, and since "aggressive measures are possible only when the *same truth* prevails for ," there is nothing else but *to treat* the masked men "like a man without a fist" and "to call to their minds the truth of life and the ethics of national consciousness"...¹⁴⁵

I started this rant because it is characteristic of whole psyche of the "legalism", and also because a rare person can come up with such a quintessence of working stupidity, extreme incompetence in the variety of ideas and organisational understanding, not just from the perspective of life... All these peculiar "tactics" of our government (the peculiarity of the worker) are reduced to absurdity in utopia of the pacifist *Bertrand Russell's* Icarus or the Future of Science, which he wrote, that the way to create a new and enlightened society is to steal one day all the prevailing attitudes and - to provide them with a secret "substance" that would make them more valuable to their neighbours... This utopia can be smiled at, but it is even more similar to the utopia of our human rights activists, which, apparently, cannot be exorcised by any "substance".

If we were to think that these are the most important and most important tionism in tactics has been characteristic of the ideologues of Ukrainian right since 1905; it was the same apartheid in 1917, when, forced by the facts, *it had* to change its conformist tactics, but it was unable to give it the scale and the necessary immensity for the moment. Despite his phraseology and social

The current political situation in Ukraine is still very much the same. It is one of the oldest Ukrainian parties. The geographical period of this party was from 1900 to 1906, which means that it did not become a socialist party, it was still the RUP. The party was almost transformed into a group whose task was not to cause revolution, but to try to replace the part that had been drinking and to seek new ways of dealing with the status quo, no matter how temporary. This applies to the party's tactics in social issues (for the most important party), and even more so to national and state issues (for the second party). In fact, throughout the entire period of its existence, the question of the need for its existence as an independent organisation, and not as part of another, Russian one (Supolka, regional ownership, liquidation, etc.) was a constant issue in the party. The party *could not include* the slogan of self-determination in its programme, as there was nothing to compete for; for one could only compete for "*scientifically substantiated and proven theses*", which was not possible, it would seem, to say about the thesis of self-determination. For a socialist, the first priority was always his vulgar mental "objectified course of history". And this "objective" course was further emphasised by the right-wing, "which, based on Ukraine's connection with the Great Russian (?) markets, *adds to the possibility of Ukraine's economic independence*".¹⁴⁶

From this point of view, the right of a nation to self-determination
The party did not leave until it had failed to take into account the facts of the revolution and the national sentiment of the Ukrainian masses (which the party did not understand), It had nothing to do with the "development of capitalism" or the "scientific justification of national revolution," nor with the fear typical of socialists, which was expressed by the attempted revolutionaries. But even this imposition did not happen overnight: First of all, the old active parties got involved in the Ukrainian cause of "the cause of democracy of all the peoples of Russia", and one of the subsidiary organisations of these activists, which was created during the First World War (albeit under a different name), claiming for so long that tsarism existed, in fact, after the revolution took the basis of its tactics "*the hope that Ukraine did not face any obstacles in the creation of its national life*" - from the side of the princes of Lviv and Krakow. Lviv and Keranska...¹⁴⁷ All of this was not serious. The party did not count on the spontaneous will of the masses, nor did it think of imposing its will on the ; it thought only of adhering to the laws of the land, people, and the "laws" of the state and their foreign interlopers. He was convinced that a national lady could not be a woman.

gan of Ukrainian socialism cannot *now*... unite the Ukrainian workers' party", the party, as a separate organisation, had to be liquidated. "Since *the Russian* revolution (1905) did not raise the issue of national questioning in Ukraine, *we do not dare* to wait for the parade of the future day of national questioning of our land in the wake of the implementation of its calls.¹⁴⁸ The development of capitalism and the Russian revolution were those forces on which our socialism was dependent not for its economic development, but only for its pastoral care; the struggle for independence! He abandoned the struggle for this idea only because "now" it failed to unite the masses... The same was said by Drahomanov, who removed from the party's tactical plan all the attempts that could not be made "in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd ward": one psyche, the very same passibilism. And, in fact, this passibilism did not differ in any way (except in phraseology) from "bourgeoisie". Because the Ukrainian nationalism of the fractional bourgeois (in a memorable note by Gen. Dzyanikin's memorable note)¹⁴⁹ put the emphasis on the need to "eliminate disloyalty and dissent" and "antagonism between two native peoples", Ukrainian socialism followed the same practice, replacing the words "peoples" with "workers". When our democrats legitimised the old Russia, which in its intentions "promoted" Ukrainian nationalism by avoiding "*unnecessary and unwanted barbarism*", our socialism was based on the same point, turning to the Balshevik or Karen Russia. , in their socialist barbarianism, they never imposed their own chancellorate, their own idea on the masses, as well as their own political tactics, following the same principles (behind "democracy", behind foreign imperialisms, behind the Soviet system, etc.), for the "moods, as they thought, of the masses, or for the strongest will of those who imposed it on them.

The brilliant characteristic of our socialism, our tactics gave one of his most remarkable examples. The struggle between nations as a tactic is, according to the right, "unexpected and unnecessary", because all nations are striving for the same goal. At the time of the revolution, the tactics of the barracks seemed to socialists to be nothing new. Impose your will on someone? - But in their minds, this is not a will that can compete with another such "will", it *is a common will!* And these people are not competing for it, if they have "self-respect, truth, conscience, a whole bunch of humane ideas, science, and intelligence"? It is clear that if the ruling people, who came to power, recognise all these most universal things (and they do!), then nothing will be a gift of understanding... Socialists believed in "democracy

as such", they believed "that *we do not have to surrender our rights at all*. Because the laws of reason, not affect, reign supreme in the world, it would be "so logical", so "logical", so *consistent with its characteristic principles* if Russian democracy came to Ukrainians and said: "Ukrainians, we have been deluded... Now we see that your wishes are true. Thus, we, the Russian democrats... take your side and concede you the right to be hosts on your land".¹⁵⁰ Thus, Kastamara and Drahomanov have already taught us that quarrels between peoples are inexplicable (only "kings and lords" are to blame), that one can always argue about the claims of "justice" and "common truth", "logical conclusions" from which everyone is excluded. What is surprising is that the socialists sought to evoke not their own villages, but, according to Dr Russell's suggestion, by spiritually "transforming" the work of the author; What if the "revolutionary" socialists have completely forgotten the revolutionary principle - "rights are not given, rights are taken" and have turned to a philistine expectation of a *given* right, an expectation of favour? Socialists from every single representative of the ruling nation, from every regime, from democracy and from the Soviet regime, want to realise this "right". True to our fractional bourgeois-socialist doctrine, the primacy of "reason" and logic over affect, they were extremely zealous, when the representatives of the ruling *class did not abandon the "logical" conclusions of the own doctrines, but only changed them, because the logicity of these conclusions was in conflict with the intentions of the ruling class*. The right-winger could not understand why the representatives of the rulers of the nation "let their emotions prevail over *their rational* conclusions and statements". The socialist Manilawas inherited and suffered if the land (as in them) and their workers prevailed over sentiment, if it was in conflict with the "unfulfilled sentiment of a member of the ruling nation".¹⁵¹ That the "principles" of any nation arise from emotion, from the will, and not vice versa, was not understood by these volatile and gentle "revolutionaries", who believed in the "transference" of the thoughts of their capable workers.

We did not put the issue of the dispute between the two peoples in the plane of a dispute for *power* over the population and the territory of the country, it was only a matter of implementing the principles of democracy, and who better to understand how this work was done in Ukraine than our Ukrainian democrats? It was a matter of agreement and persuasion. And in these applications, our socialist fractional bourgeois did not differ from the "bourgeois" in any way. In their participation, the national powers were "immediately, without hesitation". The intrinsics of their "" became "their

close, their own", because they felt like "*an organic part... of an aggregate*",¹⁵² not an independent nation. They believed that the seizure of power over our land by Russia was aimed only at establishing and triumphing over other principles, not at domination as such, - They themselves changed their principles (democracy to "friendship", fearing that if only the principles of the worker were accepted, he would lose all impulses to "seek to seize power".¹⁵³ What they were most concerned about was how to avoid revolution, not to have a "parade". "It would have been easy to make the revolution work, but would it have helped our goals? Would it have brought *order to our land?*" The goal of these socialists was to "*bring revolution in an organised, productive form*"¹⁵⁴ "with music," as Tychyna put it. Our socialists needed a revolution that would "raise the revolutionary spirit of the masses to the highest level" and "enable the establishment of national pastoralists", but at the same time "*do not fraternalistic (?) differences between the Russian and Ukrainian democracies*"; "revolutionary, but without explosions",¹⁵⁵ in other words, in the language of the Russian democrats, they wanted to revolutionise "in full force with quiet steps". What they were "orientated to was "the good, broad principles of Russian democracy", the thunder of the pen, which "soften the hard principles of tsarism" and give "parliamentarism and national freedom".¹⁵⁶ This was the belief of the revolutionary socialists. In the national papers, those who believed only in the law of struggle were considered "slackers" or "bandits" by the socialist bourgeois, while those "revolutionaries" who dreamed of "softening" the heart of the worker were "realists"... The "realist" saw his dreams as "*not as a testing dreams, but as a memorial*", because "there is no place for doubt (in the softened heart of the worker)" in the soft soul of the socialist bourgeoisie. The great slogans of the revolution, "the celebration of the great zones, the daring eyes of the abolitionist, everything (was) *for him* to ensure that no one would be covered up". They believed in the worker's kindness, which was "trustworthy, honest, and true."¹⁵⁷ What kind of revolution was there to think about?

"The gazing eyes of the abyssal", which are their own abyssal "truth". soulful" mental approach to solving social problems, who, in the moment of a histological catastrophe, pray that it is "not covered"; who, in the time of a fierce conflict between two ideas, "without cunning" had the courage to agree with someone else's idea, which carried the death of his nation, - all this is worth recording. Such pure Manilowian "love", casual gossip, sensual legal abstraction and enthusiasm of a meeting slave can be found in

The literature of the enraged nations. It doesn't matter what party a person with a vicious psyche belongs to, it doesn't matter what slogans they write on their pews, "bourgeois" or "socialist", what are these independents? We saved everything from one touch of our tearful, plebeian souls. Did they call themselves socialists, democrats? But isn't this plagiarism from Grushevskii, Drahomanov, Kastamarav, Staryi Rytskii? Isn't it the most basic, unadorned, fearful ideology of the fractional bourgeois who want to understand the value of regulation of relations that are established only by the village, physically and morally?

The same psyche that Dragomanov had, liberals and socialists have democrats, meli and other socialists; above all, those who had "fight the good fight" written on their , but who also believed in "softening hearts" and "transforming" the minds of their workers, which was their goal as "working people". There were plenty of big phrases, but there was no appreciation of the principles of coherence of the intentions of the two nations, or the ways in which nations find their places in the sun. For Ukrainian socialist "nationalism", the goal of the policy was not to *create a nation*, but only to unite *the people* socialist union. In this case, the cause of the "working people" of each individual nation was hastened to the meaning of a "meat problem" that could be solved only through "the path of international revolutionary and proletarian unity". The goal of the Socialist Revolutionaries, like that of the Social Democrats, was to "*use all means achieve peace*" between fraternal peoples, to "ensure the equal protection of the intra-racial relations of the working people". The Socialist Revolutionaries had as little faith in the right of the nation to self-determination as their social-democratic brethren. We believe that this self-determination can be achieved through a paradigm shift from the "deep and broad democratic" Masovian councils.

For them, self-sufficiency is not the goal, but only a stage of "federalisation".

They firmly believe that when the "people" come to power in the regions that are at war with each other, the law of the struggle for the existence of the pre-organisational world will be followed by the execution of their village, and the law of "saliency" will take its place. And although, as they admit, "Ukrainians from the time of the Kiryi-la-Myatodyi Brotherhood, from Drahomanov to the very last couple, have been *vainly* arguing for the need for decentralisation and federalisation of Russia, these tactics should not be abandoned now: "davodzitsya" further... Then they came to independence, but not because it would be a cathartic one.

The economic imperatives of the nation's unity, but because "*there was no other way out*". But these exits are only Seitensprung, which is a great thing to foresee, because although they are against separatism, Ukrainians are always going for their old goal - "to build and serve the East of Europe". Because "in the East of Europe, such a superpowerful Union must be formed, this is a sure thing."¹⁵⁸

I have already noted that these open partisanships of the Ukrainian legal system were based on the principle of anxiety about organising *power* in these people whose horizons did not extend beyond the of "local affairs", culture, economic development - the palette of family titles. On the basis of such a "policy" (and it was, despite the loud phrases of socialism), they believed that it could be parallel to the Muscovite government, *which was given to* them (with tsarism, democracy, and soviets). This policy of "small deeds" and avoiding a break with the existing system at any cost often translated into *extraordinary philanthropy*. While Drahomanov's party dealt only with such matters that could be handled in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd convocation of the parliament, the socialists (a political party!) considered fundraising to be the most important task in Ukraine during the current crisis, which meant looking for "those forms of work that could already lay the groundwork for ending the devastating labour" that the war had thrown the country into.

This practical "binder" was built to work with (someone else's) approval. women, and then "not for the sake of politics or the overthrow of the government, but for real cultural and public service work",¹⁵⁹ and this practice of "small affairs" (which so reminds us of Drahomanov's "minimalist" programme) was implemented by the Revolutionary Party of the Soviet Union not at the moment of aggressive stabilisation of the anosyns, but (in 1922) at the moment of the most critical state of the Bolshevik regime in Ukraine.) in the moment of the most critical state of the Bolshevik government in Ukraine! This tactic reminded social democrats, who, in the midst of war (1915), had been the most prominent truth-tellers, who had identified the most important and "most urgent" goal of Ukrainian politics in the former Ukrainian Empire... the campaign for a public school.¹⁶⁰ The "revolutionary" party of SRs themselves considered their most important task during the period *of revolution* to be "to use all villages to keep not only young people, but all labour, but all the working people from unnecessary activities and speeches", thus rise to the need to counter the volatile arguments of Russian liberalism, which defended its collaboration with tsarism. "We were not a revolutionary party (as one of the SR leaders admits), which is not passionate about its views, but... good neighbours, which

I try to get with all women: don't anger God, don't abrasion the devil. We were not "agreeersin essence, but with our *gentleness* we helped to create the conditions for "agreement of abstract conditions. "¹⁶¹

The advice could be given to some of these political insignificance of the "revolutionary" branches! Cooperation with any government that would give them the power to grow their own "local affairs", to work on "minimal" or simple philanthropic or school programmes, to do what they can do and achieve "now", to work "for the benefit of everybody", and not just the native land, without "brotherly war" - all of which revealed the typical for all Ukrainian parties *insecurity at the point of power*, following the ideals of *the tribe* (not the nation), which limited their actions to matters of purely local nature.

How the representatives of foreign nationalism, especially Russian nationalism, were distinguished in these terms! Our human rights activists looked at the element of power *from the point of view of the economic and cultural "benefits"* that this power offers them. Representatives of Russian nationalism *looked at these "benefits" from the point of view of power, and they were aimed at weakening someone else's (in their own words) power*. Balshaviks looked at everything, including the situation in Ukraine, from the point of view of grabbing their power. For them, all attempts were, *first and foremost*, valued and political. Our "SRs" have the opposite; all attempts at war and politics were first and foremost food issues: They were ready to recognise any government that would give them the power to engage in philanthropy for the "working people", just as Drahomanov was ready to see Alexander III take a piece of the pie for his "light" people. On the other hand, on the contrary, the authorities were the first to be questioned, and no agrarian reforms for the "working people", for example, could prevent the Russian revolutionaries from differing with Alexander II and Pyotr Stalypin. In these harbours, there is an institution of members of the nation-pan, for whom all economic concessions to the class or to the nation are illusory, as long as they do not hold political power. In this regard, they have the same problem as our rights activists, and there is a difference between politics and philanthropy.

The right-wing parties' methods of political barbecue are not relevant here. It should be remembered that they excluded from these methods the element of revolutionary activity, which was considered to be exclusive to anarchists. More or less the same ideology of apartheid, if we can say that the princes

respect for apartheid, sorrow and *the old Galician political ideology*, and so on, from all quarters, from "clerks" to "workers" to socialists of all stripes.

The main practitioners of apartheid were the "people's leaders", while the tactical ones (who did not engage in tactics) were the radicals. Their "first and *initial* goal" was to "help to save material and give truth to the people". Only when this "rudimentary" goal was achieved, it would be time to think about "*high political matters*", and once one had "achieved" 's minimum programme - by "legal means" - one would not do "anything that would be difficult... for the constitution".¹⁶² This is how the principles of the Galician policy were formulated in 1890, with the recommendation that they be "for all lovers of truth and working people", and since then these principles have changed. It was necessary to first give "independence and freedom" without "national non-communism", which was a "legacy of barbarism",¹⁶³ *compatible with the appropriate elements of other nations*, within the framework of the existing state, and then, "*of course*, freedom will come for the Ukrainian nation". Galician nationalism, "followed by Shavinism", was used to "materialise the people" and "work on the enlightenment". With the introduction of a democratic system, the Ukrainian question would also develop "in itself", because "the *people of Masuria* are not in the habit of pan-Palatinate movements".¹⁶⁴ The preoccupation with such things as national identity or the invasion of the region was over for quite some time, and the good democratic tone was no longer. However, to engage in such matters would mean wasting the energy of the people, not caring about "other, *even more important matters*" and working on "the unfortunate conditions of the poor". "We need such *noisy, nationalistic programmes*" only "to engage in special and *full-time work* on the understanding of the common people". It was "better for us, Ukrainians, to get excited about such distant and perhaps the most important things" (like the Galician province of independence), "since our people are bitter and we are giving them absolutely no other things". The idea of self-sufficiency is fantastic and unrealistic because "the share of the working people in such a self-sufficient state could be a hill". At the same time, the self-defence programme "does not fit *in with the strengths of our people or the political boundaries* that exist in our land". "The independence of the political in our times is a terrible *gift*." Its establishment requires "the expenditure of such a mass of effort and capital that it is impossible to establish a people's government within the existing state

The *best life for the working class is the most profitable one*". For the establishment of this "most profitable life", radicalism does not hesitate to praise Tsar Aleksandr III for causing the fall of the yoke of the "German bourgeoisie" of Estonians and Latvians, although this was done only to "then give them to the Russian Uradniks"¹⁶⁵ This already shows signs of the principles of political apartheid of socialist radicals to any political system that would provide them with "black bread" and "full-time work" on their "perception"; With the help of this "hard work", "noisy" programmes and "distant affairs" are easily given up.

This is how the task of the Galician policy was set at the end of the war. It is true, but an important reader who knows how to look beyond the phraseology will see in that formula the catechism of the apartheid Galician movement: Then - "the immanent slavery to all legal means", now - "autonomy", then - "we have drawn up our own programme specially for the needs of Galician Rus", now - the Galician-Uladzimir idea and the full ignition of the independence struggle throughout Ukraine, then - the addition of self-reliance as a rare and "gift", now - the call to "face the numbers and facts"; differentiating that the war brought us nothing but "a mountain and a decline in culture, marbles and economic ". Then - "*the minimum* programme", now - the creation of "the conditions necessary for the *minimum* rightful development of public life", and then - the work of the "idealistic" policy of tomorrow, the struggles of the politics of "catastrophe", and now the principle that "I will abolish the programme with small real achievements, rather than going into battle as a hero".¹⁶⁶ The psychology was the same.

The Galician barracks also performed with these more or less similar songs of the youth of the country. As early as 1905, the Danes were already thinking about their goal of "no national *comparison with the masses of other nations*".¹⁶⁷ this slogan became a dogma of socialists until the end of time, when their share (with a nationalist colouring) had to come from political life, And the one that remained (communist) openly betrayed its national policy, using the 1905 thesis as a basis for political renegade.

It is clear that all politicians have to deal with the abstinent, but they should not be their slaves. The Galician partisans themselves wrote that "if we are given a practical gift, we must develop a proper theoretical outlook", in the spirit of which the masses should, in their opinion, believe that they have not yet had time to act on that ideal. But such a

There was no ideal - there was no "minimal" programme and no "free work"... They themselves called on their employees to "show a clear programme on all issues", noting that "whoever does not show it, either does not have it or is cunning".¹⁶⁸ It can be safely said that our legal system *did not have* a national programme because it did not show it, it was treated as an unrealistic thing. They were fascinated by "distant ideas", attracting them to their tactics, only to be forced upon them by the moment, when, after the robbery masses of air had subsided, they returned to the old tactics of backroom intrigue and the presentation of the bill for "falling to the Masters and the Kryvyi Rih"; The tactics were not based on the mention of the masses, but on the fight with the state and the so-called parliamentary criticism. The "minimum" programme was demanded; as for the minimum, it was not sought after by other parties, but was forgotten as unrealistic. When they tried to sit down and remember something, they found an infinite number of "ideologues" who - in the same magazine - were able to take a direct and focused position on these "distant" ideas in the course of one day. In the words of the leader of the state farmers, the property itself was a "*tactical*" question for them, something like a failure to make a choice. These kinds of questions are not typical, they do not belong to the purpose of the nation, but they are questions that can emerge today and tomorrow, and remove the party from the circle of questions. It is not surprising that with this view of the maximum programme, a rare person would go to the streets to work with her absolute peasants for the whole palette of so-called small causes, which are considered from the point of view of not only immediate gains, but also that it brings them closer to their goals.

Our legal team "has never accepted Ukrainian torture from the overall plan for the social and political annexation of Russia", this is the meaning of a parasitic nation.¹⁶⁹ *Our legal profession was not aware that the Ukrainian national idea was a revolutionary idea.* Iano did not realise that it needed a revolutionary fervour to work. He was obsessed with "shavinism," "affect," and "passion" as the main features of the bar association: these flavours are unnecessary and harmful to the respect of the opponent. He did not understand that the national idea is an idea that is guided by the slogans "ci ci" and, therefore, is not akin to the concepts expressed by the words "expansion", "domination", "power". For the "competition" is not for power, but for "equality", for the "caused" (economic and cultural) decline in power. Our jurisprudence had no

I wish that the Polish Socialist Party had not been so unrestrained in its efforts to work with other people's ideas as it thought it would be - in the most hopeless of circumstances - under tsarism. And the legal scholars have repeatedly encountered a rebellion against the existing system, but have not been divorced from the deep sense of the right to occupy the of the existing system; just as the most mild choices of the student of his own work never arise from the sense of the right to occupy the chair.

I was talking about the two extreme ideologues of the two extreme parties, the Ukrainian and the Galician, and the so-called laws of civilisation. Those who thought so mechanically could not assimilate the ideas of a new intervention in the course of the elections; history for them did not dare to make such a difference as the revolution. Thoughts of revolution were "Yakubinism". "Such dictatorial thoughts went... alongside the old science of nature, the science that taught that God created *the* world in the first place, and then when it got to the point where it saw a parade in place of everything in the world, it thought about the coming *changes*".¹⁷⁰ Of course, all this was "unscientific". Only "gradualism" was "scientific" - the highest thing for lawyers, whose perception of the world was as stationary as the old mathematics of law. The notion of diminishing exists in them only as so-called evolution, but never as revolution. They never put their ideas at the centre of their lives, they are always "assessing the situation", always sniffing out which idea they think is the most popular or which is the most popular among the "people", and then following it. Under Tsarism, they were culturalists, under Keransky, democrats, under Balshevism, communists, after the actual collapse of Russia, they were independentists, and in Galicia, they were independents or "autonomists" after Bedarf. We focused on the villages of the nation and came up with ideas that would look to the future, but were at odds with the prevailing conditions of the moment, and they had never been in the villages. The struggle for different ideas was recognised only when the labourer did not give them any gifts to think, or in the labourer's case, worked hard; But even then, not out of compulsion, but with "jumps", with enthusiasm, making an advertisement for the worker, with the belief that this is not a "peradyshka", but the initial experience of a struggle that is "unnecessary" and "unwanted": the most demoralising element of the campramisu. The imposed war took in an atmosphere of and civility, which the ideology itself was also guarding, which never put the question of sharp balls in critical moments; which any conflict with "peoples", "workers' parties" or "working people" of another country

¹ *nach Bedarf* (n.) - flood ploughing.

The nation considered it a no-brainer that the pavilion would end as soon as possible. It is clear how such an ideology was floating on the development of the conflict and its causes, and how it was varied by every idea of the barbarism.

Our "people's movement" wandered in that vicious circle. It was there where he had to appeal to the masses. He criticised where he had a public avowal, and concluded a lasting, uncompromising barter with the masses. The nation was not a cause for the jurist, and so he had to suppress his own emotions, his own passion in the moment of battle. He could not follow the slogan of xenophobia, because there was no "chavvie" family, and all men were "brothers"... To speak out against another nation was against the idea of "proletariat" or the "working people", and also "intrinsic humanity"... Vain? - This would be the end for thousands of "I's" and *dobrabut*, the most important things in the world for the rule of law... In short, the rule of law could not go beyond the circle of consensual figures in its action, because the very figure of the nation was not an active, self-sufficient figure for it. What was the theory, was the practice, what was the "What", was the "How".

A palette of them that recognised only what could be achieved "Now", at this , it was not possible to look at the barbarism between nations as something unnatural and unnatural. They did not see it as anything but war. And the eight who were fighting for the organisation of the Ukrainian Socialist-Revolutionaries and Socialist-Revolutionaries: the scene is in paradise, with representatives of different Ukrainian parties competing with each other on the ground and trying to get their cannon to give up. And eight things St Peter said to them (such as the need to keep an eye out for "revolutionary" branches): "What did you fight for, for ideas? Who benefits from that? And who *has even realised* this idea? A good idea *will be accepted by the most hateful enemy, who is sure of its success*, and an evil one will not force people to any violence... Don't quarrel, don't use the ball, but ask about ideas... You all died for an idea, but you have *no* merit. That's what a fool does. You died because you had nothing worthwhile to do for the idea. For this, you will go to heaven... It is not a matter of defending the *chalavec* or defending yourself from it: it is a matter of living with people *on a human level*, teaching people to be people. This is *the highest idea of the time*. To learn to sing the same song on the ground (St Peter calls it "with the consent of the family"). Live your ideas not as a bishop, but as a common human life. "¹⁷¹

What can be said about this philosophy of the petty bourgeois? And all these You're tedious rants about the "benefits" of the barracks, the abuse of people

The belief that they have killed "in vain", the belief that a good idea is accepted by the enemy, and the desire to sing a song of agreement with him - "with the family" - are these notes not taken by the citizen from the political vocabulary of our "bourgeois" and "revolutionary" philosophers? And this is supposed to be a part of the bloody gadgets of the barracks!

Another quote is implicitly remembered, not from our legal system, but from a European. This is how Par Benoit, in the name of his hero, the Irish nationalist, pays tribute to the psychology of the nationalist's struggle in *The Way of the Rising Tide*: "Suddenly, the cry of 'Long live the republic' roused a young woman. That was Jeme Conaly. He fell to Pierce, or the two of them got into a fight... Never, as in that moment, did I realise the intense contrast between these men. One of them, Conali, has a strong belief in pen. His crude plebeian collection needs this school. For him, the power of the peacock is always trying to *find unexpected and real solutions*... Pierce, on the other hand, is the soul of an aristocrat and a patriot, who can do it knowing that he will be defeated. *His kingdom is not of this world*. His vision reaches farther than his time. He had a seed on him that grew, he knows that there will be *other packages*."

There are two worldviews here! Our "reformers", who, like the A man who sees only what he can feel, who lacks "metaphysics", tries to find "real solutions" - a difference of two new decades, a changed fallow land or a new subsidy; if this is not there, he joins the barrage. The fines that will be collected not by the present generation is a fantasy, and the idea that competes for it is a worthless idea. This "kingdom is not the hell of this world", this fanatical dream of "God's mercy" is a "neat and unnecessary" thing. My Lord (from the same novel) is a gentleman to Sir R. Casement: "I am sure, Roger, (that we will be helped)... However, *no matter what*, no one will emerge victorious from this battle, *this battle is the soul of Ireland*. It has already died, it has already died... Our liberals are still on the English ladder. In a prosperous parliamentary barn... she executed the cult of strong character, which causes and attracts"...

This "neshta", this "soul" of the people - this was an abstraction for the The Bauer's step, which "does not exist, what it does not know"; for which only the whole was unbreakable. For him, there is no sense of it, "minimal". The eternal will, the "species" of the nation, which is managed by the elders, the wishes of *several* generations, which stands above the duties and time

ⁱ *Bauer* (n.) - peasant.

The democrat, the liberal, the socialist, and above all the plebeian, for whom the struggle for an ideal is an empty rallying cry, will not recognise this.

There is nothing surprising that this point of departure *did not allow our democratic people to understand* the worker, his *ideology*, his *methods of action*, his *goals*. Devoid of any sense of aggression, he could not imagine that this feeling would be a driving force in others. Menavita believed that all he had to do was mention the good guys, and then the problems would disappear. So he wanders around in a fog, in the politics of his colleagues, falling into one lineage and then another. He is one of the well-known right-wing "revolutionaries": "We, the Ukrainian social democrats, have graduated from Marxism. We believed in its vital, creative power", but learned only "one of its palavins: the objective course of action". "We took from it only what it could give us, independent of our will, of our aspirations - the mechanical development of social assets; *not having the garages themselves, the important aspiration, in its very foundations, in its very soil, capital, we did not believe in them, did not understand them.*" The socialist thought that "we" should adopt *the "principle" of the labourer* (savet) and "the Soviet system would have started itself". The "bourgeois" were convinced that Russia's desire to dominate us led to the invention of people who were engaged in "nationalist phraseology". That for the worker it is not about the principle, but only about power; that it is first and foremost about "knowledge" - that in the national struggle it is not reason but instinct that reigns supreme - was a Chinese language for our sensual legalists¹⁷² The dzikun, as *Spencer* says, is a whole subject to the effects of the unstable impression of the appearances that close the perceptions *of the future* presence or absence. This was also the case with our speaker, and therefore he was completely influenced by the charter declarations of Trotsky (the League of Nations), the programme of the gift, without taking into account the further connection between the building and the

he League of Nations was the first international intergovernmental organisation established to promote cooperation, peace and security among nations at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919-20. The main bodies of the League were the Assembly of Representatives of all members of the organisation, the Council of the League, and the ordinary sacristans, headed by the General Sacristan. Geneva was the seat of the League's principal organs. The complex system of decision-making, the absence of a mechanism for their implementation, the declarativeness and the lack of special documents of the League of Nations caused its ineffectiveness and eventually led to the initial collapse with the signatures of another world war. The pharmaceutical organisation started its own business in 1946.

He has developed an intrinsic, untrammelled, independent of statements logic of actions, not statements but the actual facts of actions. It is not only the aforementioned organisational understanding of the politics of the worker that is important, but also the eternal transition from the past to the present, the political history.¹⁷³

Not understanding the worker (which was a must for the masses themselves to compete with him), they *understood the masses*, the people they had taught. And this slave labour was even more difficult for them. The principle that the main driver of history is always a *small minority* that carries its ideas to the masses (it is another matter on what the masses depend for the acceptance of these ideas) - this principle would be absolutely unacceptable for our democracy. The sentimental cult of the people did not allow us to "impose our will" on them, and the presence of a weak leader did not allow us to properly develop the sphere of cooperation of the nation. The deepest problem with this presidential "people's love" was the lack of faith in their own truth and in their own village. In the struggle against the outside world, this lack of faith in the old system led to the search for parallels with the varieties of villages instead of cooperation with them; In terms of the power of the individual, this led to unlimited hesitation and reckoning with the "mood of the masses"; to the weakening and attraction of those functions without which all the controlling qualities of an individual are worthless.

And then Drahomanov came along. He was quite passive in his attitude to disputes between Muscovites and Ukrainophiles: "These will divide us (he wrote) into hard and soft, *where our people want to go, it will be there*". He fought against the "bishop's spirit" in the party and against "Yakubinism", managing to actively impose his ideas on the masses. In his plea to the masses, he advised "to end each... candidate to present his programme in *accordance with his preferences*" (sic!). He has never been sure and sees "no reason why the majority of the people should be behind us now", and without this, the action is impossible for him. But the Soviet Union and the "despotism of the majority of the people" were not his ideals at all. It is true that the creative role of the zeitgeist is at least as small as his claim to the title of one of the most sympathetic magazines, Voliai, because Volia can be understood not only as Freedom, but also as ^{Willeij}, and that means "Yakubinism" and "despotism"! - But with this one of his most important teachings, in his own subconscious, he was in trouble: He had committed himself to the "old anarchists" - the Prudentialists, who were not alone in Europe, where the "Jacobin people" had gone.

ⁱand *Freiheit* (n.) - freedom (adjacent to the verb "free").

ⁱⁱ*Wille* (n.) - will (adjacent to the word "will").

and Nawat "was not happy with the Dissenters... would have *had a greater impact* on these small-scale pacifist movements. "¹⁷⁴

For this reason, Franco criticised Drahomanov. Dragomanov, in his opinion, "did not unite into one organic whole the thoughts of a specific Russian Syl'yanism... In my opinion, the townships are just the product of the working people, the Syl'yan masses in our land. His right-wing white hands, like those of most Russian socialists of that time, are identified with the exploiters and the people's pets... A worthy son of Russia, he has always believed in the mystical "will of the people" and their natural instinctive ability to achieve "truth" in public. It was the mass of the people who had to finish "building the new order". He understood the power of the citizenry too narrowly, and underestimated the importance of the role of the intelligentsia. "¹⁷⁵

This view of Drahomanov was of great importance in formulation of the palliative

the psychology of the next generation. This is the view that is currently held by all left-wing groups in both Ukraine and Galicia. This view, which excludes the creative role of the active minority (Ivan Franko's "intelligentsia"), is the very reason for the fear of our national "rulers", the lack of a mass movement behind them; the fear of speaking out with ideologies that are unpopular with the masses at a given moment; the reasons for their hopeless partisanship, which, if they were "with the people" in the moment of the historic parades, would have been tied to Kanos^{and} our "national minority" did not acquire the values required by any aristocracy: The *freedom of the electorate and the general public*: our Hryts was always clinging to the flesh of "public opinion" and "the will of the people".

RAZDZEL VII - PLEBS VERSUS NATION, UTOPIA VERSUS LEGEND, KHUTARAN "CRIPPLED"

If we want to find a single formula for all the aspects of our legalism mentioned in the previous sections, we are forced to look for this formula in his argument on the question of the relationship *between individuals (or their sums) and nations on the one hand, and between different nations on the other*. In both cases (although at first glance it seems otherwise), our legal system is "partial" over "aggregate".

^{and} *Canossa* - a castle in Northern Italy, where in 1077 the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV was separated from the kingdom and deprived of his title, as he requested from his collaborator Pope Gregory VII.

In either case, the validity of nationalism is ignored: not the nation, but some other entity is the cause of itself; the validity, the driving centre of nationalism lies not in it, but behind it; pharmaceutical - this is the will of the abstractor (in our jurisprudence) to sanction intellect, experiment ("laws of civil society" and "common truth"); material - by all kinds of seemingly "superior", and, in fact, partial ideas ("poor brotherhood", "blacks", class, rights, "privilege").

We saw here an instinctive naivety with which all the ideologues of the right (right and left) treated the state as a "dominant", "power", "active force" of the state, a nation "a favourite of God"; to the right of the nation to determine the nationality of its members, to national "affect", "passion", to the automatic national will that stands above individual attributes, above a given situation, above law, . n. This attitude of the legalism was *extremely important for the rationality of the national election*, as well as for the election at large. For the philosophers of the Middle Ages (the "naturalists"), in the midst of the debate over the right to ^{unification}, "universal" was only the sum of "special" words, captured by the same name. Universal was just a collective name for different things, and it had no reality behind it. This is how our right-wing activists think about the nation. For them, the idea of the nation (its aspirations, needs) could not exist as a *forma separatii* (Thomas Aquinas), with its own tasks and goals, unrelated to the momentary goals and aspirations of individuals. Just as ^{homoiiii} meant to them only that *omnes homo* ^{nesiv}, so "the people" meant no more than "all human beings", Gritsko, Pyatro, Syamyon, etc, so that the goals of the people, which were distinguished from the statements of Hrytsko and Pyatro (their "freedom" and "time") or tried to support themselves with these statements, were "cultism", and in party agitation - "the health of the people's intrinsic values". This resulted in the assembly of a (national) group with a mechanical sum of individual members; *its* intentions with *their* perceived intentions, and, for generals, the assertion of the right of the nation *of people*, the right to *impose its will on a* single person, a spot, a rule, a package. For our nationalists, like Spencer, there was no social censorship, and therefore the aggregate, taken especially from the selection of adzines, could not become a goal that needed to be addressed. The modern situation

ⁱ *universalia* (Lat.) - Nom. pl. ad *universalis* - agulny, all-agulny; which are adnosits-tsa da tselaga.

ⁱⁱ *forma separata* (Latin) - a separate (pure) form.

ⁱⁱⁱ *homo* (Latin) - chalavek.

^{iv} *omnes homines* (Latin) - all (all) people.

The logic of students, that there are special kinds of studies, thoughts and feelings of the individual that they impose on themselves; that some of these feelings are not "our own business, but come to us by ", with a twist. Therefore, for a sociologist, an opinion or a feeling is aggregate to what is elective (this value is less or more abstract), but for a legalist - who recognises only what he sees - if a feeling is elective, it is only because it is aggregate.¹⁷⁶ Life, liberty, and freedom are all about his electoral ideals, because this is the ideal of the Hrytskoŭ and Pyatrov agul. The idea that the struggle, the expansion of the nation, etc., have a purpose in addition to the fact that it is necessary for the whole is the most absurd thing in the for a right-winger. Only the "theologians" were unquestionably concerned with the self-sufficiency of individual things, emphasising the primacy of the "agulh", the idea, the "eternal". This was the Heraclitus moment of philosophy of those "theologians" so hated by the social epicureans. The righteous had their own theory: for them, the "particular" was not the "whole", nor did it emerge from it, but rather the "whole" was the product of particular things that already existed before. This was the consequence of *atamism*, which led to anarchism, like Stirnevsky's, though it also wore the mask of "civilisation" and "citizenship". The footnote abbreviated "spirit" and "idea" to "theological building", recognising him as a real person who felt the courtly smells of the chalavek, but he also recognised the rights of choice. Stirner - and our right-wing anarchists after him - do not recognise the right to vote (despite their own phraseology). They need the "individual" for their own sake. Only Stirner's "special" is "the self-sufficient personality", and our lawyers have this passive church of "chastity". But both do not allow for a choice to interfere with the "right".

In this atamistic understanding of the nation, at first glance, it is a The right-wing casualism and internationalism, which still put the individual over the individual, the "aggregate" over the "individual". But this is, at first, a superficial view. Because this truth was *legalistic* casualism, this value came from the concept not of election, but of the same individual. The pacifist, who has met with his colleagues, is amused: "we have nothing to do with each other, he has no more need to kill me than I have to kill him." Out of this entertainment comes the sincerity of war (which is why it is so difficult). This was a light.

^{and} *die* selfish personality.

The viewpoint of the individual who does not recognise the elections of other individuals as special individuals. If this individual's part has nothing to do with the other, then the nation has nothing to do with the other, because the nation is nothing but the sum of the same individual parts. *Out of this, so to speak, emphasis on the moment of "specialness" grew our right-wing casualism*, the addition of the rule of national civility; the science of "all men are brothers", "agrarian intentions", and so on. Here, there was no superimposition of pious heat, no pious ideology in the name of aggregate truth, but only pure, absolute truth projected in terms of selective intimacies. Their internalism was not the creation of a higher choice (Pax Romana, British ^{Empire}), but a weakening of the already existing (national) one, caused by isolation, dependence on all the orders from above, and, more generally, caused by the eternal law of the struggle for existence between nations "Chalavets", "kasmapolitism", "internationalism" - it was not the courageous internationalism of the rulers, who, by their ideas, destroyed the international system, making it weaker. No, this "internationalism" was their "safe haven", from which they ran away - my friend always advised the Perednavalnytsia - sometimes as a group: the National League, pacifist groups, as well as vegetarian and anti-alcohol groups, to work "in love and brotherhood", because the village could not flock on own, without creating some centre around which everything else would spin. Thus, our atomistic theory of the right gave us the power to administer the idea of a (national) electorate, the idea of a nation that has the will over the "individual", and the abolition of the right to choose in the face of tainted "fallen humanism" or caspian "nationalism", and the atomisation of the nation itself.

These are the brightest views on the degradation of the nation's panache, and degradation of the idea of the barracks, all understanding and feelings associated with it. In both cases, it was a play on the power of the national character, the national feeling. The concept of a nation, an absolute political one, which is immanent in the concept of the will to power and fight, became clear and unnecessary. But we still such people the time hearing the words "people", their "time", etc. in *our mouths*, we had to have *some kind of a vision of this people?* Yes, they had to, *but it was not a political nation*, only a nation of "people", or, more precisely, of *the plebs*.

^{and} British Empire.

ⁱⁱ *Dei gratia* (Latin) - God's grace.

The plebs in ancient Rome were considered to be a solid patrician: a part of the nation, deprived of political rights, a people who were interested in all other intrinsic interests, but not in matters of politics and power; in matters of private interest, but not in the intrinsic interests of the whole nation. In the time of Feudalism in Europe, the bourgeoisie was such a plebeian. As Kalyana became a political nation, the plebs became only the working and peasant classes, etc. The ruling role of the political idea was also changing, putting private interests of the adzinaks above the "acoustic" intrinsic values of the state and the nation, As a special electorate, hastening in its tactics to fight for power in another place, our legal system had to give rise to the assemblage of the "nation" with the "plebs". My nation was this amorphous entity with a membership of its members, a "free association" in which one or the other of them would a member; His ideals were nations as "good institutions, bound no more than necessity required, and strong as long as their existence did not prejudice the rights of individuals to freedom".¹⁷⁷ Democracy was associated with "men". But this was their democracy. Like men, they thought first and foremost about *equality*, but not about *freedom*, and so they were ready to forget the possibility of freedom (government) if someone provided them with equality: As Draga did to his tsarist followers, as Hrushevsky and our entire galaxy of historians who rejected political freedom, as they "demanded acknowledgement" from the same "people". They simply "bowed to the people as a living entity... which must answer to all our attempts for *individual and civil freedom, for individual and private time*". The time is the time of the individual, the time of all, freedom from all the "acoustic" villages that stood over them - and freedom from all the enemies, this was the ideal of our legalism, the ideal of pure plebeianism.

But since the seizure of , since all aggression, the Ukrainians have been In their questioning, they did not go further than the line defined by the "samaabarons", the abbots of their economic and cultural, "minimal" interests. They hated the "principle of the enemy's invasion".¹⁷⁸ They saw something mystical in the people, as well as in the contemporary masqueraders from whom they learned their science; everything that came from the depths of the people, thus gained the highest, most mysterious power in them; the vox ^{populi} was for them the vox ^{Dei}. They were expatriates of the masses. Their passion for the nation was not the passion of those who wanted it not to be.

ⁱ *vox populi* - the voice of the people.

ⁱⁱ *vox Dei* (Latin) - the voice of God.

where *the* people, who believed in the truth they had set out to bring to the world and in whose name they called the masses to follow their goals, did not feel like adversaries; No, their love for the people was a tearful and essential love for the family, for the people of this parish. It was not the nationalism of the nation, a religious ideology, with the will of the people, with the institutions of occupation, with the desire for domination and power, but a narrowly limited nationalism of the right, a sentimental ideology that would only "free" the individual from all confusion and ensure his uncluttered life under any number of wings. They based their patriotism on their love for the "old country", their customs, and "religiousism".

Instead, I want to put an idea, a high

In order to *achieve* the goal that would rise above the "particular", *we made God out of the phenomenon - we limited the nation's vision to it (1)*. Instead of including not only "now" but also "tomorrow" in the nation's vision, they were preoccupied with the first, they *limited the vision of the nation time (2)*. They were out of time, and their idea was *neither prospective nor retrospective*, with no traditions of *yesterday* and no tasks for *tomorrow*. Calling for reason and swearing by passion and fanaticism, they *made the national passion vague and barren; they limited its intensity (3)*. Accordingly, their entire worldview also changed, and instead of "legend" or "myth" they found a pagoda-like and boring theory (ad 1); instead of movement, they found spacer (ad 2) and instead of test, they found a small regret (ad 3).

The essence of this worldview was not the truth about explosives, but about fear.

ss. The supreme motor of the soul was "reason", not the will. This worldview could not stand for any kind of cooperation and aggression. He was as afraid of being cruel to others as he was to himself; he was afraid of imposing his will on them both, of hiding behind some brilliant illusion. If he had believed in these apostolic, "acoustic" villages, he would have known only the idea and the testimony in its name, if it had been meant to bring pain to "the individual". But for him, this "particular" was the essence, and that's why Kali died in a terrible struggle for its existence - because of the feeling that anxiously overwhelmed him, it was a holistic pain, a sadness. It was not the "universality" of reality, but the "particularity" of it, and the eternal flaws and lack of energy produced only pessimism and tedious pain. Our legal system did not understand such "fantasies" as religion, national missions, the most powerful national ideas that other nations knew, which were "eternal", which affirmed the inexhaustibility of the existence of their elective will and wanted to

for the death of time's duties and the aches and pains of modernity. Our government did not know this, and *that is why sadness or longing is a common feature of our nature and common forms of reaction to external forces*. This reaction started at the first stage, at the smell of pain, and did not go to the highest stage, to cooperation, to *the active* desire to control the supertime between the inner and outer worlds before the end of the world.

Our nationalists, in agreement with the way their worldview reflected in their literature, are of the opinion that "one should not steal from oneself neither the agony of joy and gladness nor the bloody complaints"... From the books of our literature, "the writer feels *the sorrow* of the tortured life" of our mountains and distant lands. He is looking for "peace in *proportion to what* , in a *liberating hope* that , will not bring an end to everything... No powerful sensations of evil that would lead to *rebellion*... A calm, easy, meek *heart* that is not able to react to evil." The reader's impression that the chalavek has a "sensitive heart" for "all those who are oppressed by such things" - the eight key masters of the philosophy of law.¹⁷⁹

This is the essence of his "humanity", the humanity that cannot be found in the "brilliant literature" that our "skilful literature" has been promoting for decades. True humanity does not grow on a holy day only through the ineffective efforts of a person, his or her constant "pain" as such, which is also covered up by the mask, the affirmation of the one in whose name he or she abdicates his or her life, putting himself or herself in an insecure position. But the sympathy of our human rights activists is far from this worldview, they sympathise with the enemy, even if it is passive; they are not upset by the breaking of their will, but only by the pain of the whole; not by the "eternal", which is no further than the present, but only by the "temporal", which has fallen to them. This is the sympathy of old women - no matter how brilliant the names in literature, it would not be covered up. The chaos, the darkness, the hopelessness that beckons the hero - these are not for the deaf and dumb.

We have "logic and reason that there is no data, there is nothing, only *atom, the moment*", and this ignoring of the data of human "illusions", "fantasies" and "seemings" that give people power over themselves and make them "live", has led to hopeless pessimism and sadness: There was nothing left of "moments" and "atoms", and only sadness and regret remained in place of the infinite, in which "fantasists" believed... There was a lustre that our entire literature embodies. For Lesya Ukrainka, melancholy was caused by fears of the death of the "eternal", of the breaking of the will and of the will of the people, while for many others it was not the breaking of the will *that* caused them *to be* sad,

inclusions, but only their specific abstractions: Adzina's death, the death of a generation, hunger, bravery, material destruction, the "par-ticular" ("atama", "moment"), which was the most important thing in the world for them, and with which there were no challenges to the object that was about to disappear; no self-determination of the will, which, dying in the end, still does not succumb to the force of attack.

We would have sought that affirmation of the will in vain, because it exists where there is a sense of *ownershipthe law*. This was not the case in our legal system. Separated by a whiff of intellectualism, it was all about (as we have already seen) the "good of the worker". Here, politics was inspired by the same spirit as poetry. "Strong! Give me your freedom... You are strong! The land of the Lord's vineyard... Brave! Become sensitive, kind - and the game is too small in the package"...¹⁸⁰ This was the general reaction of the right-wing ideology to the objective that did not give rise to women, and these unremarkable "nationalities", which were wedded to their "requests" but not "threats"; to their agitated spells of workers? Isn't this the whole worldview of our national "movement", as it was written into the psyches of its legalistic truthers? The virulence of the right-wing psyche did not allow them to argue for the parity of their rights; the "rights" the nation were not seen as rights, but only as *moral norms* that one could "abide by" but that no one else could (such as the rules of love and , etc.). So why is it surprising that in such cases there was only pleaded affection, and in the case of wife - longing?

Give yourself the smell of test and anger, work with a couple of
He is not subject to his own will, and our lawyers are not allowed to do that, because he has no will. He can only do *what* an old grandmother would do, cry out in pain; it seems that in his life, this "heart of the old nurse", the philanthropic foundations of the Salvation Army, Quakers and Taurus, are all dead... Someone said that of the great nationals, the Englishman would treat his family member like a wife (whom he is obliged to take care of), the Frenchman like a lover (who can do anything), and the German like an old mother (whom he must keep). I would say that a Ukrainian loves his country as an old nanny who has a piece of clothing *for him (and not him for her)* and on whose chest he could cry his sorrow to the mountains of his heart...

The essence of the right-wing worldview is this "humanity" and "tolerance". For them, the law is not a battle, but solidarity and mutual love. For them, the enemies and warring nations of this nation, whether they hunters or *executioners*, are

or "brothers in socialism", "brothers in pride" or "chivalry", in the "East of Europe", in "Slavism", but always brothers. For a man's psychology, the enemy is the enemy. One of few representatives of this masculine worldview in our own person, Maryam, says that enemies "do not know what they are doing": "And the approaching is not holy, but all things are melted away, as if they were a stone in a daroz"... But our human rights activist forbade the scapegoats to touch us, "for the scapegoat also longs for the light, and does he want what he has in his bosom?"

This is not ! This idea is also expressed by Dragomanov, who emphasised "humanism" and prescribed "to deal with everyone... fairly and humanely". This rule "did not and does not allow us to work with our enemies and enemies to speak of someone as "inhuman" and "unhuman". "¹⁸¹ This is the aim of the poetry of both the already mentioned and not mentioned here. We read the same "humanity" in Drahomanov, who advised Galicians not to indoctrinate "Shavinism" and "Nianism", or in Grushevsky and Vinnichenko, who called the workers of the revolution "untreated", and the "inner truth". Let us recall the philosophy of Ukrainophilia, radicalism and socialism, which saw the cause of *the national* aggression of foreign peoples and the struggle of our people only in "lords and tsars", in "ignorance"

The typical "humanity" ("don't touch me, and I won't hurt you"). (plus"), this was the highest virtue of legalism, or, as Nietzsche said: "Virtue is sitting in the mud... (Shavchenkava "to sit in the mud". We do not bite anyone and give a gift to anyone who does bite, but we give everyone our opinion as it falls to us. "¹⁸²

This "humanity" was the same as the universal laws *in the application to our people*. Here, the "only commandments" were to live a life of adherence, the only reality was the moment, the only time was to sit on a native manure pile, as long as there was no "disturbance, wings and packs". "To be humane means to see a human being in everyone, an equal self," and, of , to measure it. That is why we have a scaled pravakatar, as it is material for the church and the man and the woman. That is why (out of pity) they expect us to have a "reduction of feelings" caused by "this material situation", but do not give us an independent from it, a right to a change of attitude. Pride, anger, glorification and pride in the death of someone who has killed his idea are strong emotions for a right-winger. He knows only sympathy or crying. "We can," Suarez said to his followers, "never smile, but we can cry; we can cry, and we do not withhold the sight of crying.

or",¹⁸³ as sapient plebeians...

Such plebeians are our human rights activists. They look at all issues from the point of view of a philanthropist who knows one panacea for the modern world: the upliftment of mores, generous help, compassion, and the present, but not passion, not a compliant sense, not a noisy upset of the status quo, not any upheaval or catastrophe. Their "hearing heart" did not accept the "bloody nightmares" of revolution. They dreamed of a "better future", but not the path that their own truths suggested. The poetry of striving was alien to them. In the face of the plagues of the plague, in the face of the creatures of death, in the face of the abandonment that suddenly sent them a barrier to the future, they would have been like the jokers who saw the glitter and thunder of guns for the first time: they fell on their knees and knuckles, they were "saddened by the ruin". They are saddened by the fact that they are becoming "more and more crooked every day". They complain about the "bloody days, dark, terrible" of the revolution, because their Manila selves were inherited by what it brings in the form of "clarity". They don't accept revolution as it is: for them, it must be "apple-coloured", "gorgeous" and "musical". In their case, it is a terrible punishment, like "death by noise". They have a "terrible" life in this hell. There is no beauty for them in the life of barracks and competition. It is not for them a demonstration of faith in the power of nature, but only proof that "the human race has become pale". The land of the barrack is this "damned land" for them, in which "there will never be paradise", because, instead of the law of the barrack, the pacifying virtue and all-giving love of the "kasmia-archetypal" filialists will not come to it.¹⁸⁴

Ideals? Oh, they are always good, but their ideal is tacit (*vida vocational, socialism*) must be "musical", because "socialism cannot be established without music by any guns". The conflict between two villages, one of which has to overthrow the other in the name of its own truth, is a "mystery" that they see themselves as making, because they know neither their own truth nor have the will to make it; Their law is this "harmony", this hypathetic coherence that is so favourable to geniuses of the mind. The highest level is this "loveliness", mutual sympathy, softening of customs - the *virginity of the weak who cannot become strong*. Having no opinion, they are tolerant of everything. They can say *neither yes nor no*, they sympathise with those who are trying and those who are failing. The dream of the strong - to develop all their villages, to spend their time with their families - was not easy for those whose passion was not for the sake of change, but for harmony, not for change, but for sympathy and solidarity. Adzina was not here for you.

I could see the vastness of the impulses that were in it, that were beyond its "whole", but only after I realised that it was a century. Here, all people were equal, like all nations.

Adapting to this worldview was their *utopia*. By focusing on the "partial", not the "aggregate" - their attachment to phenomena, to light, to the present, to the "time of", they also transferred this to their ideal, a realm of uncluttered and boring, without movement. *Sarel* says that for large revolutionary villages, epochs and estates that aspire, want to secure themselves by means of revolution, it is characteristic of this battle to be presented in the form of *myth*, *legend*. In the form of "the day of judgement", "the day of wrath" (Chrysostom), "catastrophe" (Karl Marx), the picture of the conflict between two warring villages (which, among other things, was given a perfect expression by the aforementioned statement of B. Khmialnitsky) - villages that turn against each other. The *myth* that captivated the adherents of the new faith was the inheritance of *active* states. Inheriting *passive* states is *utopia*. Myths, says *Sarel*, are not written things, but expressions of *will*. Utopia, on the contrary, is a creative work of *thought*... On the basis of facts, it begins to build a model of a new order... At the same time, if *the myth of a people's mind* is jostling to destroy what exists, *utopia* at least scales back the thoughts in terms of reforms that can be achieved by changing the system." If utopia is characterised by *mental* moments, if it is proved with the help of evidence, if, in its nature, it is not certain, it is subject to doubt, then the legend is characterised by unconditional certainty, faith. Dastaeovski is referring to the papist of balshevism, the "devil" (*devil*) Verkhavensky: "he looked at things as if he was waiting for the destruction of the world, and not the Kalis (the hallmark of utopia) after prophecies that might not come true, but *it is quite decisive*... the next morning, at about 25 minutes past 10.¹⁸⁵

The government, deprived of all faith in legalism, did not
The ideal was not a myth that hardened and captured the forces, but a volatile and gentle utopia that was fixed by the saviour. Our legal system has not given us any legend of how the West (not to say the right) and its national movements went on. Shavchenko gave us this myth, but he was not understood, or he was criticised, like Drahama, for "reading the Bible" and using "dreams of prophecy for the judgement of God" to create his national legend. Our legal system knew only dreamy and tearful utopias, mental blueprints of paradise instead of legend, a paradise that did not come in the form of Dies

irae, not as a "ringing of anger", but as *Deus machinae*, as a kindness, without any valueless attempts of interested effort. It is not for nothing that two typical representatives of our legal system ended up as utopias: one is the most "working man's monarchy" and the other is the "Sunshine Machine". These dreams were dreamed of in the spring, sometimes "as a joyful vista", sometimes as "the clear *ormuzd* of youth", sometimes in the "plough as a lush vista", sometimes in a bunch of flowers from the "native field". Why and how? There is no answer to this. It is simple: "Minetsa, a little time and the harvest will come."¹⁸⁶ How is it *minetsa*? What is the reason for the end?" - This is the same concern of the *Mirharad* Utopists. They are believers, but this faith is not the faith of the prophets in their own truth, but the inheritance of the spirits: we must "look into the sun and into our end".

utopia is also reflected in our journalism, "everything is mine, what was bitter was to come, the bird's feet will come", the tiger will lie down on the ground (Drahomanov's utopia), one Russia on the other (the utopia of the "bread-makers"), and each "people" will see other "peoples" (the utopia of the radicals, democrats, socialists). Our communists are also utopists, in the same sense. They are also waiting for the time when "dawn and dusk and honey and malacca holy land" will come. This is how V. *Palishchukiv* in his "Adyghean Songwriters", where the former Adygheans were white, white, white, with the words "the state of the working people - the dream of Adygea, the *dream* of the Circassian people, their republic of creators, where labour was dependent on the death of executed nationals in one unit - the working people".¹⁸⁷

^{and} *Deus ex machina* - God from the machine. A way of expressing confusing conflicts in old modern plays by removing the mythological character. The actor playing him was placed on the stage with the help of a mechanical suspension.

ⁱⁱ *Hormuzd* is the name of the highest ranking Iranian.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Mirharad* - in collection *Mirharad* (1835) by Mikalai Gogal, there is a description of historical and cultural events in the example of the same city.

^{iv} *Palishchuk Valerian* (1897-1937) was a Ukrainian writer and literary critic. He received his high school education at the gymnasiums of Lutsk and Katsyarynaslav (graduated in 1917). For some time he studied at the Institute of Civil Engineers in Petrograd, and later at the History and Philosophy Department of the Kamianets-Podilsky State Ukrainian University. After moving to Kyiv, he worked for newspaper *Narodna Volya* and wrote for newspapers *Selyanska Pravda* and *Vesti*. At the end of 1920, he initiated the creation of the literary group "Grono". In 1923-25 he belonged to the literary organisation "Hart", from which the "Avangard" association (1925-29) was founded in Kharkiv. He wrote poetry and prose works, literature for dances, literary and critical art, and in the tradition of the avant-garde tried to applaud modern civilisation and the achievement of technical revolution. In 1934, he was sent and accredited to a counter-revolutionary organisation. In the summer of 1935, he was sentenced to death by firing squad and replaced by 10 special lager.

For Kastamarav, "the independent development of each of the Slavic peoples" had to be achieved "with the help of other kindred nations."¹⁸⁸

From the top of that utopia, they are able to descend into the dollar, a piece of "quarrels" and sometimes even the wings, with no art, no "gocaloric" or "music", and so many thoughts of supernaturalism. That is why they understand their ideal not in the form of a disturbing and bright myth, but in the form of a sleepy, sleepy Gogal's Mirharad... This "tenderly dreamy" breath of "freedom". Only extremists can get carried away, like Sarel, with the "barbaric" philosophy of myth, or, like Bares, crumble into a single "blood, ashes and death". Our utapists "see the destiny of Ukraine not in breaking free from the Slavic right and filling the field with corpses," but in seeing all Slavs "in one family."¹⁸⁹ This phraseology is a common one, as it is often used by right-wing activists in public affairs, and it is used to build their utopias with the help of myriad of people. Above all, they are "asking for love" and "craving love".¹⁹⁰ They complain that even if "Cossack and Lyash villages would disappear in a heartbeat", unfortunately, "only disagreement has not , only Russia and Lyakh are fighting", and they wonder if "these times will become our happiest", "will the worlds come to us"?¹⁹¹ The women are looking for a "blue sleeping bag", "tanks of dreams trembling, tender, gentle, in snow-white robes". They themselves do not know what their split soul, "these tanks, these loud battles", is seeking,¹⁹² but from the question, from the context, and for the poet himself, thereperhaps two answers to this doubt.

What is the vision, is the palette. The leader of our social democracy is The height of this "loud battle" is a dream about a "peaceful country", which causes "longing for pure human, peaceful life", for "la- dze", without "brotherly fighting". After that, he paints the ideal of his fellow citizens (and his own): "this will be a new kind of civilisation, an ideal one, a sensual one. All people will be calm, like lambs, all will live in sugar palaces, live in a gossipy house with a friend."¹⁹³ The leader of another faction of socialist bourgeois, the Socialist Revolutionaries, also admired Filistrov's ideals. He describes for us the state in which "there will be only the whole, full of , the breath of flowers, music without layers, the heights, the beauty of industries opened to the winds".¹⁹⁴ The Germans and other "white" peoples, according to the early French writer, love "the colour of iron and the shine of steel", and "we, the breadwinners, who are

ⁱ tanks (Ukrainian: скокаў, танців).

Why slave?" and "patriotic sword to *plough*, a man's crown to *sickle*, a woman's cow to *reap*, a woman's crop to *reap*, a woman's crop to *reap*, a *pitchfork* to clean Avgiev's stable."¹⁹⁵

This is how they imagined their ideal, the "sensual good", with the "blue package", with the "purpose", with pitchforks and manure... "Individual", not "agulh", the light, the "whole", the chalavek and their sum, their "dabra", were everything to them. And since, as Hegel says, "without the whole, no work is possible," our "bourgeois" and "socialist" bourgeois had to strive for the ideal of this whole. The Sarelian myth was not for them.

It was a utopia, so similar to others, as Lesia Ukrainka said: "We are interested in that future. We are saddened by the brightness of that bright time, because our imagination is wrapped in a long series of pictures without tones, perspectives and pavements... This is not life, but a free death from time, from a free, unnecessary gift. There is no battle, these are the essential conditions of life, no tragedy, which gives a deeper place to life."¹⁹⁶ This worldview was alien to them, to those who dreamed of others, with a tightly wound sabaka about these similarities, a calm and comfortable life. The sound of the drumming was drowned out by their soft, five-octave melodies, which did not tease or set off the will, but only and soothed. *They were not looking for the mastery of light*, but for *the appreciation of it*.

This utopia had to become their own kingdom, because the ignorant They did not think of themselves as being summoned in any other way than by way of affection. The various legends distinguished between their own right and their right to fight in the prisoner's barracks. Our human rights activists, adding to the very idea of the struggle and the character traits necessary for its patriotism ("aggressiveness", "drama"), *without inheriting it, longed for "equality"*: the right not for the favoured, not for the furthest, but "for all". History, which develops nations at different levels, cannot be used as a criterion for the "tensions" of particular peoples; Everyone "should have the fullest possible degree of development" (nations, as well as felahs and couples), and "the sudden increase in tension over the recognition of national rights" was frightening for them.¹⁹⁷ Instead, they were rejoicing, chanting: "O *mountain*, mother, freedom, glory and strength of *the barracks!*", not "take the packages", not "measures of blood and *tears*". Thus, along with other nations and couples, they wanted to redeem Ukraine's "power, time and freedom" with tears.¹⁹⁸ Therefore, they did not believe in a myth, but in a utopia, a "historic Nemesis" that could

The only way to help the weak is through affection, without effort on their part. This is the characteristic of all their utopias. They are only "waiting" for the apostle of truth and goodwill. They are only trying to find out "where is the dawning, clear, free will that they long for?" In their chests, there is only "a little girl crying and *praying for* something from the dampness of the muse". They only inherit that "this freedom will appear", this will that "the fate of the speedy mother Ukraine *will rise*", my five-fourths of a year, my someone's affection... Only Ukrainian couples and couples between nations wait for their fate to be sure.¹⁹⁹

They carried over their ideal of calmness and immobility into their *ideal of beauty*. We knew only a nasal reaction to the object, not a valuing one. They knew only love for their own self (the right self), which never gave way to hatred or anger at someone else's You. Their beauty was not in the impulse to give up, but in the longing for idyll, the preservation of what is. It was not in conquest and aggression, but only in harmony and spaciness, in the peculiar *dolce far niente*ⁱ. That would be the ideal of Buddhism - the midday *siesta in the* tragic varieties, the colour of the sky, the vada, the earth, the wind, the seemingly frozen, the dream. Who does not recognise in this image of the poetic carcasses of our literature the ideal of our right-wing politicians: "Not Zeus, not Pan, not the Dove-Spirit, but the clarinets of the sun"; "not Wrath, but the clarinets of the sun"...²⁰⁰ Such was their god, the volatile and gentle "god" of the fractional bourgeois. Zeus - who *reigned* over the worlds, Pan - who kept the "acoustic" village in perpetual *motion*, Dove-Spirit - who *created* light out of chaos, Wrath - who, although he *destroyed* it, all these gods were too busy with *the valid* formatting seals to be able to impersonate the dead owners of the "dead souls" of Ukrainian Pravans. They needed "sunny clarinets", like a dusty stove or a cricket's volatile pitch. Only they saw the beauty and the sensuality. "We see the birds (Darwin says) that are dying, we see the frequent food supply; but we do not see or forget that the birds that fly around so uncluttered, feed on the right things or seeds, and are always safe; We forget what kind of ring these birds, or their eggs, or their *maladnik*, are in".²⁰¹ Our sunny clarinetists do not see these other species. They saw only "harmony", not *baratza* and *abarona*, and in that harmony and stillness, not in movement and competition, they saw beauty, their beauty was in "deep poetic piety", in "lyricism and cherry scent", in "boundless *dabryna*", in "love for light and *chalavek*", in lyrical

ⁱ *dolce far niente* (Italian) - a salad of dreams.

anism. This beauty was sought by these creatures - as Schopenhauer said - in the light "from Wollen ^{losgerissenⁱ}", in that old woman who was "the erfreu- lichste and the allein ^{unschuldigeⁱⁱ}". Hegel called this beauty "the Schön- heit of the ^{Nervenschwächeⁱⁱⁱ}", in which everything harsh and unruly falls away and only the soul that feels appears; but the soul in which one can recognise the death of the free self-state of the spirit.²⁰²

The beauty of perpetual movement, the poetry of the conqueror, of strong muscles and strong will, must have appealed to them, who knew only the beauty of "humanity", of heads "fallen in sorrow to the fate of vain talk". For Hegel, this was the "highest ideal of life"; for our philosophers, it was sleep and time in sleep. Immobility, this pagodality, this gregariousness.

Nietzsche must have said it right: "You want to call your unbroken unity a cantankerous one; everything that can be called bayan- lousy, you want to call 'good'²⁰³ - a garden of cherries, a frozen sun - petrified movement... On the other hand, the aesthetics adds everything that cannot be "dated" by the legalistic philosophers, who recognise only the light of phenomena, and not the irrational, eternal movement that gives them life. That is why *their beauty knows no drama*, because it cannot be found there, because it is not consistent ideals, nor with what is known in German as *das Erhabene*, in French as *le sublime*, and in Ukrainian as "the majestic". For Hegel, the essence of the majestic is the work of everything "perfected". How could our human rights activist, for whom the "particular" was a godsend, for whom "only the whole is eternal", have this feeling? So is drama: its essence is a conflict, a conflict of individual will with the objective, but our human rights activist knew neither will nor love of conflict. For him, drama was exhausted at times by the usual pain, like the "Widerfahrendes", the "happenings", the "surrendered": The "tragedy" of the worm, the bots' unleashed vermin. We would have been far away from this course of thought in our musical creativity, but it is interesting that the largest opera of our most important campaigner (Lysenko's *Taras Bulba*) is as much a lyric opera as a heroic one. In it, one will easily find "something strong, powerful, wide, as the same era, as the same steel characters". Everything in her "melodramatic

ⁱ *vom Wollen losgerissen* (in German) - adarvanim ad hacienda.

ⁱⁱ *die erfreulichste und die allein unschuldige* - the most agile and lonely.

ⁱⁱⁱ *eine Schönheit der Nervenschwäche* (German) - the beauty of the nervous.

That is why this part of our legalistic literature goes beyond naturalism. Subordinating itself to all "laws" and sanctions, the fearful legalistic *self* did not dare to impose its will on matter. Expressionism and romanticism, the highest forms of interaction between creators and matter, are barely known to us. The attitude of our creators to the outside world and to matter is rightly passive, almost fatalistic: It a pendant to the most tangible forms of will projection in legal politics, defence rather than attack, concentration of the partial (material) rather than the aggregate (ideological), "harmony" (stagnation) rather than movement (movement). Since they saw in the literature a place, special phenomena and not their essence, they saw them in literary creators of the young ladies, and expressed them, not the hidden essence of the thing. Their complete confusion with naturalism, with the plebeian fall of everything "in their grasp", or, as we say, "clarity and pride" of their life, is also a problem. It is not the feeling and perception of things (which requires intuition and a lot of effort), but their writing (in the most detailed way), passive surrender to impressions, which is calling, not mastering them. Our rights-based patriarch does not show things, but calls them by name, and pushes them into their fingers. Not an instantaneous diligent belief in things, but only their pure intellectual appreciation. The strength of a lawyer, however, is that a person on foot must "have both feet and legs", and he must be careful to make sure that his presentation is not too long. And above all, everything must be clear. Rembrandt's smeared attitudes and values, his arbitrary interpretation of matter, his frantic pursuit of passion, his free gift to intense creative part of *himself* - all this is "futurism", not literature. Everything needs to be written with the clarity of a vulgarist and the detail of a photographer. The essence is not a depiction of the partial *self*, which eliminates all harms, but only those things that can be "seen", in their entirety, not in the form of too many loud wings, with variables, with variable, sometimes established boundaries between them, with predefined punctuation marks, with predefined cesurae, with predefined rules of "milieu".

And this whole worldview is the heel *of an uneven boundary*.

The will was manifested here, but bound. The right-wing affect was limited to the immediate sensation of pain or aggression, which never went beyond the sensation of a test. The pre-Vanguardian imagination was limited to the stationary "now" or the stationary "tomorrow", chasing, both in the present and in the future, for idylls, for harmonies between appearances, but

not for the Chimneys, but to break away, to go up. The ideal would be to have a peaceful and *intact* cemetery, something that is not *imperishable*, something that is a distant dream and *that breaks free from the entanglements* of the present.

If we want to look for the material basis of this worldview, we must characterise it as the worldview of *the righteous*, the *parochial*, the worldview of the family and, more, *the plebeian worldview*. Impossible to be sensitive and complain, nothing to tease the nerves, to bring them to ecstasy, a muzzle on all kinds of energy, no disanimity - what is this but a trait of a righteous person?

This aspect comes into play when we want to try to get closer to *the meaning of our legal "crippling"*. Sakrath saw everything good and kind in the world around him, which he called the above-mentioned graceful words. How did our legal profession understand these words and their meaning? Their "kallos-kagatos", their "good chalavek" was, as Nietzsche said, the eunuch, the entmannte Mensch. For them, it was only about "humanisation", about the value of plebeians who could not dominate and could not impose this instinct on anyone. They did not have two poles - "strengthening of life" and "dilution of life" (Verstärkung des Lebens and Verdünnung des Lebens), the measure of the soul's supremacy was in its haste, its sleep, philanthropy out of sympathy for the weakest, the most vulnerable, sometimes the most insignificant, "tolerance" (the inability to say "Yes" or "No") and "abjectness" (the lack of faith in one's idea and the desire to implement it). "Good" was everything that relaxed, that removed all powerful affects, such as pride and anger - "a form of self-assertion of decadence".²⁰⁵ The "good" one was the one who could extinguish the most intense aggression in tears of grief, who had an unbearable aversion to everything that was accredited, bright, formalised, and who was nevertheless drawn to everything that was tearful, vague in his views, which would allow him to never be bound to either of these two ideas, which would allow him to avoid being dependent on all the rules of two irreconcilable things: choice and mystery. The "good" one was the one who was aggressive but not sharp; who was exhausted but calm; who avoided black and white extremes by keeping a sharp edge; who looked at everything from three different perspectives at the same time to avoid missing the "addictive"; who knew only ^{amboi} instead of "these". Here's how this saying is authentically interpreted: in legal terms, a "kales-kagatos" is someone who has "extraordinary strength - not to try to cut, to break

¹ ambo (lat.) - or two.

sharp *rages*, the desire for *consent and understanding*". For them, this was not *partisanship*, but "the highest degree of culture, which always relies *on the recognition of other people's rights*, on a wide range of *opinions* and seeks the *best possible way out* in conflicts." ²⁰⁶ This is the ideal of right-wing "crippling".

Reading this, you are struck by the fact that you have eaten grass... In the forest of one of his "dear countrymen", Kvitka wrote a letter: "It's better now! Save my soul, my melted butter is burning on it." The "melted butter" of the orthodox writer reeks of our "crippled"ness, in which everythingstrong, strong, alive and important. These "oils" smell of the bitter breaths of Kirillov's methodologists, the "labour" monarchists, Drahomanov's "humanity", the "five-fingered" love of socialists for the "people", and from the radicals' impassioned and sentimental love for "humanity", "the workers' party" or "the people", from the idealism of their entire literature, and from their emotion at their own insignificance. All their "crippling" was important to *Manilow*. Manila is a walking Gogol: "his features were not without emotion, but this emotion seemed to be given too much sugar. He smiled brightly, with blue eyes. In the first minute of talking to him, you couldn't help but say: "What a nice and kind person!" The next minute, you say nothing, and the next minute you're talking: "The devil knows what it is!" - and you go away; if you don't go away, you feel a mild boredom. You can't escape it, or you wish you had a sharp word that could be used by anyone, but you can't hide what it is that is in your life. Everywhere has its own further path... everywhere has its own, but Manilow had nothing."

Nothing but boring sentimentalism was hidden in our "cache" The "lekagata", which excluded everything courageous and strong. It was the ideology of a class, a right, a tribe, of the "weak" who wanted to impose their law of the weak on such a different, such a good and such an evil woman! With all their sympathies and inclinations, they were not the ideologues of an active minority that, being a political saint, *carries* a class or a nation behind it. They were the ideologues of a passive *nation, of a number of individuals who are free*. For, as the Frenchman *Degerme* says, "the sole function of a number is not to *act, to generalise, to control*, but to sanction and to rule thought." ²⁰⁷ The minority, the aristocracy (self-appointed or delegated), *controls*, the great number *controls*. The first is a pronounced eternal tension of energy, anticipation, addled, creative, ideal, "agulnaga"; the second is sparse, blunt, unapologetic, material, "party-oriented".

The first one breaks all the boundaries of the egos of data, counting, geographical location, and time. The first one breaks all the boundaries set by the egos of adzina, counting, geographical location, and time. The second one narrows them down, because if you go out of your normal time, you need to be in a very short time, not for sake of "kirava", but for the sake of "mastering thought", and then return to your own beliefs. This function of felahs, plebeians, for whom the metropolis and patricians fight, with all the values and characteristics characteristic of this function, has just been mastered by our legal system. Directed from the instincts of barbarism, power, domination, all kinds of affect, "dragee" instincts - all these were psychological features of a "count", a tribe, not a political nation.

This is how their *idea of the region* developed. There was no pa

The idea of an English Empire that "*reigns* over the marae" or a Germany that would be "*over* everything" expresses the emphasis on the superiority of the "aggregate" over the "partial", or the attributes of Polish or Russian "culture", which is always expansionary, beyond native borders. Our Right-wing "homeland" was different. It was German "Heimat" with "gibt's ein ^{Wiederseheni}" of faithful Hans and his waiting Gretchen; it was the English "sweet ^{homeii}", not connected with the memory of "domination over the *Marauders*", but with Tipperary, with her "sweetest girl, I ^{knowiii}", the sweetest girl I know. This was what the Russians called "native places", the Palyaks "wioska oj- czysta", the Czechs "domuv mui", and the Ukrainians called "native land", where "everything breathes in abundance", where "farms are drowning in cherry groves", where "the wind-rock of the steppe cowl lulls", where "blind Hrytsko poets about the old days". There was this sadness of Pravance Mistral, "blessed Malorosia", which was the source of the Ukrainian's sincere feeling of dignity, his "abandoned five" (Vinnichenko). But not his political will, connected with another electoral principle, which the Germans did not call Heimat a Va- terland, but the Ukrainians called "common fatherland", "whole Russia", or "All of Europe". It was not their "native land", but the other people's choice to be part of it. For them, the synonyms of this "native land" were "pravintsy", "voblast"; its affairs were "butchers' affairs", fires

ⁱ *gibt's ein Wiedersehen* (in German) - there will be a .

ⁱⁱ *sweet* .

ⁱⁱⁱ *It's a long way to Tipperary, // It's a long way to go. // It's a long way to Tippe- rary // To the sweetest girl I know!*

The idea that, despite the "self-made" phraseology, is always paralleled by Castamardava and Drahomanov, Hrushevsky and the socialists and Lipinsky. Their paragon is not a nationalist, but an "autochthonist", "a lover of domestic chores and peaceful life, tied to his corner" (Kulish). He is not a warrior, but a landowner who "drives cattle and horses to Ukrainian and foreign farms" (Kulish), whose ideals were, like those of the chestnut-skinned Peramyshl at the 1646 Soym, "to be , to sit down and not to make a fuss" (Kulish).²⁰⁸

Their characters did not hate anyone, they were socialists, "simply *loved* themselves... simply felt *respect*" for themselves and their associates without any *religious* observance. They were touched by the "abyssals" who "were afraid of their piety" because this "piety" and "love for what gave me life, was considered ridiculous, and unprofitable, and harmful, and unsafe" (in the words of others), and therefore he was a little bit lonely and not sure of his right to it.²⁰⁹ This "five-fourths", loyal and valued attitude towards his father was based Drahomanov's patriotism and his "nationalism". "I considered the Russian-Ukrainian 'nationalist' movement in Galicia to be a positive one - *only because of its love for the common people, not because of its (political - D.D.) ideas*, instead of which I considered more just... the idea of... the European radical progressive movement..."

This patriotism, like this nation, is non-aggressive, ad-
On the other hand, on the one hand, which limited itself only to "love" for one's own self, but not to love for an aggressive stranger, we can see a patriotism that knows only the most innocent effort of the will to manifest this feeling; who have not yet risen to the "pure celebration of the will of a given person", and who know nothing of the necessity of "applying the same will in other ways" (Schapenhauer); patriotism, which is only a feeling, but not a system of selective ideas.²¹⁰ She was in love with her family's fear, with all the "nascus", with her "countrymen", with the unrecognisability of everything that could pull them out of the state of righteous "welfare", that knew some power over their time in their native , over their "dabrabyt", the absence of the state, the nation as a condition of association, war, and battle, which is a vapour of its gun-and-iron "harmony", the absence of all things important (he called it "brutal"), idealistic (he called it "phantoms")

The problem was the vicious circle of legalism,
He worked for the pests that were attacking *the nation* (publishing house

alien), and then the "native land" of that alien nation became his native land. Or he filled the void with a couple of sophisticated ideas: universal ones, such as "humanity", "pride", "proletariat", but which came from the same place with a specific age, with the transfer to another function of the nation, the function of governance, the function of government, which were alien and unnecessary to him. If Masaryk was right when he said that "only those who have small thoughts are small nations", then, according to our government, we were, in the eyes of the sovereigns, small nations, or, simply put, tribes.

Right-wingism, the worldview of the right-wing classes, which had not yet been embedded in the beliefs of the broader national political life, was precisely the material basis of their ideology. This was the ideology of socialists and democrats who came out of the idyllic association of the "papacy" of the Nazi or Galician "Jagomos", from these farms of "hard" workers, or from the ruined castles of the nobility, who were ready to start a business, from the environment, which was developed by the old-fashioned sensibility, a little bit of renegade loyalty, coloured by Russian-Drahomanov's nationalism and "pride", devoid of aggressive verve, and for the general public, the habitual view of the world from the point of view of "counting", plebs, the right, and the family of Pravans, as part of a higher whole. Their ideology (as Franco and Drahomanov put it) was "the naïve speculation of a man who has not seen the light and does not need to be united in thought to understand the highest social organisation, above the world of the city or the pavé".²¹¹ The attitude of intrinsic value, of counting, of law, of class over intrinsic value of the higher level

^{and} Masaryk Thomas Haryh (1850-1937) were Czech philosophers, politicians and statesmen, first president of Czechoslovakia (1918-35). He graduated from the University of Vienna in 1886. After graduating from Charles University in Prague and Czech universities (1882), he became a professor of philosophy at the Czech University. In 1890 he left the Maladacian Party and in 1900 founded the Czech People's Party. In 1915, he organised the Czech Committee in Prague, which believed that independence for the peoples of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and autonomy for the peoples of the Russian Empire was indispensable. During his stay in Russia and Ukraine (1917-18), he organised a legion of Czechoslovakian soldiers. During his stay in the United States (May-November 1918), he organised a group of emigrants who were representatives of the peoples of Austria-Hungary. He became the president of Czechoslovakia, supported the activities of Ukrainian emigrant groups in Prague and other cities, helped to open and fund the Ukrainian Free University (1921), the Drahomanov Higher Educational Institutes (1923, 1924), and the Ukrainian National University (1925). Drahomanov University (1923, both in Prague) and the Ukrainian State Academy in Padebrady (1922). He remained very popular among Ukrainians.

ⁱⁱ panotets (Ukrainian) - here: priest, pope.

of national election, of the state, of principled compromise, of the theory of the "minimum" programme, of the attitude to the abstract and the "people", of idealistic fragility, of lack of fanaticism and faith, of fear of imposing one's will, one's ideology, on the masses, on workers, on individuals, on the nation; fear of taking the matter to the ball, fearful of mimicking, of trying to justify their nationalism under the fashionable guise of some aggressively accepted ideas - "humanity", "pride", "decentralisation", human rights", "liberty", etc. n., the emphasis on material "dabrabet", volatile "dabrabet", volatile and gentle utopianism - all these were features of a fearsome legalism, which was not capable of either deep faith or its barriers, a tearful "ideology" that had to cause agitation in the twentieth century.

This outlook has given our public opinion the most important right
The country, which is so terrible that few people respect it. Lesya Ukrainka, one of the few who had this weak light in us (and for that I am so misunderstood), made the task of defining the subject simple, important and powerful. Accouterment was for her the light of the battle, the battle of the lamb with other elements that the lamb loves. "If I become a survivor of this agnu (she wrote), then I will say that I have found a new chalavek! If I break down, do not cry for me: you should know why you did not break down before!" This was Nietzsche's "what falls, must be picked up"! All that was unusable and unbearable had to get out of him, because his soul could not give him his right to it.

How different was the philosophy of orthodoxy! The whole of your simplicity were with those who were "broken", with the rejected, with those who had lost their pride in their royalty, or with those who were royally insignificant. For us, this light was the law of the weak, of bodies and spirits. They should not take the solidity of steel, but only that which was steeled in the world, melt it in their tearful emotion, and take away their right to live, their right to impose laws on the people.

This was a maral of all trampled upon, not only physical, but also - and most importantly - spiritual, which had not been put to the test. The imposition of a mechanical "flag", the loss of sovereignty, which is mystifying, the negation of the state, the critique of ideas that rise above the ideals of plebeian "welfare", the elimination of "dragnet" institutions, the desire to embrace the vegetarian ethic of free values of the regulator of public life and of relations between nations - this was the

the programme of our .

They had no reason to recognise the harsh law of womanhood, the law of the barracks - "now and ever and to the ages of ages", to recognise the truth of the cannon, the barracks and the dominance of the strongman. They did not recognise the playlessness of the instincts of life, will and expansion - they were branded with the perverse names of "violence" and "fanaticism". To this end, they promoted an ethic that did not violate the firm virtues of different races, but only served to harm the world's Kurashchup people. "The sweetness of all life", the frail and the small, was the essence of their worldview. Unable rely on any strong smell, they, who were split souls, tried every instinctive test, putting "love (nat) da scarpian" in its place and looking for some kind of symbiosis with it.

Nature makes sure that everything unnatural disappears, and everything powerful is taken care of.

happened. We would have tried to break the laws of nature. All the virginity of the healthy, which you held on to during your life, was abandoned by them. All the insignificant traits of the weak were virgins that were claimed to be universal. Virtue became "important to them because it made them modest and meek: *It transformed the wolf into a sabaka, and the human being into best of his own animal, the chalavek.*"²¹² *The akhova of inauthenticity* was the eighth of their death.

SECTION VIII - DEGENERATION OF LEGALISM

It was not surprising that, in developing this worldview, our legal system logically came to *the destruction of the human instinct*, and the destruction not only of its "aggressive" side, but of all the *aspects of nature that ensure the freedom to fight*. By failing to recognise the perpetrators, they have come to a non-recognition of violence as such, as a factor harmful, in their opinion, to women and their development. Not recognising *the aggression*, they came to admission and *barriers*. Valadar thought of a number of pacifists in Galicia, I. Franko, and the aspirations of the man he is training to be a tough : - He for a "soul mate, such a *soft, five-footed, four-footed mate*"... Kabila has a deep desire for "at least a drop of *dabryna, five-footedness, tolerance*" for "different views and beliefs"... He longs to get rid of "rigidity", "unbelief", "nanny state", and protects it from assimilation

ⁱ *virtu* (Latin) - manliness; virginity, marital dascalas.

"dagmata nanny" and "(class) of the barracks". He is a champion of the "school of modern socialism", without malice, "an emphasis on ethical, broad and humane understanding of the masses, on the right and aggressive dissemination of light, science, knowledge... and the rights and freedoms of the people".²¹³

Instead of fighting, it is remembrance; instead of dogmatism of faith, it is racially weakening criticism; instead of the moral of the strong, it is the ethics of the meek, instead of firmness, it is gentleness; instead of nation, it is diversity; instead of imposing one's truth, it is tolerance and diversity... This is the kreda of Galician legalism, which is the true successor to the famous "kreda" of the supremacy of the supremacist legalism, and the catechism of this twofold "worldview". The plebeian-worker philosophy was exposed, criticised, lost, appealed to, and not without reason, which cited its impressiveness and the volatile coherence of the Ukrainian nation, which not only does not honour the eternal, fierce and powerful instinct of the woman, but also glorifies the ideal of valiant castration. (In contrast, Ivan Franko took a completely different path, criticising M. Draga- manava, who brilliantly foresaw that socialism leads to tyranny and slavery, and eventually gave us his brilliant "Maize").

This was, I believe, the programme of legalism. But it was also the In its tanks, the border line was free of those "delusions" and "illusions" that elevated species over "I" and its benefits, that abolished the "rastloses Strebenei" from its meaning, the eternal competition to expand the scope of powerone's will, which ^{Pisari} and Columbus and thousands of others lived, to whom humanity is so much a part. These implications are the "true agni" for the law; these are the "nosey", "metaphysical joys".²¹⁴ The fascination of a large number of great souls for distant ideals is, for him, above all, "phantoms" worthy of condemnation, because for them "hot fires, harsh circles of punishment" and "millions, millions of hearts were torn apart by misery"; because "the love of life is the highest of all values", not those "phantoms" for which she was giving up her life... If there had been a woman with such a philosophy in Vasca da Gama's contemporaries, he would have been surely one of the "idealists" of Sancia Panza, who wanted to go on an expedition, because he travelled with 165 people and returned with only 55...

adds all enterprises, because this gift is not "a sir, and learn to love". The instinct of barracks must be removed first.

ⁱ *rastloses Streben* (num.) - a nasty implied.

ⁱⁱ *Francisco Pizarro González* (1475-1541) - Spanish adventurer, conquistador who conquered the Inca Empire and founded the city of Lima.

the most important ways, because he is the *chimera* that paves the way for great peace, harmony and understanding. All these immortalisations, the battle, the defence of nature and the most vulnerable races - all this is a meeting, and our rights activists have a very different view of it: "And they mingle, as if the winds were dry in the north, cutting and killing them... And they dig in the earth, and they tear at the sky. They sail over the seas - in the sky, behind the seas, they are looking for paradise, happiness, solace, looking for what only they can find in their sisters, in love, in mutual love"... Forgetting that "it seems that the greatness man is eight turns of life." ²¹⁵

The credo of Ukrainian Buddhism is frightening in its poverty! Reading it, you come to the conclusion that all history has no meaning! All the old political structures, which people are fighting for, giving them access from the earth to the sky, all the efforts of the peoples to whom humanity is associated with a sense of heroism, pride, beauty, greatness, are a "meaningless difference". It's all nonsense, but it's the same thing that his instinct says. Here we come to the "virgins" of Righteousness Buddhism, and - at the same time - to its absolute and complete incomprehension of man's soul; it allows that in its eternal quest for understanding of nature, the earth and the people on , as well as for safety and shelter, the man seeks it all! The Pravansalets, who yearn for pine needles and manure, for the "worldly peasant land", do not understand that a man of higher races *does not seek a mate, but rather he seeks one who does not need him and is pleased with him*. This psychology of the chalavek is a book with seven heels for the ideologues of the adarva-nai from the light of law.

That is why this is immanent for them, this an instinct, it is not an as-
Let the creators be the ones who make and change the material of their thick water, but they call it "sabbath ties" or "heavy yoke". Their respect for the creator is not the respect of a hero, of Prometheus, who steals the fire, or of the master Heinrich from Havptman. For them, the creature is a hireling, because it does a very dull job, because *it is not its own time*, but in "sphere". Their creature is this "mason", and the work "presses everyone" had a "terrible kind of pull". We say to ourselves that "we are not heroes and we are not bogatyr". No, "we are slaves" who willingly took on the chains. The inner voice that persecutes the creator of the time, that "makes everything forget", the agony that is *everywhere*, the lawyer feels like a riddle with a bison in his hand. He looked at the sudden, unseen labour of the artist as a punishment, *as a judgement, as a punishment*.²¹⁶

The Pravansalis have never been able to come up with the most courageous
philosophy
Western races. The approximate utilitarianism of their dagmata (calico mills

The "unbearable"). Everything that stood above the "indestructible whole", above vulgar materialism, was "hell". The eternal ideal, the lofty fantasy that the pastoralist chase and search, without stopping for a moment, trampling on time with their feet, that they were on the dirt - this was a strange and incomprehensible thing for them. For them, these things are "bezmety round mouths", "The soul is indestructible! A horrible thought, a wild fantasy, worthy of Laelia and Tarkvemada!"...²¹⁷ This herbal "aspiration" must have grated on the nerves of every strong individual, and, surely, in one of his clear moments, Kulish cried out in horror at these Buddhist worldviews:

"Dull scrapers, of a feather, a lot of treasures from the earth and a lot of and naked! Aren't Prince Bismarck and Laöla better than you?"²¹⁸

Bacon Verulamsky said that "the black (vulgus) sees ordinary virtues with a fascination, extraordinary ones with admiration, but for the highest, it has no sense". Our "people-loving" and "democratic" people did not understand them either. According to the Ukrainian public (one of the ideologues of the "vulgus"), "in recent years there have been such smart people who have been lambasting *Ukrainian softness*, finding the reason for the failures of our state. But we can say to these wise politicians that nothing can come of their bloody-mindedness and rationalism... because there is no ground for it in the morals and psyche of the Ukrainian people..."²¹⁹ The people are right, but the fact that our demophiles, until they die out, will not give up their "molkka" is probably true, as well as the fact that they will always be dominated by "firm" adherents of the "bloodthirsty rationalism" - foreigners.

As , sustrakals, and those who saw the hero only as a lord, which He jumped them, because of their weight and the whole noble, proud, *and village* character. Even the villagers? - That was not enough. We wanted the whole thing to disappear from our lives, not recognising it as a developmental stage of any significance. The advice of a man to whom history is owed the elimination of everything that was in its *baufälligkeit*, without which no new construction was possible, was the advice of our human rights activists

"A poor little boy fell into a pit of water and complained that he had no fate. She started to cry and stir inotion and her voice was heard:

^{and} *Laola Ignacio* (1491 - 1556) - Catalan saints, Spanish bishop, saldat and priest, founder of the Society of Jesus (Jesuit order).

ⁱⁱ *Tarquemade Thomas* (1420 - 1498) - the founder of the Spanish Inquisition, the first weak inquisitor of Spain.

ⁱⁱⁱ *baufällig* (n.) - lazy.

"Destiny, boy? You will be a king! And the light will shine on you like the sun morning..." And the boy fell to the ground with the baby in fear: "Father! I don't want to be king! I am not capable of execution!" "Then you will be Doubusham," said the wizard, and the mountains were terrified. Never in my life!" said the boy. "You will be a kobzar for me!" shouted the three of them from the pit, like thunder. - And the boy became a kobza player..."²²⁰ And with him our entire legal system, which also identified the "tsar" (valadar) with the "executioners", the state organisation with the robber gangs, and was ready to laugh at the "people"; who did not know that she was working with "addicts", with revolutionaries, who had never been able to understand it or try to get along with it; which sought to make its own destiny, and was afraid of those games that would force it to rise above; which was created only for the purpose of shaving La-Z-Boy's head, for boring "masonry" work, for lyrical lamentation over the ruins of a heroic past.

And it is not for nothing that they admired the Indian sage and his prerogative.

kam Rabindranath Tagore. The characteristic thing is that not only the most sophisticated Ukrainians are fascinated by him, but also people who were pressured by their studies, whose ideology seems to be different. And so, in one of the Ukrainian organs, we read a print of the Supreme Tagore, who is practicing the beginning of the new century, which, if it did not bring us a political challenge, at least showed us the way to a moral challenge from the tangles of decadal doctrines. "The apocryphal sun of the minulag was always burning in the blood-red clouds of the west and incircular *vortex*," they said; over the "naked *ego* of the peoples", which "in a frantic *pursuit* jumped to *the sound of balls* and high songs". This sun was rejected by them, because they did not seek paradise for themselves. They were not eager to fight, even though they were tired, because the "purple sky" showed storms that they had not seen; it was not the "morning sky" of the previous day. Yana wanted to sustain her sun, just like Tagore, "with a *man* who *was happy* on the table". In the midst of a few deaths, when they have lost their right to immortality, they rejoice to appear "in white robes of pristine beauty", with a "*pakorai*" who "will be their bridegroom and their freedom" in the belief that "the infinite does not " and that "the passion does not last forever. "²²¹ These loves will be

and *Dawbush Alexa* (1700 - 1745) are popular leaders of the Carpathian dance movement, the so-called "apryshky". The Apryshky attacked the estates of Ukrainian, Hungarian, and Polish lords, bankers, and wealthy landowners. Dawbush distributed the confiscated property to the people of Sywieczyn. Dawbush's life and death are reflected in folk stories and legends.

Why did he put such altars in this pit, from which one can decomposition and corpses a kilometre away, which is not characteristic of them? Are these "beauty" and "melodiousness" of this poetry not the recapitulation of all our rights? With all the understanding, with all the worldviews generated in the world? These are not only the things that are just worked out and deprived of all the potential of our native Tagore, who also "in the last days of the last year" (not the calendar year) sent his "tender-hearted" pitying practices to the terrible catastrophe that other nations, believing in themselves, had caused? For him, "he curses the weak who have to bend so that the strong can live". He lives only by dreams and hopes for "a warm slush of sleep" - he who has no hope for his own village, the village to be strong. Only this "sleeping slough" will save him from the pit of chalavecide, for now there is not the path of Galilee and the Ardaliens, but the "sunny path".²²² Just as Tagore in "Heavenly Peru" prays that he would burn away the "gluttony and drama" of the chalavecs, so our Ukrainian fakir dreams of a "spark" that "will explode into a powerful lamb and burn away the background of the papalist system, and will be apt to be used in the fight between chalavecs and chalavecs and peoples and peoples."²²³ To become strong and even to dictate laws to others - this was a tough philosophy for Ukrainian Hindus. They wanted to stop everything that was desirable, everything that was immutable, everything that was moving.

There are many examples of this worldview.

All of them are single-minded. They sought "valedictorians" who separated them ("people", "demos", "count", "blacks") from them, who "made them beautiful together"; They were "gladiators, slaves, captives", driven by their masters in the name of incomprehensible "abstract" appeals; "if only their magnificent state was in the world". They argued not only that this "magnificent state" was not real, but also that it was a contradiction of the ideal itself. "I watched the winds blow the images of arrows and complained to the saint that the pit created on the factory floor was a pit of time... I complained to the highest Creator (one of the fakirs) that "He created kings of men and gave kings *the image of arrows* to rule them, *but did not give them intelligence*".²²⁴ This peace of mind is placed above the arles, for the arles is this "simval of chalavecheskaya drapchestvo". It was the season of everything majestic, valiant, uplifting, proud and independent (among other things, the bird of St John the Evangelist), and we had all these points under attack. We looked at the daredevils from the point of landing out of fear of a coward, who, from the point of view of the place, could not take the money spent from the soul. These birds are "reason without faith

asnos", which in their boundless love were intended to help the "arlam" to create their own kind of light.

For Frank, what the Rising Hawk was for some, he was another annoyance - the Golden Eagle. "I don't like you, I hate you, Berkut! For the fact that in games you play *fiercely*, for the fact that you drink blood, for the fact that you *look down on the lowly and weak*, even though you live among them, for the fact that you are so fond of *being created*, I hate you for being a king!"²²⁵ This was the light perception, the light view of the "weak creatures", those who were afraid of all the power, afraid of losing their virginity, like the boy who was afraid of becoming a king. It was the instinctive, innate innocence of a slave to a master; of someone who knows he cannot become a master and feels his own nakedness; Those whose instincts for life have been drowned out and who, in a leveling chalet, want to be taken away from them, so that they do not disturb their sadness and become the perpetual dadoras; so that they do not dwell in manure piles or, in moments of fantasy, play the "sun clarinets".

There are different races of people, said Ibsen and Skvarada. Niseishai The right-wing felt that the races were not the same as the stronger, higher races, so, we thought, "aren't they the same as the lowest state among nations? Don't we feel these same strong, ancient movements of these free and modern peoples *as pain*, as *an* assault on our national organism?"²²⁶

It was a worldview that emphasised the free will as such and its significance in civil life, that excluded the notion of power as a goal, imposed as a consequence of the mechanics of civil life; that he bravely went into his shell, limiting himself to the perceptual objectification of the will of the nation as "five hundred" and "love" for the motherland, but not aggression and active support of the labours of other national individuals; who knew only the dispersal of individuals, but not organisational structures; who sought to *atomise the nation*, hastening to turn *his* into a "tribe" and his philosophy into a philosophy of harmless anarchism. It was a veneer of love of people, of rejection of "fanaticism", of fervour and faith, of eternal "entertainment", of not knowing oneself or one's own right; the fullness of Quaker maralisation, boredom and uninterest, with which she was associated with both her own and others; the fullness of the absence of everything that is necessary in the life of an individual and a nation. What is the significance of the fact that a fakir or a certain caste belonged to a political sect? One could be an autonomist, the other a "samastoynik", a Muslim or a palanquin, a "bourgeois" or a socialist, but all

They were these fakirs, with the psychology of the Chinese bullet, the blackened workers, the righteous of the new maral, the arrows and the golden eagles. They wanted - as Hamsun said - a mysterious and alluring, hopeful and tough life with a shiny side and a pitiful bottom.

I characterised this worldview as the worldview not of the nation, but of the *class, the ruling class, the plebs*. But there is more to it than that. *This is the worldview of the nation-pariahs, of the nation-felahs*. It was a worldview that was in agreement with the worldview of different and strong races. It was the worldview of the new races, the victorious ones.

And it is true that the science of our jurisprudence has a lot in common with the philosophies of the conquered peoples, and above all with the Hindus. We had a war with the "drama instincts" of other peoples, with "Shavinism", with all kinds of feelings of anger. Tagore is the same way: "the outer freedom (of the intellect) is this independence from the feelings of desire and pain, and its inner freedom that which is caused by the of egoism." The highest appeal of the right-wing was to the "pride" and to the "civilisation" of people (and the ruling nations), which would give them the power to get rid of their "uncivilised" habits. And Tagore is not advocating the "imposition of his power and authority on the village", but "refinement" in terms of "getting rid of egoistic desires and the pursuit of... *national prejudices, ... dogmas of faith*".

, as the right-wing tests of the opposition remind us "force nations" and praise the "faithless" mind? "India - a pedestrian country - has always sought to... live in a single and deep thought... Far from any politics, *not creating any political people*".²²⁷ Isn't this the profession of our human rights activists, who have been palimpsesting with the sovereignty of the nation, or, earlier, have expressed any kind of politics? This only reveals the fact that the right-wing is trying to shield the thought that is being expressed by the right-wing in a thick band of independent phrases. Tagore, like the Yans, swears by Zakhadu's characteristic "spirit of barbarism and conquest," and that (in a very logical way) not only the conquest of other people, but also of ; The ideas generated by the West are still carried with this idea of "conquering nature, as if we were living on a different world, because everything we need, we must see in someone else's parade of things".²²⁸ This is what the Hindu fakir is talking about, this "harmony" between individuals and the whole society. In order to establish this harmony, it is necessary, first of all, to rid the society (nation, state) of all mandatory

ⁱ *profession de foi* (French) - crap.

He wanted to gain power over the Azinas, to burn out their "spirit of victory". And if this is not possible, he turns to the addition of the nationality *ad majorem glories* of partisanship, adzinka and counting. Don't the right-wingers do the same, and then under the influence of the same mats, the inception of "gun and flower" harmony, the unbroken chain, and the unbroken "siesta" of loyalty and untrammelled people?

Tagore has no doubts about his public opinion, he says: "it is true that the national character is based on the idea that people should exert all their physical, moral and mental strength to *help the labourer in the struggle for the village*," but this is a of the "ideal" of humanity, and India does not need it. For this reason, according to the prorok, "it is necessary to punish" the organisation of seizure institutions among the peoples.²²⁹ It would be good, as our legal system believes, if "Arlene", "Berkut" and other "dagnet" institutions disappeared from existence. However, Tagore is aware of the existence of another council for minority peoples, which said: "If you organise yourself into a nation, then you will be able to contain the aggressiveness of other nations."²³⁰ But Tagore rejects this advice, as our right-wing advocates do "Shavinism" and "imperialism". Because these decadent "national" principles should be used to attack our "squalor", not to incite it. Because the law of "humanity" is higher than the law of life and the rights of the people, and it is also so beneficial for the sphere of business, for "accounting". Tagore adds the religion of the powerful, who openly say "let the unequal measure, let the unequal measure - that is the wisdom of woman!"²³¹ This may be accepted by the "equal", but the "unequal" will not agree to it. But at the same time Tagore understands that this moral must be learnt by the national electorate, even if he falls under the most powerful and he is finished: "In time, in the name of the cataclysmic leadership, *the absurdity of what a nation is will be realised*."²³² In the intaract of the cataclysmic chavvie, this is the meaning in the intaract of an adzinka who knows no other metaphors than her "home fire" and her own personal habits, in the intaract of a million felahs who swear at everything that tears them away from their own heap. We hear the same notes in our right-wing: in Drahomanov's opposition to "forced nationalism", in Ivan Franko's anti-American anthems, in Fyadzkevich's "pity" philosophy, in our "humanist" poetry, in the whole worldview of the decadent right-wing. Franko used the terms "forks" and "stables"; Tagore, who shared these values, said that "we, who are generally lowered

¹ *ad majorem gloriam* (Latin) - and more glory.

and the very dust of the earth - we will see more than once that this dust is holier than the bricks from which power and pride are built." The ideal of Ukrainophilia was solidarity and love for the "lesser brother", while the ideal of the Hindus was the pity sick and "the reduction of the pains of humanity". Both of them put philanthropy in the first place, supporting everything that was in line with "indomitable goals" and their joys.²³³

One of the communist magazines, which memorialised Stefanik's (Stefanik's) dedication, "Jana, Ziemia", presented this "Ziemia" not as a symbol of the nation, the native land, but as an avenue for him, in the name of the past and the future, as a small part of the sky that rises above the material and temporal, but as a "zia- melka", a "nadziel". This is the essence of life for Tagore, who, if he does respect Europe a little, it is only because its culture "can make the earth bear *more fruit*".²³⁴ That the European soil would not bear more ploughshares if the European philosophy of "dragnet", but the Hindu philosophy of pacoras, prevailed in Europe, but this sage does not know... He, like your right-wing colleagues, is in pursuit of a moral opportunity and will benefit from it, even though our world is dancing. It is true that in his clear moments, the Hindu sage feels the greatness of European civilisation, he sees it as "a sound of guns... *the holiness of the spirit* is clearer"; he recognises that one can "learn a lot from Europe... not only from the seeming power... but also from the knowledge of the inner workings of intelligence and morality". He seems to have a right of superiority over others, which Europe attributes to the exaltation of the "aggregate" over the "particular" and its benefits; because he recognises that Europe is becoming a "high civilisation, separate from family and country ties", but works in the spirit of this civilisation, built on the recognition of the primary importance of the concepts of "pride", will, effort, and the imposition of power, Tagore could not, like his followers in our country, do so.²³⁵

This makes a characteristic difference between the two light views that the first, active ones are courageous, they are dogmatic

ⁱ *Stafanik Vasyl* (1871-1936) was a Ukrainian writer and grammarian. He was a master of psychological guidance. He received his secondary education at the gymnasiums of Kalama (1883-90) and Dragabych (1890-92). In 1892-1900, he studied medicine at Cracow University. In 1890-1897, he wrote lyrical essays and prose poems. In 1899, 1900 and 1901 he published collections, in 1905 - selected poems. From 1902 to 1916 he did not write new works, he was engaged in public life. In 1908 he was elected to the Austrian Parliament in Vienna. During the First World War of 1914-18 he lived in Vienna. He died in 1936 after a long battle.

It goes without saying that the refractors of this civilisation have it, and we, the followers of Buddhism in general, have an organic inability to understand it. Anatole France, who is familiar with the forces that threaten the dignity of this civilisation (and that is why it is so fashionable in our country), is afraid of Buddhism; He is forced to recognise the abandonment of this religion, which teaches that "all our people are coming from pajamas"; which teaches "to be without pride, sad, without passion, without hatred, tolerant with intolerant... respectful and well-liked".²³⁶ As for the expression of this science, the witnesses of Ipalit Ten say that in its logical development this "doctrine goes as far as prohibiting not only warfare, *but also abhorrent*" (which our native Buddhism also does); that this doctrine "treats a stranger as one's own" (par. the struggle of our builders for the cause of Ukrainian "Shavinism" and for the solidarity of "workers of all nations"); that they "honour the father and mother as servants of the gods of heaven and earth".

What is the difference between the admirable and most pure idealism of philosophical

The West, which was given the start of humanity by the enlightenment, which told it that the great ideal of the right was the end of the father and the mother! How close this Buddhist narrative is to the slavishly decadent humanism of legalism, with its hatred of everything that rises above the whole worldview of its domestic values! Adzin also learnt the Buddha's religion on foot: the principles of nativism (Buddhist disciples) are "barracks, nanny state, rapes". Schopenhauer's "Wille" is the energy in our inner self, the sacred being that is always striving for individuation. This intense desire of life, this energy, which, according to Schopenhauer, has been unleashed into a single creative force, this basic life... *is practiced* by Buddhism. "Isn't this Buddhism a reaction," the researcher tries to ask, "*are there no non-Aryan races of Aryans?*"²³⁸ In this case, yes, and the philosophy of our Buddhism is a reaction of the philosophy of the strong, a reaction of "weak creatures" who are afraid or unable to master this philosophy and who want to dispose of themselves by jumping their moral values. The other Hindu fakir in the palitics, Gandhiji, said: "I love my land. However, I do not want the servants of India to harm England. The law of absolute love is the law of my existence"... In the palitics, his ideal is *Swaraj*, autonomy; his achievement *is Satyagraha*, or "legal action" and "the triumph of the fulfilment of the soul and love".²³⁹ Wouldn't these be taken from the vocabulary of our Svāraists, from their work on "artificial" nanisation of enemies, from their "minimal" programmes, from their plea for a "single soul of inner truth"?

This was the balance of our love for the people (abstracting from certain exceptions, such as the pains). Narrow and stupid intellectualism, belief in the mechanics of social "pride" and the ascendancy of humanity and the nation, and the use of arguments and abstract concepts, the addition of national affect as a "cause itself", the making of individuals and the national will dependent on a multitude of sanctions, the perceived abstraction of the will, the elevation of the individual over the aggregate, the emphasis on the passive actor of the nation ("count", "people") over the agentic (initiating minority), - All of this pressured not only the nation's goal to be lowered, to be reduced to the role of an apolitical tribe, to plebeian materialism, but also to the pastoralisation of the nation's panache and its administration, and the fullest possible control of the moment of battle, the role of the in history, and finally, the control of the very institution of life on which the will of the people and the future of the nation, which, although it occupies a special place in the world, rests.

Such philosophy could not give the kind of knowledge that was thought to be. She had to jump to a spiritual duality, a fracture, a disbelief in her work, a doubt and a doubt. I had to rise to the challenge of spiritual , fracture, disillusionment, disbelief and doubt.

And the truth is, in the wake of all this, we see the balance of Ukrainian film being terribly affected in our law.

PART TWO - THE CURRENT NATIONALISM

RAZDZEL I - PESSIMISM AND THE PAPERS OF THE MOST STATIST NATIONALISM

It would be hard to say that against this background of our legal profession there are not a few exceptions, a few people who do not more or less clearly sense the madness into which this philosophy of marriage has led us. Some of them are articulate, and their voice would be like a lament in the desert. The other - the very apostles of legalism - felt that they were in less acutely, and their noises were noises of anxiety and doubt. Both of these saints did not break out of this mud into the fullest light, and solid ground fell under them.

And - characteristically - all of them, all these disparate noises, all in one step, went to the nuclei of the ball that was destroying the nation - *and to the occupation of freedom*. Samoilenko (Samoilenko) wrote: "The best couples, the best pachutzki dissected us with the help of cold measurement, and we made ourselves a measured life without *the power of measurement*." The fact that the second saint admitted and asujali - affect, passion, and Samiilenko's longing, and unable to open the parley with the old bazhkas, can be understood: "and *sad* for our time, and sorry for those who would make us further in such a great hurry".

Other authors are also doubtful. "It's not for us to smile, not for us, the crippled, not for us to sing songs, not for the blind to look for footprints" (*Olesia*)... Faith divorced by entertainment was no faith at all,

ⁱ *Samoilenka Ulazimir* (1864-1925) was a poet, playwright and author. He graduated from the Paltava He graduated from the Paltava Gymnasium in 1885 and studied at the History and Philology Department of Kyiv University until 1890. He was a member of the Brotherhood of Tarasovites. He worked in Kyiv, Ekaterinadara and Mirgaradze, and from 1905 in Kyiv he wrote for the publications Gromadska Dumka, Rada, and Shershen. He served in the UPR government in the ministries of education and finance, and in 1919 emigrated to Galicia with the council. In 1924, he returned to Kyiv and worked as an editor in the publication of the Ukrainian literature. In lyrics, he defined himself as a patois idealist and as a patois satirist.

ⁱⁱ *Oles Olexandr* (born Aleksander Kandyba; 1878-1944) was a Ukrainian writer. He studied at a farming school in the town of Dzerhachi near Kharkiv, where he published the handwritten magazine *Kometa*. He studied at the agricultural department of the Kyiv Political Science Institute and at the Kharkiv Veterinary Institute. the summer of 1906, during a trip to the Crimea, he compiled his first book, "Joy Embraced with Sorrow". In 1909, he published the collection *Poems*, in 1911. - The third collection *Poems* was published in 1911. He was married Hutsulshchyna in 1912,

And so the doubts would seem to be at the centre of every action. And "what if you had been seriously ill for the past 40 years, and instead of God imposed a plan on them?" - Franko Maysei tries to do this; and Vinnichenko (Vinnichenko), who is trying to follow him, questions Ukrainian revolution and his faith: "What about the truth in the bigger ?" - Neither the waterborne religion of the village nor its prophet ever doubted that their "own plan" was different from the "God's" plans, no one in their community doubted them, because will and faith were in foreground; our unfinished prophets have the attribute of hyper-trained "reason". That's why all pure and free thinking disappeared in them, and all the right of national passion disappeared... Franko longed *for the freedom of faith* that he did not have: "I thought about brotherhood... Nowadays, those who believe are whole beings. I *doubt only* because *I have no faith*." ¹ This is a valuable recognition and a valuable regret for those who previously sang the praises of "reason without faith".

It is interesting that, as I noted earlier, this parallelism is not only in thoughts, but also in the expressions of Galician and Naddniprian writers. "*It is not for us to be remembered*"... wrote a Naddniprianian. And the Galician wrote: "*It is not for us, worn out by sorrow, torn by doubts, beaten by shame, it is not for us to fight this war.*"

Lack of faith, and *lackwill*. As strange as it may seem, in his clear , Tychyna felt this lack and was the greatest advocate of freedom. "Oh, how we loved the magic harmony! We want to see the world transparent, not rough. We see peace where there is struggle and storms. We see beauty in nothingness, and truth in a pun, and we ring our hearts, and we weep over the fact that all this is aphids and decay, the smoke of bad blood... So how can we break tyranny and prison bars, when all our singers are eunuchs, castrates?" ² This was the mockery of one who had become an arch-eunuch in poetry in the rare moment of the celebration of the righteous eunuchs.

These spiritual euro-castrates were, in the words of one Ukrainophile ideologue, *split souls* infected with a whimper that destroyed their psyche. They were "by all means, by all means, true Ukrainians," to put it simply. And the other - "our souls were divided" in an interesting and unique tragedy. ³ There was a gap between the righteous soul and the other agulhna soul that we - the freedom-sick - not close. And so they - whose will was more developed - expressed the righteousness

In 1913 he left for Italy. In 1917-19 he welcomed the establishment of Ukrainian independence, but in 1919 he emigrated and lived in Budapest, Vienna, Berlin, and Prague. He published a number of collections abroad. He died in Prague.

The second group were "eugenicists" who expressed their own freedom, but could not castrate their own country and therefore sank into the pool of legalism and political Buddhism. They called themselves "soulful", "saints have taken on wings designed for high flight". In such attitudes, the "most active" of today, tomorrow, "despaired, moved the village further to compete," and wandered in the "disharmony of his two souls."⁴ Communist literature also touches on these themes. We have seen how one of these "dual" souls, Drahomanov, took on the baron of renegation, this meaning of "dvudushnikov", but the other was a socialist: the thought of renegation itself does not fit into the souls of every party worker.⁵ Not believing in their own truth, suffering the sanctions of others, with a weakened will - such a dual soul was always hesitating between one truth and another (one nationality and another), always ready for renegade, and "so many geniuses have passed from us into obscurity, without wind and wings for wings!"⁶

But there were also noises that clearly pointed to a generalised generalisation Ukrainian

The first representative of the liberal worldview in the mainstream literature was Lesya Ukrainka: with her philosophy and her own life. In the majority of the literature, Lesya Ukrainka was the first representative of a valid worldview, and we understood her so little: with her philosophy of a cause for a cause, her agitation for the gun-toting, rush-to-punish stationary worldview of "eunuchs and castrates", her exaltation of expansion, rigidity and the right to the strongman. There were similar noises in political journalism. Part of it is the well-known book *Ukraine Irredenta*, which would like to claim that it put forward the slogan "from now on, only a small *handful* of prominent Ukrainians will build the Ukrainian community in Russia, as only a few people think about Ukraine's political independence". However, this book did not follow the line of thought that was developing here, because in its perception of the world the author was still a part of the materialist-intellectualist nineteenth century, however, deprived of the volatile harmony of Manilow, but with the latter, it also brings an underestimation of the value of history, and an assessment of the so-called "civil laws" and "the course of events". The currency of the Ukrainian idea was not entirely clear to the author of *Ukraine's Ideas*, who thought that expansion was not inherent in the nation's character and assumed that "with the collapse of absolutism in Russia, its defensive policy will disappear". He did not see the need to fight for independence *with the entire Russian public*, but rather to be "obedient" to that public. The "state-right Ukrainian question" was put forward by the

The parade of the day does not "*smack of national independence*", but of economic and administrative *facts*. "The administrative failings of the Russian state and the economic interests of Russian Ukraine have already put the national and prosperous Ukrainian question on the parade of the day, and *the national smell is more likely to be given to the people who grow it - a national smell than to their own - let's give it to them.*" This was the same dragomania with his belief in the "course of events", in the authenticity of the "pride" and in the need to arouse national passions (spiritual strength) that only serve this "pride"; with the impossibility of solving the Ukrainian problem at our expense in the "context of the civil society" and the better administration of Russia itself, and finally - (a logical premise), with the need to compete for national positions not against someone else's idea ("civil society"), but *together with it*. Except for the Czech Republic, Poland (with economic ties to Russia) in the first world war, the whole Balkanisation of modern Europe, This is what economists point out as a mistake of economic (material) and spiritual underdevelopment, as "crucial" moments in the national endeavour; In this failure and in the author's rewriting of "Ukrainians and Others", the same old spirit of extreme intellectualism, the unreasonable strength of the spiritual, national moment, which our entire legal system has been cherishing, is evident.⁷

Our most important publication (though not the most recent) was M. Mikhnovsky's "Independent Ukraine", the first pamphlet published by the Russian National Party (the best one did not publish anything) in 1900. in "Ukrainian Irredeemable" we see *new appeals*, but an old psychology, then in "Independent Ukraine" we see *new light*.

^{and} *Mikola Mikhnovsky* (1873-1924) - Ukrainian public and political figures, ideologues of state independence of Ukraine, and the first ideologue of Ukrainian nationalism. He graduated from the Faculty of Law at Kyiv University. In 1891 he became a co-founder of the Brotherhood of Tarasawtsy, and in 1896 of the Young Ukraine Association. In 1900, at the request of the leadership of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party, he wrote a programme for the organisation (published in Lviv under the title "Independent Ukraine"). In late 1901 and early 1902 he initiated the creation of the Ukrainian People's Party. In 1909-14, he was the head of the national-patriotic organisation "3rd Mutual Credit Society". On 1.5.1917, the First Ukrainian Cossack Regiment named after Hetman B. Khmialnytskyi was formed. In 1917 Mikhnovsky became a member of the Ukrainian Central Rada and the Ukrainian General Military Committee. In the summer of 1917, he was sent to the Romanian front under the command of U. Vinnichenko. In autumn 1917, he returned to Paltava, where he took part in the creation of the Ukrainian Democratic-Farmers' Party. In spring 1924, he was sent to work for the GPU. The circumstances of his death are not initially known.

The brochure *seems* to be both nationalistic and activist, although it does not dare to break the shell of the old slogans. The brochure starts with the panic of the nation and its struggle as unassailable facts of history and builds its own patriotism on them. For political tactics, the author does not seek sanction in the ideas of national character, but in the national flavour and methods of struggle of those nations "that have already risen against foreign domination". The author does not forget to call on the traditions of the nation, although he makes a brave and courageous statement that the existence of "no state-historical past can be of any importance to a strong, brave nation that has *felt* its power and although *it is difficult* to defend its right." The brochure appeals not primarily to the "march of the pagans" but to the "abrasive *smell* of the nation" and to the "crimes against the people's values", and in fact to the idea of symbiosis, saying that "the intentions of our governors are *entirely* consistent with our intentions". This brochure was in close contact with the right-wing, stating that "there is no connection between small Ukraine and Ukrainians", and the slogan was the exclusive slogan of the entire socialist revolutionary movement - "whoever is not for us, is working against us".⁸

These ideas of "independent Ukraine" as a heaven and earth and a disaster are

The government has been rejected by our legal profession, and important readers of almost every opinion piece of "Samopomich Ukraine" have noted the antidote to the legal profession's opinion. As such, I consider this short brochure to be one of those small noises that have been made by the right-wing calling a new nationalism.

Tragically, he witnessed the drama of the split Ukrainian soul, which was aimed at disharmony between intellect and will, at the attraction of the apostate *God*. He was suffocating in his native age, which was unable to extract from itself either a gigantic idea or a strong passion. His soul longed for that passion all the time. "Never (he wrote) have we aspired to such a *vapour* that stirs the spirit as in our time, when all the fragmentation of caprices and all those over which our nineteenth century has been thinking." He tests the works of this century, which "try to muffle and burn *our senses*". He calls for the inclusion of a material and material time for someone who could "save our poor soul", to "drown out our burning senses" and to "take us out of the race" of the "terrible chaos of egoism". The vain and insignificant modernity is a reflection on the miserable times of our history, to which the moderns were deaf, on the "*passion of the past ages*", on their "laicism of freedom and liberty", on their

"diction and local vapours", their "coarse and superstitious virgins", their "pitiful bans", their "unheard-of self-confidence", "diction of unheard-of greatness", and "the urgency of avant-garde qualities".

In his passion for strength and dignity, for the acute intensity his energy and will, he - like many others - looks to the modern age, searching for the virtues he rightly sees in contemporary Ukraine. In the Westhe is looking for that energy, "pity and enthusiasm", without which the life of the people is "colourful and beautiful", that "fantastic", seeing in these qualities the manifestation of the "maladjustment of the most precious and great, often indifferent, but so charming in its indifference". His people, the three damned "dead souls" of his modernity, were looking for this small indifferent pair of his life, and his tired soul, longing for faith and dignity, was looking for it in our ancient legends and in the harsh poetry of old Ukraine. This eternal smallness was what he wanted to jump over with his own passion, to jump over "everything small that was quick to attract, vaporous and volatile, that *did not think about the future*, did not call for help from *cold reflection*," that was "poetry and motherlessness." His ideals were not the old right-wing Dabradzinists who were stating their demands for the "march of the pagans" and the status quo, but the small and fresh nations that appeared on the outskirts of Europe at the beginning of our newest history. Everything them was "immanent" and "excitement" that "knew no bounds to its own immanence".⁹ This emphasis on the moment of will, which is preciously unmotivated and "unconcerned", this longing for fresh flowers, the opposition to "mercantilism" (in which it is easy to see the hopeless materialism "without faith" that the legalism has punished us with), is also *found* in Kulish. There is no place here to delve into the mysteries of this problematic nature, to try to combine the poles in one synthesis, but the fact remains the fact: Looking at his undoubted inherent right to "this time" and freedom from "his own corner", Kulish was clearly out of the legalistic *circle*. As a man who was one of the only in the circle of the idea of a foreign, national (Russian) state, far from all drama and sensual anarchism, he repeatedly assimilated the powerful national philosophy of the vivid ideology of the ruling. For example, speaking of Poland in his writings, he emphasises "the courage of the village and the talent for domestic robbery" as the *essential features* of Polish cultivators. She exalts "*the strong over the weak*" and says that "this *rough primitive truth* ruled the Polish and our own ploughs in the deserts of Ukraine. Jana was ready to burn the gas.

"We have to learn through art, craftsmanship, handicraft, in these unproductive, unheavenly ways. This truth, according to Kulish, abandoned the land to the Asians. This is part of his respect for the Cossacks. He simultaneously, as Kysil once said, despised it for its "headless brawl, devoid of all faith" and valued it for its dynamic energy and will. He associated "the good temperament of the old Russians, which was echoed in the fighters of the Dayanivtsi". He saw national fanaticism as a powerful weapon of strong nations, which students use to fight.

For these, as he said, "strong nerves", he praised the councilor Khmialnitsky, putting him on the same board as another fellow "enthusiast", Oliver Cromwell; the two were so different, but "terrible, each in his own way, they could change the whole of Europe and Asia". In the Kazakh "unapologetic zealotry" he saw not only a naked rebellion, but also "the idea of creating something different", the idea of a new parade. Finally, he turned to the abstract formulation of his own faith, his own, so to speak, nationalism: "*Strength in history is the only measure of importance, because it is the same as humanity, and humanity means the value of the right to live, this value means the absolute truth... The truth belongs to the very strong...*"¹⁰

These many leaders of our public opinion have a sustained n terms of the test of the decadent worldview of legalism, it found its best and most appropriate expression in Shavchenko. While Hohal opposed the "mercantilism" of the movement, Kulish opposed the wisdom of the "bulls in a chokehold", using every idea, even if it was not realised, his fantasy. This fantasy - the "agulhnaia" that stands above the "special", that should impose itself on what already exists - *is what Shavchenka's muse takes for his audience*. "Fantasy, walking in a certain forest, is a *inimagination...* And this one will continue! For the souls that are loving and passionate, it is a *castle inwinds* that is longer and better than the material palaces of the egoist." It is not a fixed time, a non-existent time, a sentimental utopia, an ideal of happiness, a time of a "worldly bread-and-butter country", an idealisation of the corrupt and misguided people, but an apotheosis of will, that destroys and builds worlds, whether it be fire, earthquake or terrible judgement, whether it be tears and wings - this was his faith, so far removed from the rejected and feared "faith" of Ukrainophilia. Like Gogal, who sought happiness in the harsh and bloody virgins of the Middle Ages; like Kulish, who sought it in the countryside, and Shavchenka, only with more strength and conviction, he had something "so terrible in our souls that it chills the heart,

if you want to reveal it a little bit", with the control of the strong, who know the law - the great "fantasy" and will.¹¹

And that's why we had so little sense! Each individual, without understanding it, but falling under its spell, took from our legalism not its essence, but something that, as such, corresponded to his or her own worldview. Thus, the most popular thing in Shavchenko's book was "Katsyaryna", and in Lesya Ukrainka's "The Forest Song", which is the least characteristic of the genius of these authors.

In this confusion of the right-wing, we must look for the reason why all these holes that were broken in their worldview by (partly) Gogal Kulish and (in general) Shavchenko, Lesya Ukrainka, the author of "Sustainable Ukraine", are now overgrown with the moss of right-wing manipulation. Our truthers saw in the brave spirits of the batsyky who saw in their rotten consciences Shavchenko and others as if they were Hamlet. The words of these few oracles were too much for the natures of the lawyers to be able to use without fear. A part of their Macbethian nature was "little human harmony". The words of these forerunners of a new worldview lost in the wall of their petrified virgins, and "the clear soul (of a Ukrainian) created for this time succumbed to the temptations of fanaticism with this guilt."¹²

But no matter how much we understand these new notes, you luntaristic worldview, but their importance for the nation is enormous. They testify with their own beings that the worldview of the legalism, the worldview of decadence, has not gone uncooperated, and not by the proudest of Ukrainians. And the doubters and doubters of the leaders of this worldview only confirm that it did not give them the fullness of self or the faith that a strong and aspiring great nation should have.

SECTIONS - THE WILL AS THE LAW OF LIFE. - ITS FORMS. - THE WILL OF . - THE ROLE OF THE ADJUNCTIVE MOMENT. - THE TWO FIRST CONCEPTS OF FREE NATIONALISM

Our national idea must be built on this will (not on reason), on dogma, axiom (not on a given right), on independent, not on derivative shepherding, on recent vapours, if we want to stay on top of the . Because the will of the nation is

woman as a "clearsensethe second order of things" (*Fichte* is subject to all apertures to her holy imitation, to all ideas. For the mind (Vernunft), the idea, only then becomes a moving , when it itself "acts as an affect" (*Jodl*). "" (*Nietzsche*), "the life of the elan" (*Bergson*), "the thirst for freedom" (*Jack London*), "without purpose", as it were, to "chase the unknown" (*Lesya Ukrainka*), "fantasy" (*Shavchenki*), with which he saw the light, The glorification of the "pitiful force of enthusiasm", the element of "recklessness" (*Gogol*), "truth is strong" and "the right of the village" (*Kulich*) - these are the ways in which other people's and our truths characterised this will.

What was the essence behind these statements, so different and so few? Are these the historical facts that all forms of nationalism, according to the science of jurisprudence, should be based on? Is this the "will", the "path" that the best, most individual, and most individual citizens of Ukraine long for?

Definitions are not helpful here. This irrational freedom captivates the soul and does not soften into the language of the mind, it needs to be felt. As Schopenhauer rightly says, "the will is as difficult to grasp with a finger (*begriflich*) as the apocryphal elements of God, the village, and the space." This is something that is "perceived, felt, but not understood". The most important thing to note about it is that it has a *goal in itself*, a movement that does not depend on an object but seeks it out. "The newborn artist (or philosopher, for that matter) is moving rapidly, frantically and winging it: it is scared, *although it does not know what it is*." The newborn *wing*... This was the cry of freedom, irrational, motherless, the first cry of the newborn, which for Roman law was a necessary precondition for the emergence of the individual. Furthermore, Schopenhauer defines this will as a non-state that, in the work of the intellect, "does not become stagnant, does not grow old". For him, the will is "das An sich der ^{Naturi}", the first power, *qualitas occulta*¹³ It is an eternal immanence, an eternal unlimited movement that only needs to be set in time to be turned on again. This immanence is abstract, irrational, a time in itself. In it, and only in it, the time passes from the desire for this task to a new desire.

Although it seems that this is not the will. Read it! Ugo *Goethe* He said that "it is the art that is most important, not the artists". *Schiller* perceived his creative will as "a feeling without a definite and clear purpose, which comes only afterwards. It is fuelled by the songs of the musical senses.

ⁱ *das An sich der Natur* (n.) - the substance of nature.

three souls". *André Gide* called it the will to ^{serve}, *Baez* - the apramethean, *Hugo* - "deaf instincts". For Lesya Ukrainka, this "mud that has become a god among men", which is the subject of legends "painted in the colours of the earth", is a sphinx: a *qualitas occulta*. This will is experienced as a non-stuff that remains in our souls as an eternal lamb, "like guns burning in a saddle". The essence of their existence is that they "strive and burn", but these "striving and burning" are not a sign. The essence of life is in its striving, growing, competing, and being, not in its origins; in the blind dynamism that has no name or image, and which we recognise only when it explodes within us.

The social significance of this spiritual freedom is clear, because The *yana* is *the driver of human* actions, the *yana*, this irrational force, not the mind. Our human rights activists built their national outlook on the assumption that the mind is the main engine of mental life. This is a memory. The main motors of our students are their desires, affects, passions, which are *often followed by mothers*. "Pavozins are... corresponding to different kinds of sensations, this value is in no way corresponding to these or other sensations... Floods, in the end, follow their own paths independent of them (from the arguments of reason), it is important not to follow the rules made, but the rules not expressed, which are expressed by the whole of time". For "the will is found where there is no knowledge... A bird has no idea of the eggs for which it builds its nest; a spider knows nothing of the slaves for whom it spins its web." The main driver was "blind curiosity, which in cooperation goes hand in hand with knowledge, but never becomes it". It is true that the law of dependence is in the world, but "the idea that it is for some reason acting is a natural force, and as such, it is unquestionable, its meaning lies with the whole beyond the line of reasons", it is without mats.¹⁴ Mats appear later, and the best way to find them is to remember the famous words of Goethe's Mephistopheles: *Du glaubst zu schieben, und du wirst geschoben*ⁱⁱ. The same thought was shared by Schopenhauer, who argued for "blind Tätigkeit", which is of itself, only *ingovernment*, but not under the *rule of reason*, "as if it were a *beginning*" (*Am Anfang war die Tat*), not a thought.

Arguing for his thesis of the primacy of nature, Schopenhauer

The transfer of it from the field of science to the field of human activity.

ⁱ *ferveur* (French) - .

ⁱⁱ *Du glaubst zu schieben, und du wirst geschoben.*

"The same is true there, where it is not pains and irritations that cause the coming appearances, but maths; in such a way - in the actions of life and people." In the celebration of natural phenomena, the philosopher sees that "the true immanence is like a void, the void like a gas..., there no whole without immanence, without desire. There is no unmixed dill." This movement is the essence of life in the world of nature as well as in the world of human actions, but not of reason and matter.¹⁵ "The saint (says Hugo) captures the most limited part of life and the zeinas (people). It is the aggregate receiver, the basis and the primary source of the actions done with the greatest of all the senses, it is the deaf instincts and impulses." ¹⁶ "The mind," Barès said, "is such a significant part of our soul! And Suarez wrote: "the intellect thinks for itself, but in reality it is a product of nature, a parrot that is fed by the arl." ¹⁷ Nietzsche also made a similar point: "this immanence (which he calls the immanence of the preservation of the genus), which has sole control over the most important and extraordinary parts, explodes out of time as a passion of the spirit, and then it has the light of reasoning behind it and says to all the villages that it is essentially its own time, instants, frenzies, and *perpetuity*."¹⁸ This immanent self is the cause of all endeavours and activities that are animating nature. This essence is seated in itself; without it, neither reason nor intellect would have any slaves. This will (which Schopenhauer calls "blind zeitgeist", "haceness", "fever", "steam", "desire", "rage", "anger", "hate") is the first gallon of the second woman. There is no Cartesian "Cogito, ergo ^{sum}" in this will. The intellect is a principle of friendship, a product of the most recent development.

This the will of a woman - something that cannot be replaced by anything else

The latter is something that, in fact, should be the basis of all communication". This is "the most realistic core of reality in the world". It is "not the result of the knowledge of a person, not a *conclusio ex praemissis...*"ⁱⁱ, not another thing...but the first and unconditional". Human students, as well as the creatures he painted (structures of termites, spiders), only seem to be "confused by the far-reaching abstraction and the desire for entertainment, (and yet allthis) a matter of blind inclusion, a matter of meaning not inherent in the kingship of the knowledge of the will."¹⁹ The same is said by the thinkers who, after all, are so far removed in their thoughts from Kagade

ⁱ *Cogito, ergo sum* (Latin) - I think, therefore I .

ⁱⁱ *conclusio ex praemissis* (Latin) - canary planks.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Kunstriebe* (n.d.) - .

Spencer: "The intellect is not a power, but a force; I do not say that it moves and creates, but that it moves and creates the forces that stand behind it. It has been said that the mind controls the benches as wisely as it is said to control its eyes. The mind is the eye that longs to see its way, to enslave itself"... He sees the analogy of will and intellect in the wind that blows the carriage, in the sail that is covered by the hand of the sailor. "The only righteous mental strength is this longing."²⁰

According to Pavolle *Hume*, reason can never be the mother of our actions if it is not connected with some passion or affect. Facts of life can never be the basis of human actions if they do not arouse our lust or desire. *L. Petrazhytsky* calls this "will", these "affects" *emotions*; these are passive-active, motor irritations. They are, for example, the emotions of anger, fear or pleasure in their own right and in steam, in the state of excitement, in the act of running to something (*pati* = movere) or in the act of attack; emotions of repulsion and avulsion. Thoughts about pleasure and time, about fear and anger, play no role in the process of matting, unless emotional irritation occurs. "How can strong muscles, sharp senses, and a great mind help me in my fight, if I don't feel the urge to use them for my own safety, if looking at a woman, knowing she is not safe, makes me feel somehow different, without causing any action?" says *Kawtsky*.

These emotions are "bizarre" in the sense that they are avulsive and Pulsating emotions are not always connected with the benefit of their adjuncts. "People often work together with their own intuitions, so it is not their thoughts that most often influence them." In some cases, *Spencer* writes, the kingdom has positive (for the addict) attacks and harmful ones; the emotions of the addict can sometimes lead to death. *Because the childish emotions "have a place" not in the preservation of individuals, but in the preservation of species.* "I don't know how the *personality* breathes, it's just a bad mechanism, twisted by someone... Who is the one who thinks, feels, tastes these people? No! This is a public group... These are my thoughts, my feelings, my taste, my perceptions, my *intentions and goals.*" Every emotion that plays a role in public life (says *Durkheim*) must, in , be useful *for society*, otherwise society would disintegrate, as it does there, with the flood of people becoming unhappy and unhappy. He calls it *Ward*.

"by the use of smell and function".²¹

The actual expression of this affective freedom, which I have called will, can be viewed from two points of integration - biological and psychological. The latter is a point of perception, the former is a function. The goals of addiction and the nature are different. The purpose of nature is functions (nutrition, reproduction, species), the purpose of adzinci is feeling, predefined emotions. But they are duplicated ad . Driven by its own "emotions", "will", the adzinka, incomprehensible to it, longs to achieve its "goal" - it achieves the "goal" of nature. Adaptation is a function. From the point of view of the gliding of nature - affect is a source for function. From the point of view of organismic integration - function is a source for affect. The task, felt by the zoning in the performance of the function of nature was not intentional, it is not an essential part of nature, but is done in the name of the "purpose" of living beings. Nature has some kind of relationship with these creatures, and they need to be given schemes.

Thus, these affects, emotions and attitudes become a very important social system.

He is a dynamic engine of society, which keeps it alive during his life, and is the source of its highest growth and development. In his social life, this affective personality is a gatekeeper of all kinds of chaos and powers. Intelligence is reserved for the rulers, but I believe that what goes into the preservation of the family is the will, which is synonymous with desire. This thirst - for love, for love, for affection, for steam, for fury, for immanence and for conquest - is the principle that illuminates the world. "The very desire for the self is the most powerful stimulus of organic and supra-organic evolution."²²

Thus, any collective philosophy of a group of people (*and, in the first place, of a nation*) should not be based on the principles of logic, but on the will of the individual, without sanctions, without guidance, without maturation; which not only should not be (like the general dragomaniacs) restrained, but on the contrary, should be nurtured and developed, because the nation lives and dies with it; to which the entire policy of the nation and all its principles are dedicated, and which cannot be drowned out by any "eunuchs" of adventurous ideas - liberalism, caspianism, humanism, etc. n. We should not limit this will of the nation to save, fight for rights and win what we need, but strengthen. And this strengthening should be *the first and foremost principles of the national idea, which I here put in place of a weak, intellectualistic, liberating, "castrated" legalism.*

This will manifests *itself in different forms*, but whatever forms it , it is indisruptive supply of heroism and aggression, in the

The *will* to save nature and human beings in the face of risk and danger, through, as Hegel says, the Schopenhauerian "*will to live*" (*Wille zum Leben*), *one of the most important of Nietzsche's "wills "* (*Wille zur Macht*), with the struggle, the elimination of harm. This clear implication of the self is (as Hegel says) the implication of the will to "define oneself", one's "must", one's "unquenchable need", one's "subjective". The will, which is a package or a subject, seeks to remove this "addiction" that is "harmful" to it. In order to reduce this harm, the persecution must be internalised by the "other", which must declare its strength, to establish the boundaries that separate the subject from the object.²³

One of the most important forms of manifestation of this Hegelian "non-space Ita "*koi*" is *asocialised by risks, insecurities, movements, and artists. "That I love and that I am fascinated (by Bares) by these animals... "*²⁴ These people, these are *Budler's* fellow travellers, who "come like a visitor", who "do not know why, call out: "Hazem!", chasing a garbage truck that "the human mind has never known a name for", which Lesya Ukrainka calls "pachvarai", that "*all the names*" given to it could not capture its essence (sphinx) These were the *Vergarnes* vandals who "loved the wind, the pavetra, the prastor", going forward into the "light after the wacha" (sans savoir faire), bringing them to "garach and varjats"...

This was the philosophy of "longing for the fact that a slave is a slave" (Sehn- sucht des Sollens); the wisdom of those for whom "insatiable natural thirst" that never gives "the final task" is not a rule (as in Franko's *The Stonemasons*), but the highest time, which Spengler considered to be the most basic feature of the "Faustian chalice".²⁵ This is what *Talon* means by "goût du risque", "a lonely woman walking in a latrine, looking for heaven". In this form of expression of the will of a woman, the same call to the forest, to the varieties of light, to the "object" with which she eventually sits down and *controls her own will* is revealed.

This will often manifests itself as heroism. The hero imposes his will on the audience, demands that they do not accept this attack, does not allow his unbending will to bend, does not want to be bent by them and dies, but does not accept the will *of another* over himself. He is looking for death, looking for the best way to hurt himself with a hateful act. He often imagines different reasons for his heroic deeds, but these reasons are not their origins. "They are either acting or, depending what they are, they are being tortured.

ⁱ *goût du risque* (French) - the taste of .

in addition, these *are* not, among *other elements*". These elements are the pure physicalistic process of the subjective self, the will, and the abstract, and the desire to achieve this ultimate, the ultimate end of the "not" in the creation of the external world... This is the "blind reflexive reaction of a creature to every attempt on its inviolable self"... This is the "Non ^{irréductible}ⁱ", which is due to its principle of immeasurability to light, a "frankenstein decision" that will not change its position. Talon gives an example of how this "mateless Not" acted not only without mats, but also *with them*, with the "perceptions" of the mind.

This abstract "thing" is opposed to any (other) will, which, although it imposes itself on us, is intoxicated by this Not, which, although it claims to violate the independence of our I, is not, placing its power above the assault on the woman, "pure reflexes of a furious bird, which, in the presence of another, as if hearing the call of all external villages, are ready to fight to defeat these people." This is a physical and logical not, which must be understood as a Sabak seeing a torturer, or a Jew seeing an Arab, or an Arab seeing a Jew.

It is true that Helo did not say that "dominion over the worlds belongs to those who know how to say No".

Whatever "this recognised reason (that causes heroic action) is, it exists because our students tell us it does", independent of circumstances. It was long ago quia ^{absurdum}ⁱⁱ, "the gift of reaction to the fatal accident", which changes the appearance of the pavement, "makes the outside world bend to the gestures of death". This is "the utter egoism of the smell of the village" (^{puissance}ⁱⁱⁱ), "the cave of the greatest asylum... that has taken away the freedom of creatures", which, although - by all means - retains its will to power.²⁶

In its purest form (as in the case of risk and in heroism), the will to power is manifested in an unvarnished, naked implication of the will, in the desire for domination. We have seen these moments in some of the most abstract forms of a woman's will; to transcend herself, to not submit to the reality of "sovereign bodies of death" and to impose her will on them. Both, Holt explains, are the same cause; the attack and the baron's stem from the same source.²⁷ The mental attitudes of the baron and the attacker are the same.

ⁱ *Non irréductible* (French) - an *irreducible* "not".

ⁱⁱ *ago quia absurdum* (Latin) - I'm making a fuss because the absurd (formed by the ad formulas

"blind faith" *credo quia absurdum* - faith because it is absurd).

ⁱⁱⁱ *puissance* (French) - power, magic.

The appearance of the same paradox, this affirmation of the same *will of the woman*, which is the same as the desire for domination, differs only in the *degree of affirmation of this will*. In the first case (of the abaron), the conversation is about a *simple* "affirmation of the will to give, purely and without further gift". In the second case, this "dadatak" (as opposed to affirmation of ownership) is transformed into "appropriation of another's", the appropriation of the same will in another person. For one of the most characteristic features of the will is its "fearlessness of others". For Hegel, this "subjective" that seeks abstraction is that "*reaches beyond the alien... pit of the light from the outside*", that is implied in the expansion, in the steaming of the boundaries, in the removal of their wanting to sit.²⁸ "The chaotic will (says the American sociologist *Ward*) is this force of the *village*", this "insatiable thirst for the *manifestation of*"; It is and , the desire of *the human being*, pharmaceutical, created and pirated, until it is impossible for five to be completely at mercy of *the agrarian*".²⁹

The famous jurist Hobbes says that in this will, which we have come know under these names, "the hollow ego of *the thirst for power*". The desire for power, he says, comes from the will to be powerful, and this ultimate self is the expression of our spiritual and integral activity, our value of dynamism. The expression of will is nothing more than an act of passion, a step outside one's own boundaries. It is not a matter of moderating and moderating desires, but rather of unrestrained striving and the development of desire from one object to another, the achievement of one goal, which can be achieved by the achievement of another." It is not in the surrender of time, but in the surrender of being. According to Hobbes, "it is never possible to secure the power and the seeds of the good life that one has in a given moment without first having to acquire *more of them*". "Give more of them!" This is the naked formula of the will that, although it looks different, is found in both risk and heroism.³⁰

The instinct of *sovereignty* and the *désir of pouvoir*, which live in the In each of us, to a lesser or greater degree, it is, as Hobbes says, the essence of all our desires, all our aspirations. For Hugo, "the self, in its adherence to the inalienable rights of the human being, is not only the bench, but all living beings... for *selfis nothing the abstract human being*." More! This sitter, this immanent self is most closely related to reality and eternal ideals." For Hugo, "to be a pavilionist is to

ⁱ instinct of .

ⁱⁱ *désir de pouvoir* (French) - longing for competition.

"The woman's eagerness", "desire" is itself a sametai.³¹ And Nietzsche writes that "we are nawat kali addai... *our* woman is a martyr for the cause of our tsarina, then this is *our* akhvara's *righteousness*". He advised his countrymen: "You are sending ships to unknown seas! Live inwith your fellow men and with *yourselves*." (This fight with yourself, the spiritual self with the whole self, I see in the Gospel). We will be aggressors and *invaders*, but we will not be able to be *valedictorians and rulers*." The essence of life is this "power and strength"; the essence is "the struggle for *right, for growth and expansion, for power*", because the "*thirst for power*" is the manifest thirst of life!³²

In this way of understanding his life, there are two moments that are interconnected: in the struggle for food and rights, we distinguish *between expansion as a goal and struggle as a kindred*. The sadness that Adzina feels when in danger, when doing heroic deeds, when seizing power - this is the nature of the nature to make Adzina surrender to his "purpose". This the nature of what the Germans call the *Gat-tungsgeist* (genius of the family), which ensures continuity and strength. Addictive asalodes, pain exist for the same reason, because magic is the correct function of this organism, because it could live, multiply, be powerful and withstand the competition with other "species". However, we must also link the conditions for such an expansion, because if the essence of the will is the will to be named and to surrender, then the essence of it is also the immanent will to search, without which it is impossible.

This is the law of expansion, which, unlike many labourers, is known to exist.

vav, it exists and will continue to exist. Here is what *Spencer* said: "One universal truth is worth mentioning: the truth that ar- gencies are tointrude on the existence of another. The impulse to consider ourselves as a race of alien races, to be inherently avid of alien lands, is characteristic of all kinds of organisations and manifests itself in all kinds of ways. It can be said that the boundaries of the spheres of existence of each species are equal to two different systems, villages... *The immanent, characteristic of each species, is to enter another sphere, another way of life, another people.*" And then - "for centuries, although the family was a wealthy *family*, it was always such a *dreadful family*, and now it is still a *dreadful family*. The feeling of sympathy was always there, even though public safety required her to ignore it. ... The evolution of those highest social sentiments, which were the hallmarks of sympathy, was steadfastly held back by those who were indispensable to the struggle for existence between spots and nations."³³

This is the law of the barracks as it exists, with one change or another,

accepts modern sociology as a fact: it is a "bourgeois" sociology as well as a "sociological" one. Socialists say: "the law of the struggle for the establishment" applies to facts that no one will deny, and then: "it became the reason for the beginning of a new era."³⁴ This is one of the epics of revolutionary socialism; however, he also reveals the holes in his works. And what about this very same socialist "bourgeoisie": "What is called resistance (in the struggle for existence) is a simple manapole of the most powerful. In the work of recruitment, resilience is the meaning of a strong person, and a strong person is the meaning of a weak person." And further: "the same process (as in the organic world) can be observed between the higher and lower races of people... The development of the lower races is delayed by the higher races... They do not want to be the highest races on the globe, but persist in the struggle for the lowest... The law gives rise to the right of might... A look at history, if from a bird's eye view, shows that the Chalavek is falling into the same water as the creators of law." In the modern world, the same laws apply as in the organic world, "the same laws apply in the super-organic world."³⁵

The "bourgeois" agrees with him, says the socialist: "Whatever the pen "We would not be true international analysts, we have to recognise the fact that the conflict is shared by different nationalities with different intentions, different and different."³⁶

Expansion is not only a self-determined act of the individual's own will, but also an addition to the will of others - these are the laws of organisation and organisation. Spengler saw the law as an expansion of the essence of "Faustian", activist culture. He also saw the will to power in the old Gothic, in the cathedrals and the Crusades, in the Viking and Gothic invaders. In this way, Gogal was looking for that freedom, longing for "pitiful eyelids", where everything was "enthusiasm", steam, and an amatical movement forward...³⁷

Nietzsche would have been right about this movement: "We still do not know," he wrote, "what this 'where' is that is driving us, since it has already struck us from our old soil. But this very soil ignited in us a desire to go farther, to the opportunities that lie , untried, undiscovered, we must take them..."³⁸

This aggression, expansion, the entry into the "sphere of existence" of others, which is based on the will of power, this value of the will of the individual, has its own associated thought process of *struggle*. Each of the theories of expansion was an established apostle of the idea of the struggle.

The normalisation of the "function" made it so that normal people (and not only people) feel the vital solitude that they should in barracks. *Jack London* calls these instances, which are also called "chasing the lads from the noisy garages to the lanes and beyond", a kind of "champion's dream".³⁹ This psychology is very close to the psychology of the spartan athlete, and it defines the kind of active soul that Spengler praises and which is absolutely alien to the athlete...⁴⁰ The Persian shah, present at the races, at the trial, said: "No, I find no for it, no sense. I knew that one horse was running faster than the other, and I knew without that; but which ones were running faster, which ones were slower, I had no interest in that...". Lesya Ukrainka writes about this in her classic story "Three Minutes": "In a conversation with her colleagues and prisoners, journalists, she said to me: "*although* neither you nor I know *who and why we serve*, I would be a bad builder if I did not have a strong class and *work hard*"... A valuable ethical expression of competition for competition.

Fighting is a form of in. There are known an-
The English politician Sir John Gorst, when questioned by Lloyd George during the Boer War, said: "You think that this war is about our longed-for avalanche with the gated chapels, and Chamberlain thinks that we are fighting for the equality of all whites in the face of Zambezi. You're wrong! We got involved in this war because there was no way to away with more than one murder and the human race could not continue to do so. The war was not an administrative one, and if we had not got into a conflict with the Boers, we would have had a conflict with any of the cantonal powers. Never before has there been such a long and measured competition..." The Englishman Baldwin, who almost broke his ankles in Africa, wrote about his impressions: "Why would a man risk his life *without having any race him*? This is a question that I will not try to answer. *I can only say that the challenge gives us a difficult task*, worthy of exposing ourselves to all kinds of trouble, as long as we have someone to show us the way." This is the sense of passion that captivates the artist and the burner, which can be found in the gift-giver, the coloniser, the engineer...

The will of government is this "expanding, healing, growth, immanent of the collaborator". This "will of power can only be manifested through co-operation: it is all the value of, of the

rapharmacists. "⁴¹ For Güö, this is the most important law of life: "If there is some kind of universal right of woman, it is this: every creature that creates (one could call this law a race) responds to an attack by an abaronai, which is itself the most attacking, the most capable of striking. This is the first instinct, which has its origin in the reflex impulse, in the irritation of living tissues." These truths are essential in the life of an individual. In every primitive society, "in order to live, we must be able to hit the one who hit us. "⁴² For Hegel, it is the negative that lies at the bottom of our psychic self, that although it can manifest and impose itself on life, it must also fight and strive for it. The process of "becoming, perceiving and resolving these perceptions... is the most characteristic of the privilege of living natures... That which is immediately only affirmative, is and will be without life, just as that which is caught in unresolved perception".

Hegel calls this barracks "a barracks for the sake of the superiority of the ness". For him, as well as for Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Spengler, Huyghe and others, this will of life and struggle is same *will of power*, domination, and "the fact that domination is not qualitative, but quantitative, as money or property, which by its very nature can be quite truly appropriated", then where the full role of *domination and power* is played, "conflict and struggle arise".⁴³ Thus, from the very nature of the mystery of the will, Hegel's work is dependent on the *non-administration of the moment of struggle* in this world. For the author of "Light as Will and Appearance", the natural world in the non-organic world and the different kinds of inorganic world must be in a state of constant struggle. Everywhere he went, he saw "a fight not for life but for death between the ages of those years. The field and objects of the battle are the matter that mutually see in each other's reflection, as well as time and space... The forces of nature and organic forms are working for the matter in which we want to manifest ourselves, and each of them has only what it has seen in the other." Varagavannah is unavoidable, because each will exists for itself as a separate and distinct force.⁴⁴

Adsul has a very significant negative momentum of each

The idea judged by the philosophers of law. Hegel said that no affirmation is possible without negation: that without apologies, the call of harmony and the ultimate in supernaturalism are impossible. Hugo emphasised that *no difference between attack and struggle*; for Nietzsche, this struggle is the action principle that "breaks the vicious circle of individualisation" (the genius of which would be Apollo), the triumph of essence over appearance; the triumph of "meta-

physical" over the "physical". For him, the will was universal ante remⁱ, which could become universal in reality *only through admission, through barbarism*.⁴⁵ The said by the German philosophers mentioned here several times: "This belongs to a living person, who has to race, who has to take over, and thus has to takeover other people's villages. We have *the right to fight*; in the same sense, we can also have the *right to attack: both are indispensable for everything*: Zarist and abaronic egoism are not things of choice or "free will", but of fatal self-determination... The *grammar that is being used is in the process of being used*."⁴⁶ Nietzsche was even clearer about this: "Will you be free?" (walking) I want to hear your opinion that you are a free man, not that you have escaped from the yoke. Free from what? This is the business of Zarathustra! But let your voice be clear to me: you *are free from anything* ⁴⁷ - not only from the abarons, "summoning" (from the other), but also from imposing your will on the other (from the other). The attack and the abaron, the affirmation of the own and the negation of the alien. "*Extreme positions are not replaced by moderate ones, but by the most extreme ones, only by the most consistent ones*" - Nietzsche captured the law of all evolution in this formula, *giving a recipe for making sense of every new idea, even though it is a reduction of the old one*.⁴⁸

I've developed this Kaiserling formula even more deeply, which we are reading:

"This is a metaphysical dynamic. The abstract concept of villages has no place here. Not the canonical, but what is the most immediate, what is the most ideal. Thus, *we have to take* a piece of what you have long dreamed of... *like the idea of eternal peace* or the kingdom. The ideal is achieved only by *not giving negation, but by counterpointing*, and by making the existing anomalies... move into new rhythms" This is the "deepest understanding of all ad- strangeness", and "since the world is all about agency; since everything causes cooperation..., the absolute ad- strangeness is the most punishing gift for achieving this goal. All the weapons were, in the long run, unimportant; it was not their weapons that caused the most significant changes. When the new Kali chivalry comes to domination, it will not happen by way of a worldly understanding and paradox... *It will bring the sword as well as the chivalry*."⁴⁹

ⁱand *universalia ante rem* (Latin) - universals of the right to things (the general knowledge that exists since the inception of material things).

ⁱⁱ *universalia in re* (Latin) - universals in things (a general statement that applies to specific things).

All the reforms were implemented in this way. I wish we had the strength to do so. Here is what we read in *The Paradoxes of Catalysis* (Mgr. R. H. Benson): "What was the unexpected consequence of the person of Jesus Christ for the public of which he was a son, if not the conflicts, the strife and the discord that plagued his kingdom? Not the words of a modern "humanist", a modern tolerant "Christian", fall from the lips of Jesus Christ... "*Go and tell this forest*", (exclaimed, speaking to the crowd); "*magicians of evil..., thieves!* This is the language that he used when addressing representatives of the Israeli elite... Can you imagine a more professional language?... "Don't fool yourself," he calls out to the modern humanist. I didn't come to *bring peace* at the cost of humanity; there are things that are more important than war and the rights of the people. I came to bring not a measure, but a sword. I came to *separate families*, not to unite them; to destroy kingdoms, not to build them; to take the masters of the work and the master of the work; to establish not tolerance but universal truth." He was the first to establish "first the kingdom of God, and then the kingdom of this world; first the world of God, and then *harmony among men*". He cared first of all about revolution, and then about harmony (we care about "harmony" and "music" first of all). And in the Gospel it reads: "From the time of Jesus Christ until the present day, the kingdom of heaven has been given to the sower, and whoever sows it will inherit it."⁵⁰ Illustrations from Kaiserling's poems, which, like music, has a harmonic balance, that "*Urphänomen*" is "*a pair of equal parts, not unison (Einklang)*".

The same point is made by the well-known Pratestan theologian and philosopher Gar-nak. For him, the greatest rhetoric of humanity was "to establish a strong rivalry between the kingdoms of God and the kingdoms of this world", which can only be eliminated by competition. "The struggle and victory all their dramatic expression become his soul... The image of two kingdoms, God's and the devil's, the struggle between them and the coming *final battle* in which Lucifer will be defeated on earth." Not only the "substances and forces" of inorganic and organic light, which Zimel speaks of, but also the "substances and forces" of the superorganic light, its establishment and ideas, "require our *efforts and struggles* before they are given to us".⁵¹ Each cultural light came "not from a logical analysis of the day, but from *the addition of what the day was*".

ⁱ *Urphänomen* (n.) - first-fruits phenomenon.

These moments of barbarism, which sociologists and philosophers recognised as something inevitable, are still being defended by politicians with a lot of sincerity. Above, I cited two theories - a catalytic one and a protest one - which emphasised the importance of the moment of struggle for the people, for the living of a new idea. Some passionate publicists emphasised its danger to the people of the nation. For *Max Müller* in extra-organisational world, the barrage is also an inevitable reflection on the state of equality. Nations grow and live for the sake of "mutual understanding", and only in this church can each of them develop. Adsyul falls to the absolute holy and to the vain.⁵² For the Italian *Enrico Caradini*, the will of the woman and the will of government are pirated into the "will of war", as he is a champion of national causes. "The will of war between nations is eternal. The war is eternal. This is the history of the nail. All the individual histories of nations and states are guided by it." And here, the path to harmony leads to the struggle, "international relations are an effort of nations to create civilised solutions. Ukraine is this nation's competition for them". Karadyni also adds the harmony and affirmations that are set beforehand. "In sovereignty, the principle of war and the principle of peace are only two of the same principle. Both the principle of jingoism and the principle of strife between classes are nothing but two tanks of the same principle; the national personality, like the personality between nations, does not consist of jingoism and does not consist of strife, but consists both. This national life is composed of a pastoral movement that replaces the state with the barracks and the barracks with the state.

And international life is built on the barracks, on pasta and other things. The world is a place that steals the world from the world and the world from the world. Only in the "adversarialism and struggle of classes... does the deeper significance of this questioning become apparent. And the greater the gulf between nations, the greater the degree of war, the greater the adversarial nature of our species". For "war is not a race of people, not a race of peoples, not a race of nations, not a race of spots, but a race between species, and even between people, peoples, nations, and others." The author notes that there were several pacifist theories in the world war, and each of them had a war. There was a military theory. Arms were supposed to end the war, but it was the war that came out of it. Interdependence of nations (interdependence economics) was detrimental to the war, and it caused the cannibalisation that led to the war. There was a socialist theory: "socialist internationalism" was supposed to bring cooperation to the war, but out of socialism, which was joined by the raging national conscience, came the same war: the emergence of

la revaluation, from which the war came. There was a bourgeois theory of casmapalism. The diffusion of cultures and civilisations killed the spirit between peoples and the Vaina itself, but this theory also applied to the Vaina. The enlightenment and ennoblement of classes and nations drove barbarians to war. "War is in militarism and in pacifism, in strength and in weakness, in adventurism and in cowardice" and in age and in degeneration, in barbarism and in civilisation - in a species of onslaught, "a species of war by its very nature"...⁵³

Strengthening the will of the nation to live, to , to expand, is the first basis of nationalism that I have been using here since the beginning of the 20th century. *The second* such basis of the national idea is the *virginity* of the nation's commitment to the struggle, and the necessity of having the necessary conditions, without which neither heroic learning nor intense life, nor faith in it, nor the triumph of any new idea, even if it changes the world, is possible. I attribute the first of these aspects to the pro-property spiritual "castration" that excluded the currency man from international life, blind to the creative power of the intellect. *The second* is the pacifism of our legal profession, which believed in the eternal peace of the League of Nations.

SECTION III - RAMANTISM, DAGMATISM, ILLUSIONISM - THE TRAGEDY OF NATIONALISM

I have defined the will of power as something that will "break the circle of individualisation" - something that will stand above the knowable, above the worlds of appearances, above phenomena, the "agulate" above the "particular". Bielelagi teach us that inrealm of nature there are two phenomena: emotion and function, and that behind the common affects there is a "cunning nature" (or species!) that pursues its own goals. German philosophers formulate it as follows: "the immense masses of (partial) wills, intentions and learners are only the pylons and sons of the world spirit (des Weltgeistes) to achieve their goals". The work of this philosopher, speaking about these very subjects, is the same for his papers: He says that "nature achieves its goals only in those ways that it jumps from each individual to a certain measure, a volatile thing, by which it can make a person a gift to itself, which in sovereignty is only a gift to the species. I have this "dream", this "volatile", this "instinct", this "agile", this "calm

that breathes life into individuals and the masses, appears in the collective (and national) life in form of an "agitated" idea. This "instinct" is perceived above the sense of self-security ("aversion to risk"), above one's own self (heroism), above humanity and above the self of others (expansion, competition). As an "agullhuman" *control over everything "particular"* in space and time *taken*. And this hovering over the particular is *one of the main aspects of every big idea*, as we have already mentioned (*anti-intellectualism* and *revolutionarism*). Every great *idea*, including *ours*, is a national idea, which, although it is powerful, cannot exist without these prerequisites.

At the heart of the modern woman lies "ein Trieb" (Fichte), the immanent thing that "remains the same in all changes". But in order for them to appear, to create their own light, it is necessary for this implicit to become clear and to be understood; for what Spinoza called *confusing ideas* to become clear ideas. This consciousness is the "agile idea" of which I speak here.⁵⁴

Jules Benda defined the meaning of the word *Ramantism*: it was "the belief in what one declares as ('agului ideii') the truth, the absolute truth, which requires the whole world to hear what one declares. Ramanism is the "spirit of apostasy" because "all apostates are ramants."⁵⁵ Belief in one's "eternal" truth and the resolve to obey it to all "temporal" ones is the hallmark of "ramantic" (or "theological") doctrine, which is the essence of all eternal doctrine.

Anatole France has a term for a "theological idea". If he wants to condemn these ideas, he must recognise their important role in history. Under these concepts, France understood the "aged" ideas: "glory", "homeland", "retribution", which are imposed on the masses and are propagated to "otherness", and to the intarses of "counting", intarses of "shining". These are the ideas that - as intarses of the "" - are promoted by the "theories" of the intarses of the "particular": the , their mechanical sum, the data of generation, their moral duty, the "time of , the measure and "welfare", "humanity", . "Ramantik does not consider these "attributes" to be something permanent, but only transient appearances, behind which there is an "independent existence" (freie Einheit), their asyarodak and soul. The antimancer, on the contrary, perceives the world as it is, without entering into the "essence of things", perceiving "what exists only as a thing in itself, this meaning is due to chance, which is devoid of all meaning".

For Fichte, Ramanism is a kind of peculiarity that belongs to the adjuncts of the "tse-

¹ *confusa idea* (lat.) - a confused idea.

lag", which in the name of the ideal of the "whole" competes with the world in many , "without regard to what one may want or need for one's own self-preservation". And so it is that the "very look" at these ideal works of art causes a test. *Disinterestedness, thus* (independence from succession!) and *matelessness* ("the very look", without logic!) are the features of all "rational" ideology. The group has its own reality, its appearances have a "supernatural character", and the idea that holds the group together has its own "superindividual" life, taking into account both the "spatial separation of the adjacencies and the "temporal separation" of the components.⁵⁶ The "Antimantic", such as L.Talstoy, is said to be a warrior "in the place of *an assassin's* question, a slave, a supportive question of *aggression*, of the state, of the native land", or of "a leap, a goal", or some goal that will be achieved only in the *future*", "is generally *achieved and not intended*". "Asabist" and "agulh", "present" and "future", "meant" and "achieved", these are the essences of the two poles: "romanticism" and "urban utilitarianism".

For Ramantik, the most important thing is national identity mission", for the world - the fight for it, for the interests of this *generation* - the long-term interests of *the nation*, for the time being - the goals of the city, the state. "Theolag" thinks that the intrinsic values of species, "aggregate affairs" respect the intrinsic values of individual parts, and that their sums and values do not vary over time. He thinks that every species of living beings is unprotected by the unlimited change of individuals. The will of a human being is a career and claims to be manifested in an idea, in a genus: that is why only its existence in the social order is important for the will of a human being." According to her own words, she is not interested in the elves, but in their ideas, in their ^{leonitas}. "That's why Plato recognised that only ideas, this is the meaning of species, genera, but also only the unlimited existence and annihilation of the individual.
"57

Renan characterises this as a "Raman spirit" (although he calls it in other words) as "the goût of great things" (le goût des grandes choses). The spirit, the solid "ramblings" live on in those "democratic" people who see their time in "tan joys" that are not too muddy and beneficial to the other side; in the "will not to work for any work in terms of *non-personal intimacies*"; in the desire of a people who "stop making " and continue to make the "least amount of money",

ⁱ *leonitas* (lat.) - ilvinas.

"For Renan, the 'gemstone spirit' is this 'sudden willingness to give oneself to an idea to which *no absolute intrinsic intention is attached*'. At the same time, he, like many others, sees in it the most comprehensive manifestation of this "rhamantic" spirit that attracts adjuncts. For "this is the meaning of the expression of egoistic entertainment..., which is precisely the opposite lackexpression, the desire for *individual rights* that is the essence of our modern democracy."⁵⁸

This "idealism", this "religiosity", this "theology" - this is the "rational spirit" that places the eternal above the temporal, values that "do not bring us anything" over "personal intarses"; the subordination of the intrinsic values of "me", "you", "us" is the idea of a great *value, which in religious life is called the Kingdom, in ethical life - moral principles, in political and organised societies - a nation or a state, as a panacea, made up of the sum of the individuals who speak a language or occupy an agrarian territory...*

"Cali Clemenceau (as we read in L'Humanité)... was completely averse to the idea of establishing a measuring stick that would have been a summary of the French censuses taken in 1870, He is deeply religious, he has a cult of his native land... He is not a materialist, he is an emotionalist... It does not matter that France has lost whole armies in the war, that it has incurred huge financial costs due to keeping whole armies in the war *The French* are pathetic in this task, but France will give the free world unprecedented *power; its torch* will be brighter, its *glory* will be brighter, and this is the most important thing."⁵⁹ These words were written by an enemy of "theology" and "religion", a democrat and socialist, who was irritated by the tone of these ideas. But how brilliantly this quote characterises the "religious spirit", the spirit of idealism, with which great nations rise and fall, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the "democracy" generated (plagiarised by our rights), who care only, in this case, not about France, but only about modern French people, about their great-grandparents and a piece of bread instead of a magical land, its goner and the unification of national territory. As we can see, our "minimal" drama is not exclusive to the Ukrainian phenomenon, it has a common thread with the "democratic" one.

From a different point of view, but the same gavorytsya and *Zara tustra*. In his speech, he speaks in favour of individual virgins, and any anti-Atheists, in favour of "individuals", especially the present one, who are being punished (militarised). "Remember these words: every old person

He had to work on his own beauty (yes, adzinak!), because he wanted to love only creatures! "Why? Are you trying to get why? I am not one of those who can be tried for their 'why'... You have already started with the 'for' of the creators! Your very virginity wants you not to do anything "for", "to" or "for the sake of".⁶⁰

Lesya Ukrainka's poetry was also inspired by these "gemstone" spirits. From her strong ideas, like Mary, who followed the Messiah, she "not work... neither for food nor for bread"; she did not care (like Martha) "for the needs of the time", but like Mary "*for the eternal*", for which Khadyzha was given the right to die alongside his other wife, Aisha Muhammad. *Emerson*, like our patroness, points to the same point of "ramantic" values, saying that "things seen are temporary, things unseen are eternal."⁶¹ *Fichte* said that great movements were only useful if they "*were carried away by the eternal*." It is interesting that the same is true of the realist and socialist *Saral*: "The Napoleonic Varyar (we read from him) pledged his life to the creators of the '*eternal*' epoch and to live in the glory of France, without protesting the fact that himself was always poor."⁶² *Spengler* uses the words "insane" (which he opposes to "mind") and "irrational" (which he opposes to "nation") to express this same superiority.

As for the Nazi theme, let's remember that the right

This is *Spencer's* point. English sociologists cannot avoid making mistakes: Why, while "the names of the great terrorists are cursed names, we call Napoleon 'the great' - because he has committed murders that *Spencer* counts in the millions, and that outnumber all the murders of the guild."⁶³ The reason for this is simple: people who are "theological" are interested not so much in intrinsic values as in "ideas", "eternity", and the glory and greatness of France. This is expressed in the top of *J. Peliszko's* Czech poem ("Värtane Napoleon"): He describes an old mother who gave the tsar three sons who did not survive. The old woman "lived, lived, lived," and the rumour spread: from exile, from the war, from a foreign land, the people's dead of Gaspard are returning to Batkivshchyna... to Napoleon. The streets look like the East, although she is a man whose insatiable thirst for domination and war took away his three sons and destroyed his life. But once she heard "vague cries, loud guns, steel bayonets, horses, and a steel coffin on a carriage," she forgot everything: "now I realised that I had three sons, that I would have given more than one for Muscovy and Waterloo, for

Each of these women would have given her sons to Gaspard the People for glory, for a long and bloody party"...⁶⁴ The democrats saw here the "lack of holiness" as one of the representatives of the "people's pride", while Draga saw it as a harmful affectation, but I see it as a smell, in this personality, not of modern haphazard concerns, but of "things and volatiles", the noblest disturbance of the soul, the most universal idealism that turns the light towards the world. The words of the Gospel: "If anyone comes to me and does not know his father, mother, wife, children, brothers, and sisters, and does not save his own soul, he cannot be my disciple." The saint of St Thérèse: "My God! Even if I were sure that I was going to hell, this would not prevent me from loving You on earth and in hell!" - "One can love only in the future, one can love only in the future!" - this is how one of our contemporary poets expressed it.⁶⁵

These are the characteristics of "romantic", "religious", and even though they are not on

It is the idea of "agut", "agitated", which puts itself above all "partiality", above all "special" and "particular", which is the idea of "aggression", when manifested in national life, placed the greatness and power of the agut above the time and people of an individual, class, generation, or even a world; to put the nation as a whole - over the nation as a mechanical assembly; the whole of the "dead, the living and the unborn" - over this group; "distant" over "near", "things and volatile" over "tangible" intangibles, maximums over minimums, "abstract" values over "concrete" ones, the unconditional will of the individual and the government over all the "why" and "for what" that are commonplace in the vocabulary of the rich bourgeoisie, which cares only about the "needs of the time". The idea of the goal here is followed by other "rights", supra-group or subgroup (supranational or pan-national), the rules of liberalism and public materialism.

I mentioned above the two main foundations of all revolutionary ideas, the eighth and national ones: the first is currencyism (anti-intellectualism), the second is participation (anti-patriotism). *Now, therefore, we have a third one - the "romantics".* And any great idea that will work with others under the domination is not alive, because it does not work for these spirits of "romantika".

I have already emphasised the essential nature of great doctrines. Now we need to analyse their second aspect: their *dogmatism and their non-sentience*. These doctrines always appear in the solution of a categorical riddle, which seems to command absolute obedience. These ideas (as *Le Bon puts it*) are associated with "simple" and "extreme sensations"... They are primarily

They are taught to the masses as dogmas of faith, "en bloc", or they are added to, or treated as *absolute truths and absolute memories*... "God is a mother".⁶⁶ These are the characteristics of these doctrines, and only these doctrines find the usual adherence of the masses, these are the meanings of the doctrines, burned with amorous smells, simple and categorical. The famous Italian sociologist *Wilfred Parrett* said that histories are made of "smells, instants, desires and intarses" that try to have a mind of their own. History is not a history of reason, but of passion, which knows only "non-logical" (azioni non logiche). The masses more susceptible to emotional disturbances than to the logic of reason.⁶⁷ "The masses (the pedestrian and other satsyolag) had little capacity for entertainment, but more for honour"... They always be dominated by "*dogma*...", a tyrannical and valadar village that evaded all discussion". These beliefs have always taken an abstract form, which is not easy to analyse as having a *religious flavour*, but which is distinguished by very simple features: A richness of the non-existent, Supreme Being, blind obedience to its riddles and *inability to discuss its dogmas*... Such a feeling can be attributed to a fictional God, a stone..., an idol, a hero, or some *political idea*;⁶⁸ but if this feeling has these characteristics, it does not have a "*religious character*". Gods, heroes, and dogmas are to be recognised without being the subject of discussion. As soon as they become these objects, they use their power... All forms of our Veda, and indeed all the sciences, are based on *rational logic*. But logic and mystical intuition are the foundations of our beliefs, they are the causes of the floods of individuals and nations... Dogmas are overwhelmed by the power they impart, but never by the entertainment that comes from them.

They triumph looking at pile of "illogicality".⁶⁹ This is how French satsyolags are known. And although in such a cataclysmic

The most common form of meeting is a meeting, but the fact that it is held. The fact is that he is "convinced" only by ideas that are beneficial to himself, or of which he is not quite clear (he "does not understand" them), but nevertheless feels them. The dogmatism of these "punishments" lies in the fact that they are absolute, without sanction. As *Huey Grahn* puts it: "it is not because it is good that religion is right, but because it is good that it is right."⁷⁰ These views are shared by all major national movements, but are alien to our human rights activists.

"Romantic" ideas (which put "agulnae", "ideal" over asabis

ⁱ en bloc (French) - .

intarses), combined with a religious flavour (absolute belief in them), *often appear in history in the form of* so-called "illusions", "legends", "myths". The French sociologists mentioned above say this: "The world has always played a more important role in history than reality. The imaginary took precedence over the real... The power of the invaders and the rulers' houses is based on the 'imagination' of the people; one must act on it if one wants to capture the masses. All the most important histories, including Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, rhetoric, revolution, socialism, were perceived as either not possible or further powerful influences on the *imagination of the masses*... Most of the major events of the past were influenced *by phantoms*... History would appear to be a collection of peoples' attempts to create phantoms or destroy them. Old and modern politics are nothing but a competition of phantoms." The old civilisation, as well as the new one, was looking for a profit sooner than it was a loss. "I learned to slave to statues and shrines as much as to running and electric lights... People were more alive to ideas than to matter. As they get older, they come to understand what matters in the history of ideas. For them people live, for them they think." ⁷¹

Hugo says that these are "ideas", that phantoms "*fictions*", which serve modern humanity and replace the fallen theological knowledge". This philosopher wrote a special ode at the top of the mountain of illusion, calling it "that which bears rich fruit"; that which "gives power to the bats of great deeds... to new beings"; "from which truth eventually grows"; from which "the heart's heart derives power"...⁷² The illusions were signalled to the sailors on watch each morning that at daybreak they were going to rocky reefs, but for this they should "be enamoured in strange lands, the fifth sailor, the discoverer of America, be put in chains and end up at sea?" Who else was Christopher Columbus but "the bathers of strange lands"? Were they not also "water-skippers without dignity", in the pursuit of illusions, "apostles who had nothing to fear"? With "eyes, tucked away in the distance", all of them "different", with the fear that everything will "dive to the bottom of the abyss, hell or heaven, not all?" - to the bottom of , to find the "new".⁷³

The form that illusion most often takes in the minds of histrionics is This is the legend of the "last battle". In addition to the fact that there is a fascinating picture of the catastrophe, which is new. Ideas are accessible to the masses only when "translated into short rules that *evoke images*, into forms that do not soften "several ideas at once" (they are inaccessible

masses), but they are "simple and affirmative, loud and clear". One of these figurative illusions, captured in a "loud and clear" form, is the legend of the "last battle", which will provide a framework for the question.⁷⁴ Sarel suggests that these instructions are called *myths, legends*, which he considers to be the first stages of christianity, reformation, revolution, and madzinism. The believers of the Catholics "see the history of the kingdom as a battlefield between Lucifer and the royal hierarchy, supported by Christ... and the peacock's inchoate ending through the power of the cataclysm". Sarel attaches great importance to these legends, stating that "one can live without a ring forever and not cause any revolutionary movement, *like the legends accepted by the masses*".⁷⁵ In his opinion, "not love or hatred, desire, passion... Only the imagination of setting these forces in motion, *of presenting us with a goal and purpose* so powerful that these passions can be destroyed", for the "ultimate difference". Sure, the course of the French revolution did not resemble the "magical images that captivated the first fables", but "without these images, could the revolution have succeeded?" Mazzini also "referred to what the wise men of his time called a variegated chimera, and now there is little doubt that without it Italy would never have been a state, and that he did more for the unification of Italy than Cavour and all the politicians of his school," because he was in many ways the founder of the national "illusion," the guiding star of the Italian movement. Karducci said that these super-illusions were the basis of all idealism.⁷⁶

Above, I have argued about the "rational" nature of the large-scale revolutions. These ideas and their "religious", dogmatic character. "Illusionism" is a synthesis of the two: it promotes the "knowable" - irrational, supernatural, concrete - and the "unknown", and this is "theological" in it; and it promotes the bare affirmation of the evidence, and this is "dagmatic" in it. Both the sensations of "illusionism" (he does not discuss it) and its intellectuality (which, although it is a non-existent idea, is a fundamentally complete concrete one) have its own participant, antipatriotism. *As such, "illusionism" is an integral part (along with "religiosity") of aforementioned three fundamental ideas, including the national, revolutionary idea of romanticism.*

CHAPTER IV - BIGOTRY AND "AMORAL" AS A FREQUENT PROBLEM OF NATIONALISM

I have already mentioned that great ideas that have the power to impose themselves on the world, *without the affects that govern them, never have any mobilising power*. Ideas work only when they have worked hard to develop their creativity in the process; when they become an integral part of the person's nature, a person of ideas. This is Fichte's instinct (Trieb), which must be "translated" into a passion, an idea, but without which the idea itself is dead. It has the power to arouse only if it is caused by the action of a strong will, if it is a simple *belief* in it.

Because in politics, as well as in religion, *the rush is always on the side of the believer*, not the doubter. In his book *Rights, Assault and Death*, M. Barès says that "civil rights are more likely to be processed in a timely manner than changes in codes, and *explosions are more likely to smell like dynamite*." Stendhal, speaking about revolution, said that "the nation fell into *rage, and the manifestation of that rage was then a stupid one*", and further, "the people have no power and mean nothing *if they are not angry*. When this anger is gone, the slightest challenge seems impossible."⁷⁷ This is the same inevitable idea of affect that Plato spoke of. In the opinion of the heavyweight, the guards should be "philosophically inclined" in order to protect their own, and this "philosophical inclination" is keyed to the fact that "he falls into rage as soon as he sees the enemy," *even if he does not suffer any harm from it*. But he would rather be known, he said, than to be *boastful, so that he would not suffer any harm from him*.⁷⁸ We have already become familiar (in connection with another) with this smell: this is the "philosophical No" we already know, the automatic and immediate attack that is essential to our will, and without which all thought dead. Mere mental perception, the mental suspension of thought, never gives an idea the power to awaken, only this feeling. Tsudowna told Sarel: "one is killed for opinions, but not for certificates, for what *one believes*, but not for what one *knows*." In his view, there can be no disappearance of a system or regime without the existence of a "*burning desire for revolt*" in its workers.⁷⁹ Hegel meant the same thing when he said that "everything that is possible in history is done by human passions."⁸⁰

These affects, which he calls "self-love," are the main source of the Knight *Spencer*. He condemns this kind of self-love, but there more to it than that: "The self-esteem of the self causes two kinds of ... Whoever does not

The one who is a baron of his own selfish rights invites aggression (of others) and arouses self-love in others; the one who does not push himself unjustly does not dare to work on things that need to be resolved. The same can be said of patriotism. It is true that an excess of this feeling in a nation makes it aggressive and aggressive, and if it has not enough aggression, it has no need to defend its rights, which are then trampled on by other nations. ⁸¹

Spencer's is an interesting one: *where a nation's aggressive character breaks down, its zeal for defending its rights breaks down at same time*. In our legal system, these things are carefully . "We only fought for our rights when we were harmed, we never walked in chains, we did not bend the liberties of others" (Starytski) - this is what we thought, and we forgot that we "fought" for our rights not in words but in deeds, it was precisely when we were not afraid to "bend the freedom of others", as it was in the time of Sviatoslav's campaigns to Tsargrad, Igarava's to the Don, in the time of Dames Khmylnicki and Mazepa from Europe on the borders of Poland and Muscovy. Revolutionary France, out of which came the dictatorial canton of Napoleon, revolutionary England, out of which came the unifier of Ireland and Cromwell, revolutionary Russia, which competed with the "German imperialisms" and then imposed its own, as it were, on us, Italy of Mazzini and Garibaldi, Italy, the instigator of the Tristate, and Italy, the occupier of the German Tyrol, Spain, which fell from the fall of Moorish rule, and Spain, the ruler of Morocco, all testify that nature and history do not know the difference between the affects of barbarity and attack.

Pisats, as we have pisats: "The struggle for national freedom of the Pakhomo not out of love and lust for domination over the Ukrainians, but only out of hatred and slavery",⁸² which means that the dynamics of the civil society development is not understood.

^{and} *Sviatoslav Igaravich* (Brave; cal. 939 - 972 or 973) - great prince of Kyiv (945-972), a pilgrim. Princess Volga (d. 969) took the reigns of Sviatoslav's princess, because he was away most of the time on campaigns. In 967 (according to other sources - in 968), under the reign of the Byzantine emperor Nikephoros Phoki, he began his activities in Bulgaria, subordinating himself to the entire territory of this state. After the death of Volga (969), in order to continue the war in the Balkans, he appointed his sons as governors in their own lands. After returning to Bulgaria in 969, he fought with the Bulgarians and Highlanders in the war against the Byzantine emperor Ioannes I Cimiscius. After the heroic barony of Darastol (now Siliistra, Bulgaria), he was forced to sign a treaty with the Byzantine Empire in July 971, during which he was annexed from the Danube lands.

Nature and history do not know aggressive and non-aggressive races, but only strong and weak races. The strong races are called upon when they are invaded, and are distributed at the expense of the weak when they are free; the weak races either resort to spasmodic rebellion (the slaves under the yoke) or give their various minorities "national", "cultural" and all other kinds of identities (the free).

It doesn't matter whether this nation is aggressive or not, this idea is not aggressive. What is important is that this idea is associated with a justified smell, with the abstract will of women and race, while, on the contrary, this idea is a mental abstraction that, although it is not free of affect (as it is the slave of Dragomanov and Dragomanovites). In the first case, such an idea is prohibitive, in the second case, it is scannable. Hegel called these affects "pafas", meaning "agitated forces... that act not only for themselves in their own right, but also in the world, disturbing the world's "holy of holies".⁸³ These facets are almost meaningless to his own passion, devoid of anything but the taste of lowliness and selfishness.

No idea, including a national one, can exist without this exact process, and that is why the sins of dragomaniacs are unforgivable, as they are the most important and indispensable underpinnings of any movement of ideas and actions.

This aspect of the great idea takes the form of what is known in the common parlance as "fanaticism", with the tastes of the bad people who give this word to all "neither good nor bad", neat, elderly, liberals, democrats and other "people's people". At that time, this "fanaticism" was an indispensable state of mind for all the artists and activists of the past, all those who were committed to lasting ideas. This fanaticism of the proponents of the great ideas stems from their "religious" nature. Believers look at their truth as *abiding for everyone*. It is "fanatical" against everything that is contrary to its beliefs. A "fanatic" sees his truth as , revealing it to the heavens, an agulna that should be shared by others. His aggressiveness and intolerance of other opinions. A strong belief in the slogans he abstracts as unconditional and binding truth for all, love for the idea that he, though a realist, is a boundless hatred of everything, that is the eighth sum of transformations that aggravates every sane revolutionary, a fanatic - out of necessity and out of the nature of the thinkers he has baronised. That is why love and hatred always go in hand, like two legs that are supporting each other in the pursuit of a great idea. That's why I'm so insignificant.

The essence of our national "castrati", who immediately, with a single love, want to jump from the realm of immeasurable supernormalities to the realms of unclouded "harmony" of music. The intellectual "ideas" of castrates who care only about "light" and the softened passions that spin the flames of a smell when a star is too bright are the same as those of others, for they are dead men who live by ointments but not by sirs, for logic is a measurable thing. But the sensual ideas of the "fanatics" do not know tolerance, because the dispute over the dogmas of faith is not settled by a loving court, but by ardours. *Le Bon* said: "those who never question truth and falsity, and who are also the saints of their own village, are intolerant." All the founders of any religious or political faith founded them "only because they managed to arouse a sense of fanaticism in the masses"; only because they taught them to "give their lives for their idol", an ideal, and - to die for its sake.⁸⁴

Every new idea is intolerant. "Ravalucia, Bartholomew

nights, religious wars, the Inquisition, the hours of the Terror, all these are manifestations of the same kind, caused by the masses, seized by those religious affections, which were determined to take out with the horn and the ball all those who worked to establish a new faith. The Inquisition was a group of people completely convinced of their own truth."⁸⁵

Of these layers, it can only be said that all the difficult periods in history the emergence of fanatical ideas. The fanatics were Henry IV's slaughterer, Ravaluak, who, as he put it, was driven by "the intentions of religion and *the irreducible impulse*". The fanatics were François I, the Frenchman who said that if his right hand fell into the race, he would have to take it, and who banned Charles V from Spain. France was ruled by fanatics in a couple of its greatest ages in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, when, as the enemy of all fanaticism, Bockle, said, "the whole nation sought parades solely in its fanaticism." *Carlyle* saw the most characteristic feature of the parades in their "*immeasurable zeal for the cause of ballet*, for the cause of "the *bachnag*". All of them are strong campaigners, "haters of unorthodox forms". The immeasurability of the struggle of the "other baggies", which Drahomanov so lamented, is an essential feature of all great ideas and their works, and *Spengler* considers the most valuable achievements for Germany to be the "ability to avoid the enemy".⁸⁶ How far this courageous thought was from the thoughts of some of our right-wing statesmen, who attributed their loyalty to the status quo to "statesmanship" and their spiritual stabilisation to "culture", which competed with "Shavinism".

Mums".

"Fanaticism (according to a German philosopher) is this fascination with *abstract*, abstract thought, which is *applied* to existing media. The essence of fanaticism is that it is devastating and destructive *in its application to a particular person*." These words contain the whole radar of bigotry. It prays to "the ageless" - because it grew out of a "theological" doctrine that stands above the world of the world, that thinks in the light of "illusions and delusions"... It is disorderly - because it grew out of a new "religious" idea that can only take place on the ruins of the old one, and it works... It is built on administration, on procreation, not on cum, but on contra, because it is the basis of life, and "everything that is immediately affirmative is without life"... That behind the admitted fanaticism there is a strong negative thought, which is not seen only by those who have no strong ideas - neither positive nor negative, those who are "neither cold nor warm, like dry wood, absolutely nothing".⁸⁷ You who look deeply into things see this positive; you "love great gardeners, for they are great worshipers."⁸⁸

And *the emotionalism and fanaticism of the weak ideas that drive the masses*. We need to give them their own jumping off point: "*amoral*". *This not, of course, amoral in the sense of evoking an ethical criterion, a moral idealism. At the same time, the maximum ethical tension of these ideas and their proponents is extremely high, and the subordination of the aggressor to the aggressor, often to strict moral rules, is strict, firm as never before*. So, if we are talking about the "amoral" nature of these ideas, then I understand here their superiority to the "*moral law of the right-wing 'kalöskagatas'*", which ethical and unethical ideas are linked to the ideas of the movement and are based on the point of view of the palatial and unscrupulous *bourgeois*; who give aggregated, public affairs solutions based on their private experiences, concerns and intrigues. From the point of view of a "self-determined Little Russian" or "pocziwego ^{rusinai}", these ideas and are "immoral". In his *Dynamic Sociology*, the American Ward says: "The ethical and social points of view go hand in hand. The first is *contain social energy*, the second is *to generate and develop it*... A righteous morality is no less than a righteous aspiration to emancipate social energy and to fully express the power of the village."⁸⁹ From the point of view of the integration of these morals, "evil is a fearful thing. one who always (passively) living is worthy of the guard.

ⁱ *pocziwego rusina* (Polish) - shchyraga rusina.

"You have to move, breathe, and talk. From the point of view of this maral, you have to feel the enemy's love for you, even if he not done you any good (Plato), from this point of view you have to tread lightly, even if he does not know what is harmful (Lesya Ukrainka).⁹⁰

The tension of allpowers of the soul, all the energies of life are valuable here; "neither good nor bad" (and God adds them), no matter how "ethical" they may be, are worthy of judgement. Here, the desires are strong, in faith, in love, : if they are "righteous", then they are in the first place, if they are "imposing" - there is more joy in them than in the dozens of righteous people. These are the natures of the "steadfast, whatever they become"...⁹¹ Shavchenka was one of these "steadfast" people, although his father, sensing this "steadfastness", doubted "what he would become" - these (as he said to his death) "not very good, these old fools" would come out of him... This firmness - these "pitiful virgins" and "pitiful zagans," as Gogal said; the one that has fallen into the dungeons and the dungeons, as Kulish said; the maral, with "no justice" that would rule "a lush bogranitsa ... from the wings of innocent people", but in comparison with which "the white light" of the built-up seems pale,⁹² as Lesya Ukrainka wrote.

This is a good thing that it makes you good, and unethical everything that weakens its scope and strength. Life, as one of the representatives of the new worldview that soared from the nineteenth century taught, is a deliberate breaking of continuity, a struggle, and therefore all aspects that increase ability to struggle are moral. This is the dream "that we are fighting *so hard* to get to the bottom of his most difficult problems, that this person, by using his highest qualities, triumphs in his own unconventionality". This is a maral that there are no "good people" who are "good because they are not so strong that they can become evil"; who opposes the "chaos" that kills faith in oneself and the desire to take one's place under the sun; who knows that there are two poles in his ethics - the unshakable strength of instinct and its weakening.⁹³

Maral, who working here, added that "chalavecneas", which She forbade harming others, valued life above all else, and did not have "drama instincts". She knew another synthesis of life, another purpose, and for this purpose, this bourgeois ethic could not serve the audience. Its goal was "strong people", not "whole people", which captures with its love its own and others'. Here he rather abstracted the gospel principles that allowed his fellow servants to be the most beautiful in the name of God.

The ideals that God placed above the "other", above the "neighbour", above all temporal things. Here, the ideals were the "pillars" of the covenant. And "for every pillar of the chalavek there is a time of love and hate, courage and revenge, generosity and anger, affirmation and negation" Or, as our poet said, a strong man is one who has "the flowers of new paths, the holy and the spots of new lights"⁹⁴ and who, "together with a woman," although "love and hate are not the only things she has..., life is not only in the past and present, but also in the future, but also in eternity"; that all attempts of the so-called "maral" look at the point of view of this "eternity", caring for the "*highest temperature of the soul*" as the ideal.⁹⁵

The existence of these "eternal" ideas and these very flaccid ideas themselves are being destroyed

They can be used for other maral measures. They are "amoral" in the extreme sense. "Lezent, the great historian of the Inquisition and his great worker (we read in *Buckle*), condemning the harshness of the practice, cannot but mention that his intentions were pure"⁹⁶ It is necessary to distinguish between the morality of the historian and those who do it, and the morality of one of the millions who are not even historians.⁹⁷ This reveals the very truth of the "amorality" of great ideas. Every creature (says Yodel) strives for that which, under the laws and ownership of nature, is good or evil. Good is anything that strengthens the strength, freedom and power of a given species; evil is anything that weakens them. This is precisely how "amoral" differs from the materialistic and universalistic "moral" of jurisprudence.

For our intellectuals, the knowledge was of little use. Adzin-

He said, "to come as a moral zero into the world, to know things... and then decide... to act in this way or that way; maybe as a result of this knowledge, it can create another system of floods. Pazney... is happy to recognise such a good thing and in the wake of it he longs for it..."⁹⁸ And reality is not so sweet and profitable, in the sense of the saying "although it is (this thing), and in the wake of it it is a dubro". The soul is not a thing that knows, but a thing that though. All the struggle for existence " someone else's moral responsibility". Kali "the beast... gnaws at the one who stabs him, and the idea of sanctions has nothing to do with it."⁹⁹

From this point of view, the "moral" students accept the "moral" ambition and "lychee", and the "good" students accept the "universal ethics". Each species has its own virtue, and the differences between different virtues are not expressed by their weaponisation and paranoia, nor are these the ways in which a new moral is established. "By what means can any rise power?" Nietzsche asks,

and adkazvae: "by the sons of barbarism. The dominion of virginity can be achieved by the same means as all dominion is achieved". This is how he came to his "moralfreie Tugendi"¹⁰⁰

Not having any superior sanction, except for itself, each collective has no superiority over itself ("the time of all", etc.). The conflicts of different values (ideas, movements) can never be resolved by their reconciliation, "harmony", "no principle can overcome the weakest one by the strongest one".¹⁰¹ "Maral" is not "known" from experience, but is immediately, like the Platonic one mentioned above. It cannot be known by the abstract mind without the presence of species and its intrinsic qualities, but always in relation to them.¹⁰²

Nature has given us lust, passion and pain - this is just an invention of nature to achieve its goal. "Lust exists only in the same sense as fire and brilliance. That is why only filmmakers can absolutely add to and morally condemn war, slaughter, violence - filmmakers and people with dead instincts of life, Kulishov's "eunuchs." ¹⁰³ Lesya Ukrainka wrote: "It's not our instincts and passions that are dirty, but their frantic buying and selling of what should not be put up for sale."¹⁰⁴ "Sadness and pain have their origin not in the nature of things, but in the nature of plastic organisms"...¹⁰⁵ "No thing is good... but only as it affects the organism"...¹⁰⁶ Here we again come to the "assimilation" of morality, which is dictated by the development of the village of special organism, by Reichtum an Personⁱⁱ, by Fülle in sichⁱⁱⁱ, by Ja-Sagen zu sich^{iv}, by Überströmen^v, by Herr werden^{wollenvi}, by those criteria of truth (and morality) that are in the "growth of the village". Those moral ideas are good, which are useful in a cultural sense, based on the existence of a conflict between social groups or between the game and the natural world; good ideas are those that are useful for the sake of the race, good - for its sake.¹⁰⁷

Witman also relied on this ethic when he wrote his "creative a "true participant", far from "feeling the value of life". She became Süderman's peer, for whom only the "banal, the arid and the vulgar" were immoral.¹⁰⁸

ⁱ *moralfreie Tugend* (n.d.) - free ad marale virginity.

ⁱⁱ *Reichtum an Person* (n.d.) - bagatelle asobi.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Fülle in sich* (n.d.) - sales in the sub.

^{iv} *Ja-Sagen zu sich* (n.) - gawarene sabe "yes".

^v *Überströmen* (n.) - peralivanne praz krai.

^{vi} *Herr werden wollen* (in German) - hatsetz stats gentlemen.

A mirage that is the mirage of all new and fresh races, all powerful adjuncts, all new ideas that are new and full of future...

All of the above should be considered from one (quarter) of the general points of view of any big idea (and the movement that goes under it) that we see in the newspapers. This idea is unmeasured, uncompromising, fanatical, "amoral", and only those in the intersection of species are entitled to its rights. Every great national idea is marked by these features, and this, *and nothing else, gives it explosive power in history.*

SECTION V - RELATED HISTORIES - "RAMANISM" AS A SOURCE OF PRIDE - THE SYNTHESIS OF RATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM - THE FIFTH PATRIOTIC VALUE OF NATIONALISM

History confirms the validity of the above. For in her pen are only ideas of a "rational", religious nature, ideas that are aggressive, emotional and fanatical. What else but these ideas were responsible for alltartar pandemonium of 1793, the French reaction to the English invasion of France under Joan of Arc, and a number of other events I have already mentioned in the newspapers?

Let us take our watches! One of those who fought the great war and led his people to victory was on foot: "In the old regular armies, generals played a more important role than politicians. But in the apocalyptic war, the nation was an army, it was different. The most dangerous weapon in a war is not guns, but *the ability to touch the heart*. Did you Kalisians think that Germany would capitulate at the cost of territory? (But it did, because)... its backbone was broken. Do you think that something similar could have happened if Germany had put the likes of Clemenceau, Gambetta, or Pete on the table? But Germany didn't. (I did)... politicians who didn't know how to appeal to the heart of the nation. "¹⁰⁹ Appealing to the heart of the nation, as I have tried to argue for years, can only be done by introducing one of those "fundamental" ideas for which the masses give their lives. Such an idea in the modern world was the idea of fighting "culture against barbarism". The power of this idea was so percipient that it not only tested the will of its allies to fight, but broke the will to fight in them. The power of this idea was in its uncompromisingness (French jusqu'au bout, angelic knock out), in the understanding of which the

and 1793 - the year of the establishment of the Jacobin dictatorship in France.

It was the will of the German truthers that they would not stop trying to make their own peace...

A representative of another powerful nation shares the same opinion: "Everywhere smells like a movement. *All the great histories* were pioneered by strong smells. And those individuals whose sensibilities were the most fierce had the greatest influence on the state and character of society. Pure intellectual awareness is never enough to win over a nation... The great haste of religious reforms is due to the righteousness of their sentiments, but never to their intellectual nature." Not only is the world ruled by "passions, not intellects, but also... the righteous luminaries of the world, to deserve this name, must often be *enthusiasts and fanatics*".¹¹⁰ Historians testify that under the influence of these ideologues "great empires were founded, churches, cities and catholicities were erected, and the whole surface of the earth was changed."¹¹¹ French colleagues were following the American sociologists: "Only fanatics found religions and states..., at the call of Pyotr Amensky, millions die to conquer Aryent, the words of the visionary Magamet and his supporters were like old Graeco-Roman lights... Luther extinguished the light in the agni and inwing. And what did Newton and Galileo do in comparison with them, the author tries to find out? Fanatics of history, visionaries, inventors of seductive illusions did the most to reduce the amount of light. They because they "unknowingly embodied in themselves the ideals of their race and their time, then they were betrayed", because a people can only be led by their dreams and delusions, *because in the end, ideas rule the world*. If these ideas are to survive, they must have the strength of self-luminaries and echo chambers. "In the name of vivid fantasies, the light was stolen, cultures perished, new ones were created... Illusions were the most important factors in history... Illusion created the pyramids..., moral and political leaders to build a single damnation, revolutions were caused, and states were founded." Yedl said, "All history is a lesson that haste is all on the tank of peoples with the greatest passions."¹¹²

Georg Zimmel is now taking issue with the fact that "the reckless he nineteenth-century "tarnassia" has always had its origins in the influence of the passionate vigour of our nature and the hyper-expansion of our minds. Intellect, according to Simmel, is, like money, characterless, "not for lack of quality, but because it chooses to be on the other side of the line... We crave character from all things... and often theatricality takes all the thinking and imagination. Slave to the dancing

the dignity of a woman, which is written first of all in the work on the one-state firmness and rigidity of the past centuries; the ease of intellectual understanding between people, even if they are public natures and pacifists, while such an outstanding intellectual individual as *Dantesov* is so prominent that certain theoretical workers need to be proved not by evidence, but by implication; the tendency to , which is based on the avoidance of fundamental questions of the employment of life, which... no reason can solve - but the idea of the right to the secular world is inclusive, that the universal love is preserved in liberal circles, histrionic noses of intellectualism and moneyed society: "*all of these arise, as they must, from this negative feature of characterlessness*"...¹¹³ The lack of character of our age, its divisions, which it has brought with - in the divisions between classes, nations, views, religious parties, humanity of all broader perspectives and plans, locking it into a narrow circle of existence; the characterlessness that put the very existence of our civilisation at , and thus, in *Zimmel's* opinion, was manifested in hyper-intellectualism, in "bezver", in the lack of fanatical "one-way", emotionalism.

Not the "characterlessness" that drives people to the brink of death. white, but this "labour for emptiness", this attempt by fanatics to recognise history, is not. *Their works are in the intensity of the chalaveche pride*, which is the only reason why these words are not empty. It is unreasonable to say that the desire for domination belongs to a different kind of desire, like other desires; that it is unnatural... The attempts to set this desire have led to the most effective *movements forward in the development of society*. These aspirations are linked to the formation of the nation's quality. In the same way, the support of great labour and great masses of people in the sailing of a single regulatory system should be associated with the principles of civilisation. The greatness of ambition, the belief of great nations in their mission, their desire for domination, the sensuality of their psyche, is imperative for the growth of the desire and the inclination of entire cantons to the European-American culture. "Just as in biology, not this or that race, not this or that organism, but the organic world has the benefit of competition for existence (the attack on the dominance of each species), so in the social sphere there is not only one, but the whole of the grammar.), but the whole society benefits from the conditions that result from the dynamic activity of its members! *Kali Pianer* is creating a new stage inforesthe wants to fulfil his own needs, but in doing so, he is giving rise to the need to fulfil the needs of all other individuals.

Just as when a path is made in the forest and left unused, others follow, until the path is too long to be used, so the attempts to create a crowd, though at the moment they serve only them, are the initial steps of material civilisation" for all.¹¹⁴ Such actors of civilisation were Columbus, Vasca da Gama, Kitchener, the first American colonizers, our barrages of workers and scientists, and all of them were driven by the "thirst for domination", all of them were obsessed with lunatic ideas, All of them had a "risky and adventurous attitude" (Gogal), all of them rejected the "right of the strong over the weak" (Kulish), which is why our recent past has been so completely forgotten... Because these attempts (says Sarel) in the crust of the best, looking at the nothingness of the unparalleled individuality of recognition, create those secret features of the parts of nature that *provide unlimited pride* in the world.¹¹⁵ The same idea was expressed by Ward: "the conditions under which a person develops are of the kind that... implicate both their purpose and their nature. The senses (adzinak) are used for functions" (of nature).¹¹⁶ Nature (according to other philosophers) only achieves its goals in such a way that it jumps from adzinak to a peculiar illusion (Wahn), whereby it imagines as a gift to itself what is in reality a gift to the species.¹¹⁷ The English historian Seelye said in his book *The Expansion of England* that the British Empire was the fruit of "the dedicated efforts of the mass of individual Englishmen". The British went out into the world in search of freedom, private enterprise, profit and security from their neighbours and domination over them, and when they started working one day, they realised that they were the host of the greatest empire in the world...

Its true that the forward movement that originates from these is a
There are frequent bloody battles. But these people can move forward without struggle, and is it necessary to move forward without struggle? To realise the indispensability of this movement and its ways means to never destroy the existing institutions, never destroy what is burning, in the name of "humanity", without putting fingers to it... There is a mystical connection between the "desire for domination" of individuals and the pride: "There was no need for any humane mood when we built the Aswan placina. This plaque was as much about the meaning of love and compassion as it was about the invention of the world. The manufacturers in Manchester made these plans to make work, the government helped them to secure Egypt, Sir Ernst Cassel borrowed money to get good workers, Wilcox and Bark made plans driven by their instincts and ambitions. But now, as these creatives

and the sea, and gave it to the land without a single loan... two million hectares of land and three weeks of harvest; two years after the approval of this plan, Egypt was built from the proceeds of construction"...¹¹⁸ Can these works be considered of great importance for the progress? Is this work not enhanced by the inspiration of ambitious people to dominate and subjugate the earth and its races? History knows no race, nor does nature; there are haves and have-nots, who, though they secure a place under the sun, must give up their freedom for it. The "right" of everyone, even with "European" instincts, does not exist in the nation, and if it did, it would be the most immoral thing in the world...

The right of a nation to self-determination? A woman, but not everyone, that

"I have the right, I *have* the right! The candidates themselves know this lie - in the depths of their souls - that they have this right: "the revolt of the in the same the altar, but it does not involve the state-creating elite." ¹¹⁹

This is the essence and deepest significance of the connection between the right to freedom of expression and the right to . It is not enough to have a lot of ideas and bigotry and turn them into reality - it is necessary to have *genius* and *the will of the people*! It's true that no idea has ever been successful, no idea that hasn't taken on the characteristics of a "rational" dactyre, no idea that hasn't attracted fans, but neither has an idea that hasn't taken the audience one step further in its development. For just as a class cannot remain in power and dominance if it is not useful to the public, so too cannot a dominant class in the world of the nation if it does not use its dominance for humanity. This race is extraordinary at finding easy syntheses between nationalism and internationalism. The Pax Romana and the British Empire seem to have worked more to internationalise and civilise the world than the papal internationalist "castrates". Caesar and Cecil Rhodes were better foreign policy analysts than Lenin and Marx.

Adzin is one of the of this theory: "The longing for freedom, which Now, this is a piece of dudes, this is just the other side of the second desire, which is also universal and inadequate: the desire to steal from other people." One of Thucydides' characters said: "I do not blame the Athenians for the desire to kill other people, because it is natural; but I blame others for allowing themselves to be killed." Freedom always goes hand in hand with superiority. The inferior, the unprivileged can never have anything but freedom out of affection, which is as empty as . Weak, inferior races dare not inherit what

They... should not be disturbed in the seat.¹²⁰ Therefore, the point of gluing the pride has nothing to do with "moral". Just as it is not "moral" races or systems that seek rewards for their "moral" or "kingdom", so it is not the "non-moral" or "unruly" nature of the data they rule that is the reason they are trying to fulfil a socially useful function. As long as they do so, they are granted privileges and glory, and in the case of labour, they are killed. This is how tsarism failed, not because of its glory and virtue, but because its organisation was not able to defend the empire from attacks from the East (Japan) or the West (Germany and Austria). As this idea came to light, the jealousies and rages of the ruling class, which had been neither less nor more than a few years earlier, suddenly became "noble" and tsarist. French feudalism (Spencer says) fell into decadence because this system did not produce any beneficial outcomes for everyone, only good things. The ruling classes did not fulfil most of their functions, though they further diminished their privileges. Public power was exercised exclusively in the private intersection, and it was this change, not "privilege", "freedom" or "nonrality", that caused the revolution that destroyed feudalism.¹²¹

It is the same in international . Imperialism is not a

The only thing that is not "atrocities", but at the same time the performance of public affairs in public intersections by nations that are called upon and respected for it. There are superior and inferior nations; nations that can control others (and themselves), and nations that cannot. All pride is based on equality and recognises the principles of superiority. Those who do not have the advantage or the data to become the rulers cannot become equal and independent.¹²²

Nature does not know humanity and justice, it knows only service and . Kali peasant did not plough and sow, nature did not say anything: "He is not a good man, we cannot see his galloping horse... I said: he did not sow these crops, he will not reap! A fisherman doesn't throw seeds in the sea, nature doesn't tell him to: "He has a fish and a wife, he needs to dig a hole... It's a simple story, and not at all "chalaveche": It didn't work, let it go! Nature rewards only in terms of effort and merit - for its purpose. The same principle applies to public life, and a water nation does not accept *gifts* from "reapers" of nature that it did not sow; It does *not* accept independence, which it *cannot* achieve, nor does it have the *feeling of a village* of foreign races that want to dominate people, land, winds and sea, serving themselves and *the Chalavačec flag*.

The socialist "humanists" also subordinate the cause of the freedom and independence of peoples to the cause of the pride *as they see it*. For them, the pride is a matter of the proletariat, and Engels was right: "We must work create a

Western European workers' party, and this goal will support everything else.

Therefore, no matter how nice the Balkan Slavs are, as long as their evocative impulses are at odds with the intentions of the political party, which is what I am trying to do - let their evils be! (können sie mir gestohlen werden!)"¹²³ Engels also divided peoples into "superior" and "inferior" peoples, and understood "brotherhood of nations" not as "brotherhood of all European peoples under one system" but as "a union of revolutionary peoples working together with counter-revolutionary peoples", an idea that was developed after Lenin.¹²⁴ In full agreement with the "bourgeois" imperialists, the pacifists were socialist: "The theories of the general brotherhood of peoples are worthless if we do not take into account the historical status, the degree of civilisation of individual peoples.

¹²⁵This is the cited. History states that the reign of the whole At the time of Muggles, the only races inspired by the sluggish, uncomplaining pafas ("the

alligative" ideas), and the virulent fanaticisms that are an inevitable part of every idea that looks to the future. But, on the other hand, races and ideas that want to play a role in history must appeal not to the world's "righteousness" but to their will and strength to push history forward, to work for the "flag".

This is how we came to the fullest realisation of our most cherished idea: *not only a fanatical, uncompromising loyalty, but also the service of the intentions of the pride, as we understand it here, and the right of strong races to organise individuals and peoples to existing culture and civilisation*. An idea that does not reconcile itself with these apostolic injuries must assume, as, for example, the Spanish or the Mohammedan, that, despite its fanaticism and unquestionable "theological" nature, had to give way to others. As Renan said: "A nation that is locked in the pure pursuit of its own interests cannot play an aggressive role. Only the universal aspects of the free genius can play a leading role (maîtrise)." ¹²¹

SECTION VI - THE CREATIVE AND INITIATIVE MINORITY AS A PARADING FORCE - THE SIXTH REQUIREMENT OF A STRONG NATIONALISM

"Nothing is created in history without effort and without pity" was the theory of the founders of the revolutionary socialism. In practice, it meant: "To stand up for every revolutionary nation, to call for an aggressive war of the revolutionary countries of Europe against the greatest threat to European revolution"¹²⁷ (which was Russia at that time). "Nasille", "terrible white supremacy", and "vain" were the metadata by which the "enemy nations" were being used to define the path of the "enemy nations". These same methods were used to promote socialism in the internalised national class of the barracks, which is a well-known thing that should be done. Sarel also recognises the enormous role of noise. In his opinion, "noise is one of those things that... nations that have lost their humanity have to find their own destiny".¹²⁸ Writing about Rome's alliance with Carthage, Walter wrote that it is a very human nature to "strive for the greatness of one's own land, and this means striving to help one's neighbours. The one who would like his native land to never become bigger or smaller, richer or poorer, would be a citizen of the world" In other words, according to the Fernean sage, only those who have a sense of patriotism in their hearts, who do not want to develop or move forward, but stand by the rule of "do not move, are likely to expand their land. That is why a nation or an idea that aims to break the terrible bonds of individualisation; that cares not for the immediate but for the "eternal" must play a huge role in the life of the national clamour. Without it, neither the stagnation can be removed, nor the space for the construction of a new one can be calculated. Without it, neither the Balkan, nor the "Russian", nor the Anglo-Saxon peoples could have started to the "universal endeavour of their genius" for the benefit of themselves, their people and their pride. It could not have been otherwise, for if history is a battle for domination and power, for participation in valorisation, then creative noise had to play a significant role in this work, because appropriation is first and foremost a matter of desire, not of power, a matter of the pharmacological and melting of matter in the flood of one's own desire, will and strength.

Wilfred Parrett's Italian satsyolag says that "faith and barracks different religious dicta and people are an indispensable foundation for the building of national life. A people *senza fide* (without faith *in its mission* will perish.¹²⁹ Since faith is a desire to impose on others, the role of the church in history is clear. Each kingdom (religious or political) is only good because it is a kingdom of the pen, but in order to survive, it must be willing to

The flock of the kingdom that was founded by the *ecclesia militans*. Every new idea can be written in this way. This noise is not one of those things that may or may not happen. The aggression that causes a new idea to emerge is not an accident, it is immanent in every "theological", religious or national idea that seeks to occupy a certain territory, or in the goals of some masses of people. The Moors and the Panthers, the French and Atyra, the barbarians and Rome, Rome and Carthage, England and Spain and the , Moscow and the Tatars - are many examples of this... The author of Zarathustra says: "In every mentor, the truth is the same 'evil' that glorifies the enemy... The new is in every case 'evil', as such, which, although it seems to be, overthrows the boundary stones and old shrines"¹³⁰ and is subject to "creative noise", as Sarel also said, Engels, Paréta, Darwin, Spencer, under different names and different identities, and which has been giving us historians since our own time. Aggressiveness, not compromise, is the path of every new idea, which is accompanied by another, which sometimes mutually excludes itself.

These adverts are to the question "how?". At the same time, the flocks Perhaps the most important question is "who?". Who comes into the light and comes up with an idea? Right-wing activists, democrats and other people's activists have said - *the people everywhere!* We say - *never the people!* The people exist for every idea, whether it is static or dynamic, they will become passive, they will accept it. Actors are active, those who carry the idea, those from whom this idea , the active or *initiating minority*. It is called par-awareness: "class and famous " (in the eyes of the right-wing masses, it is not a real idea), "national famous intelligentsia", "aristocracy", "ruling clique", "tyrants" (political writings: USSR, fascist state, "Unegalitäre-" or "Führerdemokratieii" (Alf. Weber), but the essence of this minority and its role in all public life is the same. This group, which develops an idea for the "uninformed" masses, makes it accessible to these masses and, finally, mobilises the "people" to fight for this idea.

As for the right one of these ideas, the right national one, Speng said. The nation, like all ancient cultural elements, is losing the value of not only *one* person. "¹³¹ Others state: "the European, European, Central Asian, Islamic culture of the Arabs has withdrawn itself from the *ancient world*."

and *the ecclesia militans* (Latin) - the military church.

ii "*Unegalitäre*" or "*Führerdemokratie*" - "democracies without race" or "Pravdyra democracy".

would be the religious perakanans who have stamped their mark on the smallest elements of these cultures. "132 There is also a "aristocracy" that cuts across the region. Ward gives such vivid examples of this: "If a cultural power, say, England, France or the United States of America, suddenly abolished all councils and became a state of civilised anarchy, can we assume that the pharmaceuticalisation of the government under such conditions would have been associated with *the actions of the people*, causing the most disadvantages for the non-existence ? Surely not"... Here, such would be made up of *a handful of adzinas* that would float in the country, and which, if they were implemented by the *authorities*, would be *loved by* . *The people never give up on the*, they are left through the council. In the history of nations, it has never happened that the people have taken the initial steps to formulate a council. *Councils have always been established by the minority that sought power, but never by the majority that sought power.* "133

Pastavce instead of the word "council" means parading, organising, leading, leading

I hear the village council - and it is clear that the rules established by Wardam here can be applied not only to the work of the council, but to *the work of the organisation whole group: Both the existing value that is expressed in public institutions and the ideal value that is supposed to be "public thought", plans that are only at least represented in institutions.* Never passive crowds, but only an active minority of the public - the creative , the future "*varahi*", the cannibals, the pioneers, the class that represents the nation, the nation that represents the "union" of them, the groups of "instigators" or "podżegaczy" - ever smaller. The role of this minority is strong, *as a reservoir of new ideas.*

I would like to see H. Zimel's deep argumentation here. Yong says that civil society is maintained first by "interactions" between the units, and then by creating its own , which are independent. "These methods are consistent with religious survival in the clergy, political citizenship in the administration and in the army... the army, in its turn, in the commando corps, every patriotic association - in its city hall, every political party - in its parliamentary localities"... These minorities are the bodies of groups that exist for themselves. There, where these bodies are not yet formed, the asocial elements have a substantial existence (only there does the role of "people" play). If these groups are organised, they have their own existence, independent of the group members. These bodies (and never the "people") the ideas and forces that keep the group alive in present. The people are unable to create themselves

The creation of such bodies, such independent *minorities* that would stand above the units, which would be able to fulfil the group's identity and mission, resulted in disasters. They decayed and died when these groups were nothing more than the sum of their members, when the leadership of the group was inextricably dependent on the interest of individual members. On the contrary, where such deficient organs of the group were created, the group worked on the move. For any political disagreement, whether legal or administrative, requires the movement of a whole group, whose actions are a game of chance, which stems from the game of physical and moral conception. These are the things that social bodies (*minorities*), created to clarify the , do not know, and thus *they can help to preserve the group*, making social action more complex and sudden "Thus, in a large number of cases, the intrigues that seem to *be replaced by a smaller group* are based on the fact that a smaller group... has more freedom in its hands, more ease of self-sabotage, more pain in its hands." At the same time, such an organisation of a minority, such as a group, gives better control to the villages of the agul. Because the people never rise above the the peasants, which is rather low intellectually. The gathering of people enhances the affect of each member, the village of smell and care, but not the village of entertainment. If the group is to act as an agency, if the cause is to date a coherent movement *en masse*, such a replacement for masses by the authorities is inevitable. If such a replacement is necessary, but there is still no body that, along with the weight of the people, "must *win* this battle with the masses".

We saw an illustration of this in the revolution in Ukraine. The short-
The organisations that perform for the public, deprived of differentiated bodies, are unable to compete with other organisations. It is true that there are cases when the organ of a group begins to treat itself as an entity, more concerned with its own interests than with the group to which it belongs. This is the case when the organs cannot assume the functions donated (or acquired). *Then comes the decomposition of society* (Poland under the Polish rule, Ukraine in the late eighteenth century, Russia under Tsar Nicholas II); or - revolution, "when it is necessary to get rid of unrelated acts and contracts between the units", when the mass of zones takes over the function that the "minority" of the state performs. "All the revolutions that *a* certain political *group* (minority), by submitting its council, the legislature and administration to the direct influences-

ⁱ *en masse* (French) - in mass.

There are social phenomena of this parade". But the call of the masses to the arena is too small! Thus, in any case, in order to maintain a job, to defend abuses and to take any *action*, a public figure will always be necessary, *be respectful, strive for the power of the minority*, this social responsibility and strong ideas, the most important feature of history.¹³⁴

The creative clamour - as the "what", the initiating minority - as the "who" - is the basis of almost everything public work, the way in which a new idea is promoted. These two points, as a matter of practical politics, are the basis and an essential part of any new idea that gains the right to live.

SECTION VII - THE WORLDVIEW OF THE "FAUVISTS" AND "BUDDHISTS" PEOPLES IS A DILEMMA: QI-QI

The ideology outlined is not a fantasy or a vague theory, is practical creed of faith all ancient and noble races, and *it has ensured and will continue to ensure its dominance and validation by the darlings of this world*. A thousand lessons can be learnt from this history!

This is what German philosophers of the Prussian Revolution said: "The military was used for political enterprises, for the acquisition of wealth, *glory, abstract domination* ('theological' values!). The contributions of other peoples were pure contributions of salt... their God was only capitalist Jupiter and they did not respect the "sacraments" of other peoples. Cato gave his "ceterum ^{censeoi}" at every meeting of the Senate, and Cato was the sovereign of the Romans. The eight Roman principles were *a cold abstraction of domination* and primus, like the "pure egoism of the will", a principle of action for action. *Mantesque* said that it was the usual custom of the powers to pit their strengths against each other... Publius Nazica told them, *without any need*, to build a fleet. They were more afraid of the Gultayavanna than of the enemy. Their family of lords were true "fearful", so characteristic of powerful races. They were "firmly convinced that only Rome was different", and it is believed that the Romans, who were "canny", "special", "courtly", chasing after "abstract", "theological", "eternal" values, they were defeating their own, and even more so their "concrete", bound workers.

ⁱ *Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam.*

"The Romans (in the words of Mantesque) were glorious and proud, the Carthaginians were proud and strident, the former wanted dominion and power, the latter wanted honour; as a result, the latter 'fought a war without loving it', and that is why they fell under the rule of Rome. The same idea was expressed by *Caradini*, who taught his countrymen that for them this was a war, that they fought it "with pacifist sentiments". Carthage worked for temporary tribesmen; for him, as a legalist, independence was of little importance, since he did not need to fight for it; for Rome, independence was itself, a tribune in itself, and it became the world's greatest empire. "The battles lost, the decline of the guild, the plundering of treasures, and the fall of neighbouring spots forced Carthage to take the most severe measures. But for Rome's decisions, the only thing that mattered was its *fame*, and since seemed to me that could not exist without domination, there was neither hope nor fear that magic would force it to take measures that were not practiced by it." For Ryma, only "agulnae" is important, not "cankretnae" or "tsialesnae". Therefore, "in the battle of Kannama, the women's faces were covered with tears". To characterise the pro-cleansing, tearful, "chalice" mood of the newly generated races (so close to our right-wing activists), the altarpiece mentions "fearfulness, and softness of the Asian peoples" and, above all, the Philippines, which "blurred the battlefield with tears at the thought that now they would be destroyed... Other tears were shed by those Arabs who cried out of pain when their leader was killed in the battle".¹³⁵

This was not a non-existent "ethos", but an abstract
The most noble ideas, the noblest idealism (which I appreciate, not just "humanity") that these peoples brought to the pinnacle of domination. These fanatical spirits, the desire for domination and devotion to the idea, to their mission, were also imitated by the Anglo-Americans. "War made our empire, war and conquest," said Lord Roberts, the victor of the Boers ("Message to the nation"). And these theses have been given by a number of English historians.

The historian Sili recalled with recognition the admiration of people "who built an empire" and who "were, in fact, pirates". These builders were neither "humanists" nor "eunuchs", but men who had far-reaching ideas in themselves - they had the greatness necessary to do a great work. This was the fate of brave people who dreamed of brilliant things, dreaming big... ^{and} of Letucheniks who paraded their illusions in a sovereignty that would never fail.

^{and} *dreaming greatly*.

They were pirates and aristocrats, admirals and slave traders. They were pirates and aristocrats, admirals and slave traders, people like the famous "Ataman" Jaxon, whose "bandit" attack was a fun way to conquer the South African; those of whom Kipling said that they were "neither gods nor devils", but only "men of the world of men". Not dry "principles", not small-minded theories, but far-sighted, pitifully passionate men who cared about "tomorrow" and the "ultimate" principle of domination, created this empire that no Englishman could think about without shivers of admiration."¹³⁶ The whole philosophy of these men was in Budler's quoted words - they "would go to go" to satisfy their thirst for adventure, or, as one of his colleagues put it, As one of these canny old men, Walter Raleigh, said, "to discover unknown lands, to occupy them and to take them over in the name of the punisher"... How does this philosophy differ from the Russian one?

Tocqueville said: "It's a matter of haste for England,

The principle that the English intrinsic nature is a measure of justice was the basis for the fearfulness of English politics towards everything that stood in its way: "firm and unrelenting in stifling rebellion, and abusive to the pieties and pities of those over whom it dominated "¹³⁷, this race did more for the chaos of civilisation than any other.

Sahl sees an analogy between the antique chalices of heroism and the chalices that are being used in the conquest of the Far West.¹³⁸ Ford was a typical exponent of this energy, saying: "Everything is possible... Look ahead of you all the time, think about new problems all the time... I have to adopt this way of thinking to create a new state in which everything is *possible*".¹³⁹ How does this truth differ from the "terrible laws of history", the course of "evolution", .? *Theodore Roosevelt* said: "The times when people love other people's lands as much as they love their own are harmful to a society." To defend one's land and to protect its greatness is the highest goal.¹⁴⁰ This is the persistent, constant energy of powerful peoples, "the virtue of noble races, absurd, spontaneous, with the fervour and passion for *ideas* and invention, for life and love. "¹⁴¹ Spengler likened this spirit to *the spirits of active civilisation*. Its characteristic features are: "cooperative work, ... activity, participation, self-determination... struggle to work together in the *moment*, ... work is blunt, *grasping, imposed by what has agility* and

^{and} *Far West* by Jiki Zahad.

"I was tearing up..."

This worldview is very special to Asians and Hindus. "The history of a Western European is the forest he wanted, the Hindu one is the fate that happened to him." His ideal was this "from the momentary sovereignty, accessible to courtiers, the *abstraction of abstractions*", this "highest poetry of strength, sharpness of will, passion to crush all the feathers". This is the kind of poetry that Lesya Ukrainka "deserves", who "gains the will to chase obscurity to death". The will of the government is not expansion itself, it is "expansion as a rightful only value", something that is contrary to one's spiritual vision of "me", "you", "neighbours", "now" and "here", it is immanent and "biannual", in the sense of space as well as in the sense of time. These people had their God not in the available courtly ways of the court, which had to be done by hand, but in the "tender" way, which had to be done in battle and competition.¹⁴² He who has his own God, (says Hugo) for him, for the sake of the vague dream, adds the benefits of this world.¹⁴³ Isn't this the same idea of Shavchenka, who only then could engage and have God when he "burned the fallow land"?

This is the spirit of the *shareholder*, and *its people are willing to do this* *In this case, it is not because they do not engage in the falsities of "humanity" and "justice", but because these spirits, which we have accentuated, are not there.* And on the other hand, there were "Kalar" peoples who were immersed in their slave's dream, who did not accept these all-encompassing ideas. I said above how the occupation of these ideas, freedom and power in one circle attracts them to the other. Those who cannot attack cannot compete. Tao Te Ching said that the Buddhist country that started by banning all aggressive warfare ended up banning warfare. In line with Plato, who required an instinctive knowledge of the enemy, Buddhism is committed to love of him. This doctrine reigns supreme, *and the stranger is treated as one's own*. In line with the "activated" Aryanism, which emphasises the idea of "eternal" ages over all temporal ones, in Buddhist lands "one should honour 's father and mother, serving the heavenly and earthly gods". Kali "this dak-tryna softened the chalaveka (walking Ten) then for the price of its softening" (en amortissant).

This act weakened the people who recognised that they were "steel". less zealous and more sociable", and since then have been less destructive and less animalistic.¹⁴⁴

It is interesting that Tan also came here to make a sign of independence

between (as Nietzsche put it) Ja-Sagen and ^{Nein-Sageni}, between affirmation and negation (Hegel), between the pursuit of expansion, achievement and death. German philosophers we have mentioned saw their ideal in an "abstract" strictly separated from the courtly and uncomplicated, while others, such as his paparazzi, saw it in an "abstract aggregate", weighing everything "partial" and everything "universal". And the Buddhists took for themselves as an ideal something exactly like this. This explains the significant role played by the Buddhist races in history. The longing, the will to be righteous, should be seen in an emotional light. Peoples deprived of these aspirations, these passions (which are reserved only for the preservation of the race and its heritage) must perish. Those who have this will atrafficked or abolished are left behind in the struggle.

In defending his conversion to Buddhism, Tan said that he was a propagandist. and to be "more tolerant of your passions, more tolerant of your enemies, more tolerant " (how dramatic!) is not for the European man. "Their wisdom was not created for the minority races of Europe. Buddhist science calls for study, *but we want to do* (to quote Goethe, "there was only a beginning"); we no students to give us anything, *but we want to be the most powerful thing in life*. Finally, as we learn for our efforts, she promises us nirvana (our native sunshine and clarinets are the same!), an absolute appropriation, *the very idea of which fuels us*. Sakya Muni did not come for us, he will not save us. "¹⁴⁵

This is not the idea of a shareholder. "A nation that... adds to the whole idea of glory... brilliance, individual excellence, and reduces everything to the satisfaction of the material needs of the masses, this value of satisfying the needs of the greatest number, will become a ready-made battlefield for conquest. "Whoever loses his life, loses it." Interest can never be grounded in nothing; having fear of things that are weak and heterodox, it will lead to a state of weakening and demoralisation. "¹⁴⁶

The only races that live and rule are those that know no doubt, that do not think about the right to own existence and the existence of the weaker and lesser; races that do not distinguish between abnormalities, but between their own invincible strength, for whom the pursuit and idea of their own dogma is abstract, not relational, seeking sanction at a cost. "For it is not known whether from the beginning of the world we can name a single culture, institution or religious science that could by standing on the principles,

ⁱ *Ja-Sagen* and *Nein-Sagen* (num.) - gawarannye "yes" and "no".

whose value was counted only in terms of realities". Strong nations are in whose schools "pity was poured the soul by this activity" rather than relaxing the doctrines of "aggressive action", respected by enemies.¹⁴⁷

In these two worldviews, the absolutist and the Buddhist, there is a struggle between the powerful races and the weak races, which see their only recourse in the degeneration of the powerful. But every great nation that does not at least bend must remove "Buddhism" from itself, because it is death and . "The lovers of the world and the brotherhood of nations (Spengler says) ... are the spiritual *truths of philanthropy*, this is just another form of pacifism. The self-contained reasoning (intellect) has always been a variation of life and histories, not recognising... The perception of all racialisation, which should be the subject, not the object of histological development (because there is no third), must now be sheepishly lambent on the dictates whose followers to think for the sake of reason - for the sake of logic, the rule of facts - for the sake of abstract reason, the fate - for the sake of reason... the few qualities of Rim's writing are antithetical to the fact that he was able to exclude his felakhic instincts from his politics... The haste of the felahs would mean the betrayal of the nation from history - *not for the benefit of the eternal world, but for the benefit of others.*" Such a felah nation would have become an initial state of a bundle, fallen into the hands of others, a state that "oscillates between a long reign and unstoppable explosions of rage" ...¹⁴⁸

These are meant to draw the reader's attention to analogies that are almost inevitably are passing? In each case, Spengler was right: Humans will be forever treading the earth, building pyramids, occupying lands, organising the unorganised and competing with each other. Those who try to break free from the grip of this law in the name of Felix's "measure" and "aggressive enforcement" will find themselves passive enforcers of it. Those who do not work for their abstract ideals will work "for Pharaoh". This is the only dilemma that we are facing.

SHARE THREE - UKRAINIAN IDEA

RAZDZEL I - NEW NATIONAL "ERAS"

The motto of this book would seem to be aggressive in many places. But it is presented in other sacred ways, which I have given it in the first parts.

What is not becoming a Ukrainian idea is this "*whole new spirit*". Our journey in the desert has not yet ended because we had a thousand wills instead of one, and hundreds of these instead of one bright thought that would unite everyone into . After all, what is a nation if not a collection of millions of wills that have been moulded into the image of a common ideal? The ideal of the domination of a single ethnic group over the territory it inherited from its ancestors and which, although it is ending its own days, is still a reality.

Putting our sacred *aspirations* into the clear language of the *layman* is Fichte's way of crystallising every idea. The Ukrainian idea consists of these two parts. From a clear goal, from *an ideal*, which includes the national will, from the *will itself* and from the feelings of diligence, from the national "era", "emotionalism" (Bares). is the *feeling* that something has a purpose, and *the thought* that gives the feeling a definite form (Spencer).

The failure to develop the "emotional" beginning was precisely the cause of our most recent disasters. The fervour of "Marseillaise" would have been extremely fierce without the people of the Event, who then pitched the formula and the place. But even the appeals of 1789 would have been in vain without the fervour of *the Marseillaise*. This powerful passion was not mated to the Ukrainian idea.

The Ukraine we aspire to does not exist, but we can create it *in our souls*. We can also *fall for this idea with the lamb of fanatical adversity*, and then this lamb will eat away our slavish "Saramlivism" to itself, which will destroy us, as the Saramlivism of its truth destroyed French aristocracy, as the ideology of the "repentant nobleman" destroyed Russian duality, and in this agnos other people's ideals will be buried.

But only then! Because if we recall the passionate desire to create our own light out of the chaos outside, if the "Malarussian" account does not change in us for the sake of any desire for control, if the themes do not become axioms, dogmas, "Saramlivism" does not become pirated in

^{and 1789} was the first year of the French Revolution.

"brutality" and the spineless "people's love" into aggressive nationalism, Ukraine will not become a nation anymore. This is the goal of the gauntlet, the "subjective moment", without which neither natural wealth, nor the number of people, nor any "evolution" can help us. Nationality - walking *Kälten* - has, in the first place, subjective aspects. It is a metal and a melting element that can rise to temperatures as high as possible, but also fall below zero. In the latter case, there will be no need for any abstract debate to make the historian recognise his claims to state existence. This is, among other things, the main point of Ukraine's problem.

"¹

We had that moment ignited. Instead of ignition and white light, that We have not been saying "emotionalism". National pastors have never been "pitifully enthusiastic" in Ukraine. The word "nationalism" was used by "people's lovers". *They were sarcastic*. The attachment (in his words) to "what gives him life", and to himself, was considered "ridiculous",² like all "instinctive feelings". His idea had nothing to do with "religious fanaticism" or "the fervour of reason prevailed over emotion". It had to be done in such a way that "the findings of reason prevailed over emotion". To stifle the ecstasy, to kill the nerves in the idea, to break with the boring party programme - that's what we had to do. The "sharp intensity" of national emotions was labelled as a manifestation of uncultured qualities, as a "brave appearance". Drahomanov was a champion of the "spirit of the old lawless non-communist", which he thanked Shavchenko for. He, like his students, did not understand *that non-communism is about other people's gods - only the downside of unwavering faith in one's own*.

The goal of Ukraine did not focus on this great value. This value coincided with her "mending love" for him, not knowing the will to impose herself on her family and the outside world, not having the support of another's idea to protect her in its shadow. "Why are we so insignificant?" one of the "split" Ukrainian souls tries to ask, and says, "because what we *have* in us, and if it exists, is as insignificant and weak as we are."³ This was the insignificance of the will, in which Ferreira saw the gallant bravery of our entire century.

It would be hard to say that the Ukrainian idea was completely devoid of "emotional" colouring, only that it was "insignificant and weak". It remained at a tentative stage of development. *Our will to celebrate national individuality* did not take on the task of imposing other people's wills, and we believe that "each has only what the other has in his or her eyes"; without lordly captivations, "we simply *loved ourselves*, simply *felt a fifth of ourselves*" everything native, our own, "naskaz".⁴ And there are many truths here

If this "without a public face" was taken into account, then this "emotional presence" in the country was there, but it was undeveloped, passive, *only abaronic*. "In our national endeavours, we did not go further than the boundary that was defined by the interests of *the barony itself*. We were very disgusted with Polish nationalism, as well as with Muscovite nationalism with *its instances of state violence*."⁵ The instances without which every idea, to which Poland and Russia owe their life, are dead, were hated by us. The paradox was the thesis that every great idea, even if it is great, must also be able to cook light.

A Ukrainian does not want to be a part of this idea, because it requires a village, because triumph is not bought by "noises and primes".⁶ The need for this idea is to come without a call to the national babysitter", where there is no place for it; The "anger" of the struggle for diversity of opinion, the "ardent, courageous desire to bring down to the very basics" of the labour idea, the appeal to the "valuable instincts of the masses" - these were emotions that had to be hidden, even as they were reducing the struggle for light.⁷

And at the time, when the Ukrainians moved to the adoption of the law, this adoption was , palavered. The population of the revolutionary Ukraine knew, in fact, only "what it did not want, not what it wanted". His desire to "destroy the existing order" was just an expression of the feeling that only the outside of the "force" in the world had; he not think about organising a new "force" for the revolutionised countryHe had no "thirst for domination over the Kims", but only a purely unproductive, purely abaronic "love of slavery".⁸

And it was so small! The very "harmony" that was pushed for by the king not only did not give the idea a chance to flourish, but also did not lead its people and its . The Latsinska Tsardom, with *a foreign* language, as well as the Tsardom that came from it, was admired and fell by the masses. And how desolate the slaves of the Ukrainian people are, who are now working, *alien* to Russian balshevism! The very "goodness", the very parochial "us", the very sentimental love of the world will not give the idea of . *Nothing else* must be in her being, in her aspect. And this is the "non-stuff" that the masses need to understand, which is the essence of the idea, associating it with details that are not understood and alien to the masses, - It is precisely this *instinct to dominate*, to rule, to impose a variety of thought and light on oneself, to *lead* with oneself, to organise life, even if one could sit down. The masses are so sensitive to this "instinct of noise" that they feel its attack in the form of an idea that is not their own, and often accept it, calling it sluggish, small, abstract, only abstract, over-the-top, fearful, even "their own"

Come up with ideas.

Our pathos was "longing for a pure, human, measured life";⁹ but this life is not only longing, but also angry! Not only measure, but also war! The basis of the Ukrainian appeal was "purely human", not "primus". But, of course, the aspect of a new idea could not happen without the will to give it to the primus, and sometimes to the "robbery of another's". After all, what is there in the nation's invention that is not "its own" that has not been appropriated by others? One feels such a nation "on our land *that is not ours*" on its own territory. In the southern Tyrol, the old names of the region, the German nicknames, are realised, made "alien".

The instinct of domination ("primus") is characteristic of any strong idea, and without it, we can never have Winniczanka's "mendacity" or Fyadzkowicz's "pity" philosophies, nor the "antiphonies" of Dragomanov, nor the "music" of Tychynaev, nor the "people's love" of the socialists will ever have the right to exist. It is not enough to have someone else's will, but to have one's own will, which would take the historical light of facts into the chain.

We were trying to work with someone else's idea, and only in the name of "humanity" and "harmony". "I don't believe in that which is aggressive in us - that it can be seen with the eyes of a chalavek... The chalavek is for me, let me practice what humanism is."¹⁰ But only that creative cooperation is by future "friends" from the unruly enemies of our idea. If that spirit of negativity and piety had not lived in the catacombs, if it had not *already been present in the first Christians*, the Russian arles would not have been inclined to follow it.

Drahomanov was working against the prophets because they had "humanity, altruistic thoughts", and at times there was "fierce and evil *work of* those who do not accept the faith of the prophets and apostles"... Terrible blindness! For the idea that is limited only to "altruism" for itself, and devoid of the "fierce evil" of the works of others, is alien to the light. Eight words from one Balshavik: "The RSFSR is not only five lanterns, but also five fiery signs that signify a new truth to the world. For these five signs, I will take up arms and go to kill." What kind of "humanity" can be found in these Chartists and servants of the devil? When sending to death those who did not understand his science, Calvin said: "God wills that all mankind should be made to fear for His glory."¹¹ This is the pathos (only plus signs, not minuses) that does not become a Ukrainian idea, which knew only its own passion, but not the passion of others, that in 1917 did not settle on the pro-prosperity angle of the capturer - the owner angle: those who want to disappear

of the captor.

Every creative idea needs not only to be liberated (se libérer), but, as Le Bon said, to be imposed (s'imposer) on the audience. We had "primus" in the name of "harmony", they had "harmony" in the name of triumph over ours. There is this spirit of not only cooperation but also the will to dominate, the will not only to cause but also the will to compel, not only to "timelessness" but also a strong desire to "emulate" creative ideas. And as long as this campaigner does not enter our "ematic", Ukrainian idea, valued and applied by outsiders who care not about "goodness" but about self-determination, will die and remain alive.

The ideas of others that we had to deal with were all the same as our own. The spirituality of Russian truth-tellers is expressed through the instances I am talking about here. "What wouldn't I want to be," we read from Dastaevsky, "what wouldn't I want to achieve, what wouldn't I want to become a dabrachin, a spider that sucks other people's juices, how can all this interest me? I know that I want *dominance, and I've had enough!*" And in second place: "... the great histories are that we will never become a great nation if we do not remember our own nationality ("self"), our own sacredness for the world... All the greatneses of the nation were able to develop their greatneses because they were so "honourable"; because they had power, because they served humanity, because they were proud, always and always, of what they were."¹² What is this if not a riddle that not only removes the baroness from the boardroom, but also imposes her "proud" and "honourable" national image on the public?

Pushkin, Tsyutchav, Blok, and Mayakovsky all had these facades. in both pre-developmental and post-developmental Russia. One of the enemies of Balshavism was walking among them: they were very different from the "subaltern" population, "the communists all shaved, in skinned jackets or worker's blues, in high boots... The gait *was adrift, the movements were sharp*. In their pavodzinias, one could feel not only a fertile energy, but also a rashness, an attitude, and frequent rudeness. "¹³ - Who is the master of "adventurous", "quick" and "sharp"? *The one who is in general!* It is the aspect of command that has been lost, the aspect of those who are not only "of great value", who claim that the idea of maximising the co-operation of this world, an action, of someone else's idea and one's own passive masses, requires "weight," "speed," "energy," "pressure," "judgement," and often "rudeness"

This will could have been ignored at first: neither Khmal
neither the Russians nor Washington, for the last time, thought about the
immediate

dependent state, but they had that spirit of "combativeness", abstracted in the service of the idea of freedom, and the importance of the best logical conclusions about the state and the will to power, which no programme can replace. This did not become a peculiarity of the old legalism.

And this is true both in terms of *someone else's* idea, an external idea that needs to be taken over, and in terms of *own* environment in which the idea is developed, and which also needs to be kept inert. In this case, the "musts" are just as irrelevant as in the first, and so the bearers of new ideas, despite their frequent "democratic" language, were not recognised for their major role as creators, always only as a group of truth-tellers. The sensations of these moments of these ideas were not met with sympathy from these masses, they had a mixture of complaints and the desire to settle loyalties with which the writer treated his material. The ideologues of strong ideas in Russia, said Maskal, "were very much afraid that our people we would say at that moment, that we would be able to *solve this mystery...* Our "common human beings" were in service of our people *as mere strangers*, even during the Selyan reform... "What is better - are we these people? - *Dastaevski* tries to ask, the people after us, these people after the people?... We must lean towards the people... but... under one condition only and this is the only one: that the people take a piece of what we carry with us. We cannot abandon ourselves to any kind of truth; ours must remain with us, and we will not give it up for anything in the world, except, in extreme cases, for the time of unity with the people. "¹⁴

The proponents of the "forced" ideology of co-operation were also able to create

This is the centre of bolshevism. For him, the masses would never be a measure of truth, no "will of the people" or principle of the majority would make him renounce *his* truth. His idea was to seek knowledge in the system, but only "in the struggle of the masses", which should be "shaken off the wrong path". is not at all democratic to say that "ten clever men are better than a hundred fools. "¹⁵ "The cabal of childhood," Lenin wrote, and all movements "must be precisely infected with non-communism in giving to people who retard their growth by their lack of worship of stability. "¹⁶

What our dragomaniacs could do to this - albeit negative and costly - phase of *Russian* ideologues

ⁱ *combativité* (French) - participation.

ⁱⁱ *sine qua non* - an absolute .

Marat, the "target of the people", was the same way about the people (and "fearful egos"). And here is what we read from *the Polish* nationalist Raman Dmowski: the subjugation of the public under this idea is never "about the negative association of an agnos with a flaw, but about the association of those who stand by this idea and *the compulsion to obey* those who do not even recognise it".¹⁷ Indeed, what is of virtue of thought? - And for the sake of argument, the answer of the Ukrainian "people's lovers" to the same question ("we are with the nations, are these nations behind us?") - "*We bowed to the people as a creative force that must heal all wounds... our country, which must answer all our attempts for individual and civil freedom, for individual and private time...*" "Where our people want to go, it will go..."

In the first two cases, the truthers gave *their* reasons for the torture. not "stoicism", in the last - they tried to "stoicise", what is their slave? There is the evil will to exploit the passivity of the masses and the masses, here - the fear of imposing one's will, as a way of "Jacobinism" and "despotism"; *the psyche of those who follow themselves - and those who are in the grip of power and fear*. The psyche of those who lead and those who are led: "pastors" and "shepherds".

That self-confidence *that colours the sides of every idea* of its representatives is nothing more than an unconditional belief in oneself, a valuable s'imposer of passive matter, not a seeker of ideas in it. An idea that does not have this zeal in its emotional effort will never be owned by matter.

Thus, the Ukrainian idea, although desperate to fight with others for domination, must first of all overcome the proverbial legacy of the slave times. We have to correct the fundamental reassessment of values. "Fanaticism", "instinctive feelings", "emotionalism" in place of "reasoning", "the spirit of national non-communism", everything that was brought to us, must be rehabilitated by a fresh and small country. In the place of amor ^{intellectualis}, there should be a faith that knows no doubts and a passion that knows no "why". Freedom for one's own must have the full will to stamp one's foot on others; in place of dependence on power there must be the will to rise to obedience. We have to carry our faith, not bowing our heads either to strangers or to the authorities. We must *have faith in great mission of our idea*, and pursue that faith aggressively. A nation that, though dominant, is a peacock's power

ⁱ *amor intellectualis* (Latin) - intellectual love.

and the panoptic psyche of the Valadar people. "Fanaticism" and "primus", not "love", perform an essential function in public life, and their place cannot be left unoccupied. If we don't, someone else will. Nature does not leave anything empty.

SECTION II - THE PLACE OF THE UKRAINIAN IDEA - BRIGHT, EXCLUSIVE, COMPREHENSIVE

Only an unconditional faith in the ideal of the schedule that escapes him, which does not allow any discussion of its riddles, any amusement at the established conventions. The emotional, sensual colouring of the ideal shields it from the most logical attacks, the most immediate mental "proofs". The absolute nature of the ideal (to which these "emotions" are attributed) generally excludes all rational analysis, making the ideal *inviolable*, enclosing it in a strong wall of "fanaticism" that cannot be broken down by the most modern cannons of persuasion, ridicule, fraud or correction. There, where the intellectual is gnawed by doubts, where the ideal of himself and his soul is dual, the faithful, without wasting time on fruitless discussions, like Luther, throw the charms into the sphere-packer and disappear. Unsuccessful in the art of *argumentation*, such a person is a doubter.

We were just playing with the getai of faith! We did not like "primus thinkers", nor an "absolute ideal", we were "logical and reasonable" in our attempts to try our faith. Our attitude to our own and other people's ideas was based on the glorious "for the sake of what", and our attitude to sovereignty was, as Dragomanov put it, "from the feeling and faith to science and reason". It was not, of course, in the free and unrestricted sharing of our ideas (not in "emathism"), but in the moments of others that we sought sanction and validation of these ideas. Deprived of emotional support, the Ukrainian soul, constantly reminded of the logic of others, hesitated between different, sometimes contradictory thoughts, unable to *separate* Savlo from Paul, not fully believing in either.

This word "*addict*", in the clarity of the meaning of the Ukrainian ideology source of our national atheism. That's what Ferera's footsteps are about: "A person can believe in this truth *only if he knows how to be independent and to follow* what works for him... (good to evil, beauty ugliness, truth to memory). *Only then*

He can distinguish between his work and that of his colleagues, but he can also *make them clear and soft*. "Determinant" (définir) is the same as "sign" (finis), which means a line, a boundary. these boundaries are closed or blurred, then the good, the bad, the truth and the memory, the good and the bad are mixed. And in that case, how can the will *crave* them if cannot distinguish between them?" In this case, everything ends with "the anarchy of doctrine and the weakening of the will." ¹⁹ Menavita was right. "The anarchy of doctrine" led to the weakening of the will, "the weakening of the will" to logical casuistry, and indeed "the anarchy of doctrines, of which neither the guarantees of love nor the power of agitation have been connected with any of them.

We did not become a national *dogmatism*. One can only believe in one religion. I believe that the bright flock is in the same age as the spiritual ones. And if we were people, if we saw the light, we would see a starry-eyed man, twisted under someone else's voice, where everything merged into an unintelligible mess, where it was impossible to distinguish between nation and tribe, independence and federation, native land from "Slavism" or "Eastern Europe", people from tribe or class, nationalism from internationalism, stateism from legalism, your idea from someone else's, the war from the barracks? - The image of what was supposed to be love merged with the image of what was supposed to be hate. There was no clear process of the relationship between God and mammon, to which every religion is tied, in our national ideology, no dogma, no meaning and "era", no meaning and sovereign nationalism that the masses would understand.

My bright idea was a dream - an image of a Russian story with three characters
- and

We have a roof on St Safia in Istanbul, or Poland from *morza* to ^{morzai}. We could died for the sovereignty of the nation, but for the political struggle for rights? For Ukraine "as wide as the earth, as high as the sky", but for "autonomy", "self-determination with accession"? One could have died for independence, but not for the federation, not for this mess of ideas thrown together, not connected to each other, not to each other, with their own incoherent "buts".

Without a clear ideal that would distinguish itself from other worlds, Ukrainians *could not have strong faith init*. That is why its opponents tried to oppose it with intellectual arguments, which made the ideal fade and blur like a fog.

For the ideal to be clear, one must "be independent and *pro-progressive* to those who work for it". This country has never been a slave! Here.

ⁱ *od morza do morza* (Polish) - ad mora do .

The question was asked by R. Paletikia's formula, a "patriotic discourse" on the topic of "Little Russia": "how it could be established now so that it could be useful to the Russian state without violating its rights and freedoms". This was not in line with Khmialnitsky's formula of "let one thing be given to another, and then fall away, and then be replaced". Drahomanov was concerned with the burning of the idea of the Ukrainian state with the panache of "God's judgement", with images that were entirely in keeping with Sarely's "myth" or Shavchenka's vision ("The West", "Cossack of the Borderlands"). The "aspirational" and "socialist" countries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries also adopted Paletka' formula. His principles, like Paletki's, were to find a "solution for both sides of the conflict". The Manarchists understood the national identity to be "in line with the national identity of all three Russias". In order to maintain the aspiration for the "game of Russia", the author of the Ukrainian Irredentists also advocated "national exclusivity" and the goal of "competing for the good of the nation... without fear of others and in union with other nations".²⁰

Belgium and the Czech Republic inwar 1914, which immediately became the Ententes targets,

The Balchaviks who immediately came up with "international" slogans openly promoted their idea to their villages. We tried to guess which village would be the right place to "orientate", and this was called "real politics". "Society," wrote P. Kulish, "falling under other tribal *power*, will inevitably become demoralised until it unconditionally recognises the protective *principle of improvement* in it, or opposes it with all the energy of alienation.

Thinking first and foremost not about "power" but about "improvement", the Ukrainian idea could not be promoted either brightly or with all its energy, and as a result, it "inevitably" demoralised.

"Was ihr den Geist der Zeiten heißt, das ist im Grund der Herren eig-

Paletika Ryhor (1725 - 1784) was a Ukrainian public and political figure and writer. In 1745 he graduated from the Kyiv Academy, worked as a teacher of Latin and German at the Academy of Sciences in Petsarburg. In 1764-73 he was general inspector of the noble corps. In 1767 he was elected to the commission for the drafting of the New Code. At the commission's meetings and in his writings, he advocated the independence of the Left-By-Right Ukraine and the right-wing Ukrainian path. The author of a series of works by contemporary philosophers, Dictionary in Six Languages: Russian, Greek, Latin, French, German and English (1763).

ner Geisti" - this rule was understood by other, strong peoples who *were the* "spirit of the times". Our truthers are the ones who are better at using it, not at giving matter its own form...

This is what the new country has to deal with again and again. Because all of these ideas (Slavophilia, the "Rise of Europe", socialism) must be fruitful, like everything else that is happening in the world. The Ukrainians have to understand that their idea, although it may be a bright idea, must exclude every other idea, and must be based not on partial but on the full adoption of another's. *And for that, this idea must be universally accepted.* And this means that it should be a political power, over people and territories, and the other is to inspire such a form of public administration, that would allow him to "improve" the region under his rule, to improve the moral and physical conditions of the region in comparison with its current state.

At same time our idea was valued everything else, but not by the this one. She was not interested in "how the highest state authorities are organised"; she would have her own "court, army, astrologers and geniuses". She did not need these "loud" and "distant" programmes "at any cost". It was only a matter of "ensuring cultural and civic self-determination" and "the will of the individual"; it was not about "trying to establish your own state", but about "the will of the provinces, of the people", because independence had "come of age". It was only a "socialist cause" and a time of the Ukrainian "peace of the country", without any quarrel with anyone, socialist or bread-and-butter "welfare". Who will give it - the whole world, the "European East", the whole "vetzer from the East", some supranational organisation. In this way, the cover of the former foreign regime was preserved and the call was made. And all of this, both legalism and internationalism, was an expression of the most important function of the organisation of the nation - the organisation of , which is devoted to a foreign idea and state. This was *not a complete, but partial* surrender to an alien idea; a capitulation to it that diminished the universality of the national ideal.

As the "primus" in pachucaevai is akin to the ideal, so is the adkidala. The country, in its own way, has its own particularities, moments of power, characteristic of all creative ideas. At times, she rebelled against the work of someone else's catechism.

ⁱ *Was ihr den Geist der Zeiten heißt, Das ist im Grund der Herren eigner Geist.* A passage from Goethe's tragedy Faust.

market imperative, but only in the name of limiting it, not in the name of solving its own unconditional mystery. We did not create it to replace the "false" hierarchy of the pastors with a "true" one; we did not create it to establish new rights and obligations as a state. Luther said: "What is freedom, if not justice and ? What are they fighting for, if not the goal of peace and obedience? "21 And what does Balshavik say: "At the end of the day - a series of grand *explosions*, and then *roll* the earth into a single pity concrete"...

To "scream", to "force obedience", to bring the idea of a new paradigm, is the first task of the universal idea. And this is precisely the function of the country, inferior to others, in giving both the outside world and the world of its own art. We used to describe the *pachuczotsy side* of the Ukrainian ideal with the word "pyshchotnist" ("tenderness"), which excluded "noise" and "zazirlevanist". This "pyshchotnost", which was understood as a degree of willfulness, had its basis in the *intellectual*, sentimental aspiration, which was to betray the highest function of the nation, the function of power.

According to Carlyle, right-wing nationalism focused on the "insubstantial" national ideal. Such ideas always distinguish between the essential and the incidental. The essential is not knowing the frames. The insignificant is to leave the forest to its own devices, not touching it, like Tsarist Russia, which gave us charavars, dumplings, garelka, kavbasa, songs and "Little Russian dramas"; Or like the Balchavitskaya Russia, which gave us our language (with foreign content) and power for itself, gave us the land and the orders for the old and the new lordship... In his memoirs, Rakowski recalls that the Kali - in the time of the new Ukrainian-Balchavian writers - told Lenin that Winniczanka was ready to accept the Soviet government if only he would ensure the rights of the Ukrainian people, and the Balchavian pope cheerfully exclaimed: "But it's a good thing! *Give me a pit for three languages!*" Like one of the Catalan saints, who was ready, but "did not want to be righteous without a trial," Luther declared: "What harm can a cassock do? Let him have his own cassock at the door, *let him have three cassocks*, if it makes a pit for us. "22 "Both the Balchavite and the Protestant popes, who were separated from each other by three hundred years, were apostates of a new "slavery", a new hierarchy. The pastors and the righteousness of Ukrainian socialism were limited - they cared only about the right to appear, but not about the right to essence; the right to the cup of life for which the rights of primogeniture are claimed.

For those who knew about the "pyatshchotnatsyin their days, it was as follows

once, in the interests of the country, this "language", this "sutana". The sophisticated work on the "fall of the common people", which was *supported* by "loud programmes", was this "sutana".... The "regional affairs", *which were supported by "God's grace to Rus"*, were that "sutana".... "Material and light affairs", *proclaimed "high-political affairs"* - all these were "sutana" that our "people's lovers" took for their own *purposes* to seal their conscience, to forget about the truth of someone else's ideology, in which they took their souls. For what did the Catalan sutana mean if anti-Catalan ideas were righteous in it? What did the Ukrainian language mean anti-Ukrainian ideas presented to outsiders were not allowed in it? *The universal* ideal, the organisation of power is an essential function of every national organism, *for external consultation (in the fight against internationalism) and for internalisation (in the fight against atomisations)*, for dealing with the external community and with the passive internal world. If nation cares only about "language", only about "Ukrainian worldly lands", if it afraid of truth-tellers, if is ashamed of itself for performing the highest functions, this task is taken over by strangers, by admirers. A nation that has not developed the idea of a new "obedience" to the world and to itself is at risk of war. A nation's virtuous involvement in the arbitration of someone else's idea occurs when it is subjected to the atomistic caprices of a powerful individual.

The country's foreign policy priorities are not far from the leading position of the world.

only as a dispute over who would "wear the apron of the African Negro", outsiders learn a wiser view. And here, the "soviet" does not hide the nation as a journalist, and here the nation does not put itself in the brackets of a historian, only that it will not fight for those "aprons" for itself, but in the intersections of someone else's idea.

What kind of distortion the normal growth of a people who aspire to independence, who are exposed to a foreign idea, undergoes, is a vivid testament to history. Ukrainians who had to fight on the Mazurian azers for Germany or in the Manchurian gaol for Japan, or give their lives for the purposes of the Third World War, for the purposes of the parasite's great power, for the purposes of the parasite's great power; Rheinstein and Saxony, who were the successors of Austria and Prussia under the armour of Napoleon, realising their own yoke, are examples of the heroism of peoples who up their high goals for the nation to outsiders, imposed by the "nature". *In this way, it is a gift to have the means that through this self-restraint, the people will be able to free themselves from the challenges and anxieties associated with loyalty to the "universal" ideal of their nation.* Your defences will be patriotic, patriotic and

The only ones who are going to go to the trouble of feeling someone else's power.

A nation's falling into the arbitration of someone else's idea comes at a time when *its leaders succumb to atomistic, centralised caprices of the people*. This was the case with Stashytsa's writings about his people: "The unseeing people, using their lost will only for the salary of the fallen and for the untethered troops (they cared only for the 'cassock!'), brought external slavery upon themselves."²³ Our dragomaniacs, who also saw their lost freedom in from all sorts of tzajars and in "no authority", called down on themselves external authority, someone else's authority. The public was amazed that even though she did not want to join a self-governing organisation, she was subject to the threats of clashes or unclashed *vagaries*.

Kali geta stanetsa, the offensive is coming, and it's going to be a long time coming. And then illusion

The pious aspirants of the rule of law are urged to restore their local values "for the common good", "welfare" or "prosperity", because *the fate of the "common good" depends on "how the supreme state is organised"*. All the efforts of the nation, deprived of self-government, are in vain, and they result in the establishment of the butchery. Called out in 1648, the Ukrainian peasants were subjected to serfdom, introduced in 1783. Russianisation in Ukraine. Foreign rule also pressured the fact that under the rule of Russia, Ukrainian men "have the right to own land, but never to harvest it". The idea that by confining themselves to the narrow confines of the "cassock", the need for a home life, the people could lose them, but this is an evil illusion. However, the apostolic authors do not have their own idea, and in this case, the alternative will be someone else's.

This alien idea is like my, "native" idea, but it is not a good one.

It cares neither for a universal thought nor for a strong will to impose it. Then all these "cloaks" and "languages" are donned by museums or "native" communities, and the masses themselves are the ones who are affected by their actions. Then of the "top thousand" desert: Gogal's "Moscow is my homeland" (as in "mother tongue" in red Ukrainian). Kvitka sings about the white man, and Valery Palishchuk about the red tsar; then they start to admire the "beautiful Russian language" and "winds from the east"; then they start to talk about the "three Galinas" of the Muscovite people, and then not only sovereignty but also "sutana" becomes a reality.

Then the nation becomes paralysed. The philosophy of the rentier, which is not about , not about organisation, but about saving and "giving", saps the nation's economic energy. Splashed in the palette, this "greed for seizing what is not ours, the audacity of force"... this "crude primitive righteousness

da", who, according to our historian, "operated a native plough in the Russian deserts" in the 16th century, who "put forward a gaspard, a skill, a handal", is also working in economics. And these looking at their wealth, are making "a nation of treasures of the land and the sea", making "another Kurashchup parade", and they are leaving the political and economic organisation of the region to outsiders. He works as a tribe of an alien nation, with the wisest elite, with philanthropists, not savers; organisers and producers, not conspirators; visionaries, not pacifists.²⁴

For only the zeitgeist that organises life gives it its national character, not the "native" language that the passive masses breathe. Ukrainian songs have been sung since ancient times, but the world recognised them as ours only after the Ukrainian heroes of world fame appeared. The Ukrainian Cossacks have existed for the world since the time when they received foreign generals. Ukrainian legends have been known to the world not since the time of their adoption by the pro-Russian Gogol, but since the days of Shavchenka,^{Starazhenka} and Marki ^{Vavchukaya}. In Kulish's time, our husband, true to his aristocratic institution, called the Righteous Ukraine Poland, because there were so many religious expatriates there, sugar makers, pharmacists, engineers, agrarians were passionate, they were organisers of life, they had just joined the political power in the country in 1863. - If the land belonged to them, it belonged to them, not only in their own thoughts, but partly in the thoughts of the Russians themselves, who, even under Karamzin, considered Poland to be everything that the Dnipro Prom was. The Ukrainian masses worked in 1917-1921 in the same way as , but Ukraine as a reality was recognised only in these thoughts, and this knowledge

Alex Starazhenka (1805-1874) was a Ukrainian writer and ethnographer. In 1821-23, he studied at the Kharkiv boarding school for Dvoranian youths. In 1824-50 - in the military service. From 1851 he worked as an official on private gifts under the governor-general of Kyiv, then under the minister of internal affairs, and later as an employee in Warsaw. In 1864-68, he investigated criminal cases under the governor-general of Vienna. He began writing in Russian and was published in the magazines of St Petersburg. With the publication of the journal *Osnova* (1861), he began to work and write in Ukrainian. His short fiction is written in the form of a comic strip, lively and in the name of a commoner. The works contain a maralitarian tendency, idealisation of the past.

ⁱⁱ *Marka Vavchok* (literary nickname of Vilna Maria; 1833-1907) was a Ukrainian and Russian writer and poet, translator. She wrote in Russian, Ukrainian and French. Her first collection of poems was published in Ukrainian in 1857. In her works, she condemned the revolution and described the historical past of Ukraine. She had a section of foreign literature in the magazine "zapiski" (1868-1870).

The Ukrainian peasant, abandoning his ideals of a "worldly country", took up the political and economic organisation of the region and the sword, as the elite, clumsy or short-lived, tried to assimilate the goals and principles of every national elite.

Without a universal idea, the country will never reach the state of law. Without the revolutionary ideology of socialism, the movement for higher wages would be a dead idea. The struggle for the social and political achievements of French revolution would not have been possible without the old republican mystique that had surrounded the movement in 1789. All the efforts of the English calamitous atamans and merchants would have come to nothing if it had not been for the great idea that inspired them, the idea of an abrahamic people with *dominion over the world*. Without that idea, the Habsburg Empire would not have been able to survive. "Imperialism from the time of William II was condemned to failure, because the outward manifestation of power is nothing if it does not become the will of the rulers of the world."²⁵ This lack of "controlling", ruling ideas was interpreted by Barès as a failure of rebellion, "without the fruitfulness of civilised national convulsions"..."²⁶

In our foreign policy, we did not think about "apathy", but rather only about the social, perceptible needs of a certain class; As socialists and human rights activists, we should think about "social cause", "language" and "cassocks" without worrying about "what the higher state authorities will think" ("the federation"!)). In such cases, only "fruitless convulsions" were responsible, regrettable, but not coherent political movements.

Although Ukraine is at the highest level of the rule of law, it must develop in itself, along with the will of the authorities, that all-embracing idea, the idea of a spiritually, economically and politically united nation. Without such an idea, we will continue to find nations in yoke, ruled by nations that are split in soul, not in the position of expressing a united will; nations of "cavalier explosions", nations without a voice, satellites of the strongest; couples, states, have at home slaves not only political, but also spiritual and social, nations with "anarchy of principles" and with "weakness of will"... In this way, we will not abolish all the atheistic and international doctrines that are spreading in us, that are shaping the nation's thought and its energy, that are undermining all the collective national will. Such an idea can become in us not

and *Boulangérisme* - a movement in France in the late 1880s under the slogans of revanchist war against Germany, revision of the 1875 Republican Constitution and dissolution of the parliament. The movement was led by General J. Boulanger.

It was not a universal, nor a social, but only a *national idea* that looked into the future and had the power to reflect its own light.

The fact that the nation is eternal, that the will is not an identical sum of individual wills, but something in its own right; that its goals are given in whole periods, evolving from the moment to the moment, from the moment to the moment; that a non-self-governing nation is not a nation, the idea of self-government should prevail over all others. It should not be bound by any treaties that limit its inalienable rights, either in Soviet Union or , but it has the right to give to the national will.

This is precisely the meaning that if, at the moment of the date of the nation's existence, someone claims the rights of the "session" ("*katam pamyat*"), then no principles of "law" and "justice" can save him from the fate of Kachubey. This means that if the date of the nation's self-determination is on the right, it should not pay attention to the "federalist" caprices of national minorities.

This means that if Ukraine's geographical position is to be considered as a threat to the nation's security, then the principle of democracy must be on the track, and that the "will of the people" or democratic forms of government can then ensure its own development. This means that we have to end the fact that the Germans are in charge of the ^{University}, not working with the idea of independence as a "tactical" matter, but with a form of governance that is principled (like our right and left "statesmen"); organise all external events in such a way that they serve the order of the nation's celebration, but not the "pleasure" of its members, what Ranke calls "the princes of the married politics".

Self-ownership means that when one class, in the name of its class-economic ("rentier") ideals, takes over the state-owned economy, it is not a "competition for the cause of the working people", but a national struggle. The specific, self-possessed meaning is that each class, although representing the nation, must address not only class and social, but first and foremost political goals. It should be about gaining political and economic domination of the nation at home, and not about giving it to a foreign, even "brotherly" class at the cost of claims of "social evocation" of the masses, which will never be fulfilled.

The same attributes as those of the atomistic ones are also true for all secular doctrines. The national will is more than the sum of its individual

ⁱ *Verfassungskultus* (German) - the cult of the office.

It is not the will of the people, their *time* needs, tasks and conditions of the moment. It is not the number of people at a given moment, nor the geographical location that plays a role in the nation's impulse to search, but *the subjective moment* that shows the will to search. In the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire, strong in population and traditions, could not take advantage of its geographical position (on four seas) and fell. At the end of the eighteenth century, Little England had only a half of the population of France, but this did not prevent it from despairing and making a deadly struggle with the mightiest labourers. Jagiellonian Poland had the same unfavourable relations with Moscow as under Czarist , but in the seventeenth century Poland was in Moscow, and in the late seventeenth century Moscow was in Warsaw. Moscow was in Warsaw. The national will must stand above "natural borders", as well as above "this national holiday". It is not a maiden to the varied notions that "the idea of sovereignty has had its day", nor to the worldwide doctrines of the "rise of Europe" and so on. The national idea, which is still alive, must openly declare its initial ideal of self-government over external relations, as well as over the relations of the internal villages that generate energy. The goals of the nation are not limited to the tasks of the day, nor to the fortunes that this generation has sung. The nation looks to the past, where it is looking for its own ruling point, and to the future, which it must provide for future generations, and *is forward-looking and promising*, not ignoring traditions or a single idea of the future as the "task of the day".

We have to take into account all that are relevant to the canon
The leadership of a nation can be defined by a single ideal - democracy, socialism, universalism, pacifism. Each of these ideas should show how it strengthens a nation, how it serves to strengthen it, or, on the contrary, how it weakens it. The ideal of independence should not be assessed from point of view of "freedom" of the individual, "democracy", the form of government or "causation of government", these times of "good relations" or "peaceful life" of the country, but it should be looked at from the point of view of the sovereignty and power of the nation.

The whole science of human rights must be corrected! We were taught that the national ideal should be "looked at without any prejudice, free from any legacies of history"... This is exactly the right thing to do! We have to recall the bloody attempts of past generations to know how to continue to achieve the same goal. We were taught that the ideal of the nation is this "land", "cavalier of black bread" and so on... Just like that! These ideals are expansion, organisation, and self-government.

We were taught to "always engage in agreement" with labour ideas, "not to gloss over national antagonisms", not to give in to "meaningless differences"... Just the opposite! The nation must first of all think about feelings and ideas that help the people and the goals.

We were taught to seek a time "that is higher than all nationalisms", to "recognise all people of all faiths as brothers", to seek "an international agitation of the ages of truth", to speak out "against more human scourges than religious and national fanaticism", "without prejudice to the future"... Just the opposite! This "international truth" is ridiculous, because it is only a cover for an aggressive alien idea, such as Russian Slavophilia or Bolshevism. Do not be afraid to "agitate the point of agreement" in politics, because there are as many points of agreement as there are nationals. Internationalism, as the righteous critic of fascism rightly pointed out, is like any other - it belongs to both. But if this internationalism "without unification" is claimed by a nation, this political anarchy, it is not fit for a nation, even if it is a free one. We were taught: "If the will of the people is ensured by the authorities, we must turn to the authorities, if it is ensured by a union (federation) with another nation, we must use the federation"... Nonsense! We should say: if the "will of the people" is not superior to the will of the padparadvassians of the nation, we must give this will, if this "will" is for the execution of "non-padparadvassians", we must limit this will. We were taught the ideas of the "humanitarians", but we should remember the words of Machiavelli: "When it comes to amusement over the fate of the native land, the game should not be delayed by any entertainment of these unreliable people, these cruel people. There are essential points that need to be put above all, which will ensure national freedom and independence."

This is the peacock of our national idea: it is universal, you are key, bright, which slogans are not about being saved, but about action and the will to give power over the principles, over other people's ideas, over one's own actions, over "abstinence", over everything temporal and particular. Only that idea will lead us out of the state of righteousness, only it will ignite with those aspects, without which every idea is dead.

SECTION III - "MYSTICISM" AND "REAL LIFE"

Understanding the idea of Ukrainian as a universal meaning and role in

The idea of a single woman. Two working ideas can be negotiated in two ways: either by paralleling them with one another or by "superimposing" ideas on the basis of mutual understanding, or on the basis of mutual relations between villages. The former is a way to reach an agreement, the latter is a way to add to the variety of ideas. *Franz Ferster* introduced the first method of "federalist politics", a name that sums up both the programme and tactics of our legalism. Starting from this point of departure, Ukraine has always been on the same path: "mysticism" and "real life", the programme of maximum and minimum; she shied away from "distant ideas" and turned to "good enough life", was disturbed by the sucking up of purely manifesto slogans" that distracted from "real and solid affairs", and was all about "the people", the momentary state of national communication, and the existing political boundaries; It advocated "timely resolution of the issues of the future", advocated coming to an agreement "with people of other masses", "abandoning big programmes" in order to achieve "small real gains". Only "slackers" and "theorists who praise the national " could deploy "noisy slogans". We have all learned the modern, pushing the future into the , with the intentions of the unborn; "not the categorical imperatives of national bonding, but the actual needs of the masses, given the circumstances of the time",²⁷ "without a second thought" to promote someone else's idea, to work "on highly political issues", "for the programme for this *newspaper*", for "teasing" neighbours, for raising calls that cannot be implemented "now" or that "people do not understand yet", not "romanticism" but "realism".

And in this case, there was a major reason for the terrible quota of the country. It is not easy to distinguish between the two: the agitational idea and the work on the common needs of the masses, the latter must be supported by the former, but not by working on their own. This is their synthesis! The very struggle for "real changes" with the ignition of a "ramantic" ideal can only lead to its embedding in the psyche of the masses, and is very practical for the moral demobilisation of the nation, and for the promotion of other ideas. What gave strength to the Russian and Polish Kalanistas in Ukraine? The fact that each of them, whether as a leader, priest or mentor, gave us not only "for the sake of the unfortunate", but as a source of "higher ideas" that inspired their fractional labour and encouraged them to cultivate "the spirit of the pile". Ours were not about building Ukraine, but only about spreading "humane ideas", writing, education, and the use of talent in campaigns, without any aggregate ideal that would inspire and provide

would have left their jobs.

Shavchenka's "castles in the wind", "fantastic illusions", were indispensable for any people who wanted a better future. We shouldn't be playing with these "castles in the wind", but hold them as the image of the nation's pride, leading the effort to bring them closer to the point of throwing them down to the ground. And if the nation is not prepared to pick these "castles", it is always reminded of their rights, associating "real world affairs" with them, imposing a mystical ideal on the passive masses.

Just as faith fulfilment in the kingdom, so national mysticism finds in the poets. "*Everything begins with mysticism,*" says Peguy, "*and everything ends with a fire,*" everything begins with "noisy ideas" and ends with steady work. "The point is *that every system of mysticism should not be eaten by the politics* that has met it. "²⁸ Every step of the work that was done "was inspired by a mystical goal.

"Small real gains" are not difficult only for those who follow in the spirit and line of their forefathers. Small profits that pursue a specific goal only lead a nation astray. If "real buildings" are advertised as a precursor to the ideal, as a stepping stone, if they teach the masses to be small, if they make them believe in the power of achieving the ideal, if they kill the will of people, they are harmful. "Small real gains" is an attribute for the people. If such slogans as "good food and a job", "small amounts of black bread", "a good and happy life" are used as a goal, then such "gains" are deadly for the nation. Only the "manifesto calls" connected with the nation's traditional needs, the great "mystical" idea that calls all the nation's traditional efforts (the ideas of 1789, *Italia farà da se*ⁱ, Russia in Konstantinople, Poland *ad mora da mora*), gives a glorious meaning to the people's sophisticated struggles... There is no guarantee that an "distant" idea will "distract us from the struggle for real gains"; on the other hand, there is no guarantee that the struggle for these "gains" will distract the people from thinking about a distant idea", which is pushing them to the role of a tribe.

I defended the idea as a *sine qua non* condition whole world of this nation. But that is not enough to say. Just as no "movement" that is not inspired by great ideas is fruitful, so *is a great idea if it is not based on its national path*. Without an ideal, one cannot

ⁱ *Italia farà da se* (Italian) - Italy will do it itself.

The ideal of a nation, in which, in the "achaga", the ardour and the hopes of the people would be ignited, which would rise above all time, knowing no "chamu". But such ideals can only be realised by an ideal that is faithful to the principles of the sovereign will and self-government *of the nation*, which derives its place not from the confines of the state, but from the integrity of the people's own patrimonies, their geographical position in the world, their customs, traditions, history and psyche. It is not easy to derive one's ideal of "minds in order faith", it is not easy to take for good that which we "logically reason" is good. It is not easy to create an abstract ideal, to "think in a logical ideal way", to be "free from the legacies of history" and "grow up on the historical soil of intuitions, habits and institutions"; it is possible to take as an ideal an ideal that is "scientifically substantiated and logically proven". The absurdities are not "nationalism", but some valuable ideas of "universal humanity" or ideas of humanity and their pursuit of the ideal of the nation. All these abstract and intellectual Brahminical doctrines need to be abolished, because they only cripple the nation, expanding the scope of its implications, paralysing the people.

"Good laws should be good for all people, just as

A good geometric theory is good for everyone". Deeply memorable words of the great Kandars! Every nation has its own law, its own truth and must only obey it. Modern sociology, applying the principles of biology to civil society, says that "it is necessary to change the habitual view of an institution, a custom, a moral norm as if it were in itself and strives to achieve these benefits for the whole of civil society". Each social type has its own criterion of good and evil, courage and bravery. The saying "what is healthy for a Russian is death for a German" is a vivid expression of the same thesis. This biological and social truth tells us to abandon all the ideals Ukrainian legal system has given us, which are based on the so-called "agrarian age" ideals or on the feeling of being "an organic part of an agrarian (foreign) goal".

We have been taught that our slogans are "ad intellectum", not "ad Patchouli, in the mood". Just the opposite! The national idea only becomes a powerful factor in life when it combines both parts: the and the intellectual, when it is combined with people's instincts and conscience. And this magic is only possible if the ideas and national ideals are not alien to him, if abstract conclusions are imposed on him, otherwise he will not ignite his passion for it.

A nation that adopts someone else's idea would be a soft regret, like an inferior magnet. It is necessary for the pressure of someone else's idea to weaken, and this nation will have "magnetic energy" in itself. A nation, though it may be like steel, is full of magnetic energy - it must have its *own ideas*.

"We know, but we don't want to" is the formula for conveying the ideal of a member of the people to whom this ideal is violent, called "reason". "Knowing" itself is fruitless without "hachu", because it is not the first but the last to be a mover in public life. This "hachu", which sits in the heels of the nation, urgently needs its own "knowing", and if it is not found, it becomes indifferent to the movement. If *reason is light* and its value is not based on our *light perception*; if the kirunak, in which the nation goes, which the mind chooses, is not a gift that the sovereign has; if reason and sense, logos and eras agree, the best efforts of the nation will fail. The nation works as if it were obeying someone else's idea, and this meaning is mechanical, without any emotion, or it stands against anomaly and breaks the connection between its own "want" and someone else's "know". For "a lover can only love what he loves," and a lover can only love what is his.²⁹

I "know" a lot of rights in our territory, and
The souls of the nation, starting with Adam Kysil, now Kulish, through our internationalism, to the monarchist ambassadors of the "European East" and the "three Galician Russian people", or the Galician "autonomy"... Gogal could exclaim three times that Moscow was his "homeland" (this was from his mind, from his "knowing"), but (as Dastaevski said) he could not find a single ideal in that Moscow that he did not mock (this was from his "wanting"). "Russia was scattered and scattered in his mind, and he could not put it back together in one piece." Like thousands of others, he had nothing positive to say about someone else's "veday", only negative criticism. We often find synonyms between "vedayu" and "hachu", some of them ("pyashchotnye") in our own "sutana", while others in the "voycha nash", the other (the "illuminati") adopted someone else's "soutane" for the sake of fiction ("I paraphrase someone else's words, and say that this is from the soul", in ^{Semianka}). They were found to be correct

^{and} *Semianko Mikhal* (1892-1937) were Ukrainian poets. He received his secondary education at the Harol gymnasium, and attended real schools in Kibintsy and Kursk. He attended two-year general education courses with the teacher A. Charnyaev (Petsarburg) and the Petsarburg Psychoneurological Institute. In 1914 he moved to Kyiv and was drafted into the Tsarist army. He served as a telegraph operator in Vladivostok. He joined the RSDLP(B) and worked in the Balchavik subfield (he left the party in 1920). In 1917 he came to Ukraine. He was an organiser of the following.

The people who were second to the price of jumping in to "make noise" with someone else's idea were called perakidniks. But neither the powers that be nor the rabble can be blamed. We must not be caught in the thought of "arbitrary part of someone else's life", but we must take our part in the value of the whole. If we use our sacred "want" to build on our own bright, powerful and daring "knowing".

If the universal ideal of the nation could be sparked by powerful national institutions, it had to derive its place not from the conventional principles of internationalism, caspianism, socialism, humanism, but from the mysteries of the national psyche, from the needs of the nation, from its ambitious, irrational will to give and to dominate. The philosophy of British nationalism ("right or wrong, my counsellors"), the German album "Deutschland über allesⁱⁱ", the pavilion statue - *muta tis mutandis* - and our slogans are all familiar to the philosophers. The only good ideal is the one that is based on national institutions, which put themselves above everything partisan and temporal, fractional, which is in touch with the future and does not give up on any other efforts. In these terms, the doctrine developed in this book, as *nationalist* jurisprudence, is clearly opposed by both the right and left wing jurisprudence, which has clearly rejected "nationalism" that promotes narrow ideals of one class or another.

On this nationalism, on the interplay of national nations
He said that we must build all our ideals, political, civil, cultural, religious, on the nature and psyche of the nation. This newly realised significance is, first of all, the unconditional celebration of the inherent will to live and to fight, and then the remembrance and re-emergence of those seals of our psyche that have grown out of our history, from the stage of the extreme east of the Shareholder. These are the Western European concepts of family, grammar, and ownership, these are the principles of our culture's organisation, independent initiatives, social awareness, and the

He was a member of futurist literary groups; editor of the magazines *Art* (after Mikhailenko), *Hearse of Art* (1922), *Semaphore to the Future* (1922), *Boomerang*, *Gong of Communism*, *New Generation* (1927-31), and others. He proved himself as a poet-futurist, as well as a theoretician of this trend. The poetry of the 1920s has features of expressionist poetry. From the end of the 1920s, he moved from futurism to the apprehension of revolutionary heroism to the ideas of civil war, Soviet patriotism and proletarian nationalism, and the Balchavist Party. In 1937, he was arrested, accused of "active counter-revolutionary activity" and executed.

ⁱ *right or wrong, my country.*

ⁱⁱ *Deutschland über alles* (German) - Germany is above .

The European spirit is about individuality and expression, shaping, hierarchy, not counting; about activity, not occupation; about the moment of production, not the moment of the zenith; about organisation, not anarchy; about idealism, not materialism. "Everywhere where the European spirit prevails," says Paul Valery, "the maximum of *needs*, maximum of *labour*, maximum of *capital*, maximum of *fertility*, maximum of *ambition*, maximum of *power*, maximum of *reduction in externalisation*, maximum of *change and abandonment* are respected... It is interesting that a European does not mean race, language, or habits, but the impulses *and the scope of the will*..."³⁰

Transferred to the sphere of specific attributes, that ideal would be for us: sovereignty, "imperialism" in politics, a kingdom free from the state in religion, activism in culture, free initiative and patriotism in economic life.

But in order to realise this ideal, we need to find that "gap of will", and for this to happen, we need to break with the current ideologies of the right. The ideology of the apocalyptic and the nationalism that I am developing here cannot be reconciled. Saving and domination, symbiosis and self-possession, harmony and counterpoint, abaronism and aggression, scepticism and dogmatism, minimum and maximum, materialism and rationality, people and nation, nation and initiating minority, "static" and activism, tolerance and exclusiveness, rationalism and irrationalism, partiality and agglomeration, and inclusiveness; reason and will, activity and universality, and nationalism - in which process the essence of both ideologies can be captured.

The principles of modern nationalism, which always emphasised by my The mantle of will, power and aggression is the essence of the present-day princes of "reason", "stability" and "understanding"; it is the essence of the most labourious dragomania. The principles of the apostasy were "rationalism in culture, federalism in society, and democracy in the city". Nowadays, nationalism means: *organisation and faith in culture, autonomy in the state, truth, hierarchy in the society*. There, the "time of the masses" was the place of life, class warfare was the place of life forms, and faith was the place of life spirits. In modern nationalism, the content of life is the nation's *activity* and power, the content of life forms is the national *struggle*, and the content of the spirits is the "gem", faith. There, patriotism was a "heavy yoke", not a "sentiment"; here, it should be replaced by "sentiments", self-willed vapours, fervours.

The reader noted that nationalism does not include hierarchical synthesis of different principles, but he approaches it in completely different ways. He also came to the synthesis of universalism and the

The book *is not only about the differences between the concepts* of cynicism, instinct and reason, tradition and innovation, realism and idealism, the people and the vital minority, life and will, but it also *emphasises the very points that the legal system valued in its synthesis*. key moment that captures whole ideology of modern nationalism, this moment of domination, power, activity, the most dominant moment of the rule of law: The rescue, passivity and subordination to institutions, principles, partisanship, the people, and other people's ideas there, and the active imposition of oneself on them here. This is what I would call *the new ideological basis* of the nation's efforts, which has been needed for some time.

Our nation cannot get rid of these attempts, cannot close itself off within its integral boundaries. "A nation that is confined to its own narrow affairs does not play an important role in the world. A nation can be dominated only by the universal aspects of its genius." And these "universal parties" (discussed in Part II) are waiting for their own rapid development, because we, in fact, are not a nation of laws. That "scope of will" was in our prodigies, in the idea of the Kalanization of the Levaberezh, in the idea of the Black Sea, in the barracks with Pownacz. Such tasks are now before us again.

This is the "universal" effort of the Ukrainian genius, this new and fresh idea, ignited by the unconditional will of the people, it was the idea that led us beyond the narrow concepts of "autonomy" and "Europe's entry into the world arena", back in the days when the voice of our nation was listened to by all those who seemed to be solving world problems. This is the synthesis that the nation's task of "rising up and rising again" named after him is admirable. That voice will again be able to give out only those who, in harmony, burn our national idea and national eras. Only then will a fresh Ukraine and its idea be "a lamb of pitiful enthusiasm". Only then will our "anarchy of principles", "weakened will" and "split souls" end. Only then will our "sugar cravings" turn into a single movement, which we will be able to give purpose and the desired scope.

We have not been able to find our own "know", *and that's where you lie is the deepest problem of Ukraine's current state*, not only foreign brutality and "abstinence". Here, we cannot dare to be responsible and to use our "knowing" because we are afraid of it, because we cannot understand it: ideals and freedom and power, to compare "revolution" with "music", freedom with flaplessness, *asalode* and idyll with *baratza*, freedom and harmony with noise, lyricism with dramatism, peace with vainness, orderliness with order, security with *avant-garde*, freedom with ru-

We accept other people's valued "knowledge" because *we are so afraid of losing our own that we consider it better to protect our "beauty" by spoiling others' "village"*. This vacillation of will must end. The nation that is about to become free and play its role in the world must once and for all lose the light of the world view of the created races and learn from the dramatic, valuable lessons of the great peoples of the world, who are already working in Ukraine.

Because, contrary to the Right, "freedom, glory, and the death of the barracks" did not "pack" or "cry". The struggle for the existence of the law is a woman's struggle. It is the universal truth. The German barons who claimed to dominate the Baltic States in the name of culture; the Latvians who created their own state and masquerade there in the name of "majority", which had its place, though it has lost its place in the name of access to the world, - each of them has the truth for himself. The judge recognises it for those who have great strength, moral and physical. This strength can only be achieved when we are exposed to new spirits, new ideologies. Every nation its dilemma: these wizards, these benders. The British are so proud: "Rule, Britain, over the *Mara*, and never, never, never will we be slaves"... These "dominions", these "slavery"! The same idea was expressed by the interpreter of Prince Igar's "Words on the Passage..." - these "patched seats" - these "*slave seats*"...

That courageous, glorious ideology of ours, the ideology of races, which from the time of

We must now take up the fight for the cause and for the timing of the rights that we must relearn. But we must think about breaking with the spirits of the lawyers who work for the national soul...

"Only the new spirit mentioned above save us!"

COMMENTS TO TEXT

YES PART ONE

- ¹ A. Schopenhauer - Samm. Werke. V. I., Die Welt als Wille u. Vorstellung, Inselv., Leipzig, p. 166.
- ² G. Simmel - Philosophie des Geldes, München, 1922.
- ^{3,4} Leslie Stephen - History of English Thought in the 18th Century, II, ch. X.
- ⁵ H. T. Buckle - History of civilisation in England.
- ⁶ Y. Okhrymovych - Development of Ukrainian national thought. Kyiv, 1922.
- ⁷⁻⁹ M. Drahomaniv - Strange thoughts.
- ¹⁰ W. Oswald - Monistische Sonntags Predigten.
- ¹¹ M. Drahomanov - Complete Works, "On Question of Little Russian Literature," Paris, vol. 401.
- ¹² L. Tolstoy - The kingdom of God is within you.
- ¹³ Young Ukraine, part 2. Lviv.
- ¹⁴ S. Efremov - For the year 1912, p. 12.
- ¹⁵ Work ch. 11, "The non-existent question" by S. Voynylovych (Nash Holos, p. 283).
- ¹⁶ O. Salikovskiy - "Ukr. Zhyttia", 1912, part 2.
- ^{17, 18} "Ukr. Zhyttia", pp. 7-8, 1912, p. 51; p. 6, 1922, pp. 12-13.
- ¹⁹ M. Hrushevsky - What kind of federation do we want, (edition 3), Kyiv, 1917.
- ²⁰ Moloda Ukraina, 1906, p. 6.
- ²¹ M. Voronoi.
- ²² I. Franko - From the top and the bottom.
- ^{23, 24} From the days of my youth.
- ²⁵ M. M. Language.
- ²⁶ M. Voronoi - On the occasion of the opening of the memorial. Kotliarevsky.
- ²⁷ The World of the Child, Lviv. 1925, student.
- ²⁸ M. Chubynsky - "Ukr. Zhyttia", I, 1912.
- ²⁹ W. G. Hegel - Vorlesungen. d. Aesthetik, V. I., Berlin. 1842, s. 156.
- ^{30, 31} pp. Bochkovsky, Welt, Vienna, 1920, . 36 i 110.
- ³² Nash Holos, Lviv, . cit. 285, 349.
- ³³ M. Hrushevsky. - Ukrainian Vestnik, 1906. book 3.
- ³⁴ Ibid. Bochkovsky, op. . 97; Narod, 1891, pp. 17-18.
- ³⁵ W. Zombart, Towards a Psychology of Socialist Theorists (Leningrad: LNV, 1924), 3-5.
- ³⁶ G. Simmel, op. cit.
- ³⁷⁻³⁹ M. Drahomaniv - Strange thoughts.

- ⁴⁰ Preface to the Community, 1878.
- ⁴¹ Grom. Golos, 1925, p. 6.
- ⁴² Narod, 1891, p. 2.
- ⁴³ I. Franko - Love for Ukraine.
- ^{44, 45} O. Spengler - Untergang des Abendlandes, I, 118 etc.
- ⁴⁶ G. W. Hegel, op. cit.
- ⁴⁷ O. Oles - Selection of poems, (Lavrov ed.).
- ⁴⁸ O. Turyansky - Beyond the pain.
- ⁴⁹ Christianity and World Problems, No. 7, The abolition of war, N.Y.
- ⁵⁰ I. Franko - Faded leaves, from Kaaf II, Mama Nature.
- ⁵¹ V. Vynnychenko - Revival of the Nation, I, p. 22. 22.
- ⁵² Gr. Nash - People's power in Ukraine, Prague, 1922.
- ⁵³ Moloda Ukraina, 1905, part 1.
- ⁵⁴ Ukraine, (Monthly of Ukrainian Studies), Kyiv, 1924.
- ⁵⁵ K. Koberskyi - Ukrainian nationalism on both sides of the Zbruch. Lviv-Kalamia, p. 46.
- ⁵⁶ M. Shapoval - Revolutionary Socialism in Ukraine, I. p. 67.
- ⁵⁷ "Ukr. Zhyttia", 1912, p. 10.
- ⁵⁸ Ch. Maurras, La Politique religieuse, p. 77.
- ⁵⁹ A. Schopenhauer, op. cit.
- ⁶⁰ Ukr. vestnik, 1906, p. 12.
- ⁶¹ S. Yefremov - For the year 1912, . 77; Life, organ of Ukrainian social youth, part I (4), 1925 r.
- ⁶² K. Kobersky, . cit. 114.
- ⁶³ Gr. nash.
- ^{64, 65} M. Drahomanov. - Strange thoughts.
- ⁶⁶ Life, part I (4), 1925.
- ⁶⁷ M. Drahomanov - Letters to .
- ⁶⁸ Gr. nash.
- ⁶⁹ M. Drahomanov - Shevchenko, Ukrainophiles and Socialism.
- ⁷⁰ Young Ukraine, part 6.
- ⁷¹⁻⁷⁵ M. Drahomaniv - Strange thoughts. Narod 1891, no. 1, 2, 19.
- ^{76, 77} K. Kobersky - . cit. 44. 46.
- ⁷⁸ M. Bakunin - State and Anarchy.
- ⁷⁹ M. Hrushevsky. - Ukrainian , 1906. part 3.
- ⁸⁰ Preface to the Community, 1878.
- ⁸¹ M. Hrushevsky - Borytse poborete, Vienna. 1920, ч. 1.
- ⁸² M. Shapoval, . cit. 225.
- ⁸³ S. Efremov - Ukraine, Kyiv, 1924, pp. 1-2.

- ⁸⁴ Correspondence between M. Drahomanov and M. Pavlyk, Chernivtsi, 1918, V, . 262. 262.
- ⁸⁵ M. Drahomaniv - Letters to Naddnippians'ka Ukraine. Internal and external Turks.
- ⁸⁶ M. Drahomanov - On the question of Little Russian literature.
- ⁸⁷ M. Hrushevsky. Where did Ukrainians come from and where is it going, Kyiv, 1917.
- ⁸⁸ The farmer. Ukraine, II, III-IV, p. 33.
- ⁸⁹ M. Drahomanov - Letters, etc.
- ^{90, 91} Khliborobok. Ukraine, fascicles VII-VIII, fasc. 185, v. V-VI, p. 63, 64. ⁹² Khrystiuk, Ukrainian Revolution, II, 19; Vynnychenko, Revival of the Nation, I, 43, 44.
- ⁹³ Ibid. Bochkovsky, op. cit.
- ⁹⁴ V. Vinnichenko, . cit. 111, 103.
- ⁹⁵ Dilo, 3. I, 1923.
- ⁹⁶ S. Dnisteriansky - Nová staát, Prague, 1923.
- ⁹⁷ V. Paneiko - United States of Eastern Europe; Ukrainian , 1926, 3.
- ⁹⁸ S. Dnistriansky, op. cit.
- ⁹⁹ Unification, Vienna, 1924, November.
- ^{100, 101} Ibid. Bochkovsky, op. . note 51, 94, 125, 167.
- ¹⁰² M. Drahomanov's correspondence with M. Pavlyk, vol. 13; Correspondence of M. Drahomanov with V. Navrotsky, LNV, 1923, III.
- ¹⁰³ Narod, 1891, p. 1.
- ¹⁰⁴ The Community Programme, 1880.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ukr. vestnik, 1906, I.
- ¹⁰⁶ L. Tolstoy - Patriotism.
- ¹⁰⁷ Community part I.
- ¹⁰⁸ 3 beginnings of the Ukrainian socialist movement. M. Drahomanov and the Geneva Socialist Circle, compiled by M. Hrushevsky. Vienna, 1922, pp. 158.
- ¹⁰⁹ Narod - 1890, II and 1893, 14.
- ¹¹⁰ G. Simmel, op. cit. p. 48.
- ¹¹¹ M. Drahomanov's correspondence with M. Pavlyk, vol. IV, p. 17.
- ¹¹² K. Szwarce - Herbert Spencer, p. 106 (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt).
- ¹¹³ 3 initiatives of the Ukrainian social movement, st. 111.
- ¹¹⁴ M. Drahomaniv - Complete Works, introduction by B. Kistiakovsky; Proletarska Pravda, 21. VII. 1925.
- ^{115, 116} M. Drahomanov - Strange Thoughts; Political Writings. Moscow, vol. XXXI.

- ¹¹⁷ 3 initiatives of the Ukrainian social movement, aged. 85.
- ¹¹⁸⁻¹²¹ Narod. 1891, pp3, 19 and 20.
- ¹²² M. Pavlik - Narod, 1890, pp. 2-3.
- ¹²³ Narod 1894, p. 4.
- ¹²⁴ M. Drahomanov - Paradise and Progress.
- ¹²⁵⁻¹²⁷ Narod, 1891, pp. 1-2.
- ¹²⁸ Preface to the Community, vol.
- ¹²⁹ Political Writings, etc., p. 388. 388.
- ¹³⁰ 3 initiatives of the Ukrainian social movement, p. 49.
- ¹³¹ Narod, 1891, 2 and 19.
- ¹³² M. Hrushevsky - What kind of federation do we want, Kyiv, 1917.
- ¹³³ M. Hrushevsky - Free Ukraine.
- ^{134, 135} Ukr. zhyttia, 1925, part 1 and 1913, part 4.
- ^{136, 137} O. Salikovskiyi and V. Salikovskiyi. - Ukr. zhyttia, 1913, 4 and 9.
- ¹³⁸ S. Yefremov - History of Ukrainian Writing, p. 265.
- ¹³⁹ Ukr. vestnik, 1906, p. 5.
- ¹⁴⁰ S. Efremov - For the year 1912, p. 176.
- ¹⁴¹ From the Kyiv 'Rada', (Nash Holos, p. 418).
- ¹⁴² Life, July 1914, 1917.
- ^{143, 144} Ukr. zhyttia, 1917, . 3, 6; O. Salikovskiyi, ibid.
- ¹⁴⁵ L'orient libre, Prague, part 3, 1924 (art. by S. Shelukhin).
- ¹⁴⁶ Draft resolution on the national question by O. Skoropys for the December 1904 congress. RUP. (Unification, ViennaNovember 1924, . 84).
- ¹⁴⁷ Bulletin of the Union of Liberation. Ukraine, part 15, IV, and part 6, V, 1917.
- ¹⁴⁸ Nash Holos, Art. 356.
- ¹⁴⁹ O. Dotsenko - Chronicle of the Ukrainian Revolution, Lviv, 1924.
- ¹⁵⁰⁻¹⁵⁷ V. Vynnychenko - The Revival of the Nation, I, pp. 90, 92, 98, 268, 279, 43, 155, 192, 193, 39, 47.
- ^{158, 159} M. Shapoval - Revolutionary. Socialism in Ukraine, vol. I; Vilna Spilka, kastrychnik 1921; Nova Ukraina, Prague, 1922.
- ¹⁶⁰ Ukr. zhyttia, 1915, X, II-XII, (V. Vynnychenko's article).
- ¹⁶¹ New Ukraine, chaps. 1-7, Prague, 1922.
- ¹⁶²⁻¹⁶⁵ Narod, 1892, pp. 7-8; 1890, no. 1, 2-3, 8, 19; 1891, ч. 1.
- ¹⁶⁶ "The case" of the proclamation of "autonomy", chaps. 164, 166, 1924 r.
- ¹⁶⁷ Moloda Ukraina, 1905, part 1.
- ¹⁶⁸ Narod, 1892, no. 2, 7-8.
- ¹⁶⁹ Ukr. zhyttia, 1916, p. 1 (M. Hrushevsky's article).
- ¹⁷⁰ From the initiatives of the Ukrainian social movement, art. 138.
- ¹⁷¹ New Ukraine, VI, Prague, 1923.

- ^{172, 173} V. Vynnychenko - Revival of the Nation, II, . 92, 94, 163.
- ¹⁷⁴ Correspondence between M. Drahomanov and M. Pavlyk, VI, 190 and VII, . 267. 267.
- ¹⁷⁵ LNV, (article by Ivan Franko about M. Drahomanov), 1906.
- ¹⁷⁶ E. Durkheim - Die Methode d. Soziologie. Leipzig, 1908, pp. 28, 34.
- ¹⁷⁷ M. Kostomarov - Two Russian nationalities.
- ¹⁷⁸ P. Zhytetskyi (D. Doroshenko. Review of Ukrainian Historiography, . 176, Prague, 1923).
- ¹⁷⁹ LNV, V, 1910.
- ¹⁸⁰ O. Oles - A selection of poems (Lavrov ed.).
- ¹⁸¹ M. Drahomanov - Strange Thoughts.
- ¹⁸² Fr. Nietzsche - On the virtuous.
- ¹⁸³ André Suarès - Trois hommes, Nouv. Revue Française, Paris, 1913.
- ¹⁸⁴ K. Polischuk. - Sound colours; P. Tychna. - Instead of sonnets and octaves; "Rainbow" (Kalish).
- ¹⁸⁵ G. Sorel, Réflexions sur la violence; Dostoevsky, Demons.
- ¹⁸⁶ M. Staritsky.
- ¹⁸⁷ Krasnyi Shlyakh, 1923, I.
- ¹⁸⁸ M. Kostomarov - Note on Pan-Slavism, Ukraine, pp. 1-2, 1924.
- ^{189, 190} O. Konysky.
- ¹⁹¹ I. Franko - From the days of sorrow.
- ¹⁹² B. Chumak. - Chervonyi Vinok, Odesa, 1919.
- ¹⁹³ V. Vinnichenko - op. cit. 183.
- ¹⁹⁴ M. Sribliansky - Etudes on Futurism, Odesa (Kalish), 1924.
- ¹⁹⁵ I. Franko - From the top and from the bottom.
- ¹⁹⁶ L. Ukrainka - On Utopia in Fiction.
- ¹⁹⁷ M. Hrushevsky - Ukrainian Vestnik, 1906, I.
- ¹⁹⁸ I. Franko - My Izmaražd.
- ¹⁹⁹ M. Staritskyi, P. Kapelhorodskyi.
- ²⁰⁰ P. .
- ²⁰¹ F. A. Lange - Geschichte des Materialismus, B. II.
- ²⁰² A. Schopenhauer, op. cit.; Hegel, op. cit.
- ²⁰³ Fr. Nietzsche. - Also sprach Zaratustra.
- ²⁰⁴ June. Shlyakh, 1924, pp. 11-12.
- ²⁰⁵ Nietzsche - Wille zur Macht, 32, 78.
- ²⁰⁶ S. Yefremov - Before the court of his own conscience. Public and political work of V. Antonovych, Kyiv, 1923.
- ²⁰⁷ G. Deherme - Le nombre et l'Opinion publique.
- ²⁰⁸ P. Kulish - The Fall of Malorossia, vol. I, 31; II, 76, 123.
- ²⁰⁹ V. Vinnichenko, op. cit.

- ²¹⁰ A. Schopenhauer. op. cit.
- ²¹¹ I. Franko - About Drahomanov, LNV, 1906.
- ²¹² Fr. Nietzsche. - Also sprach Zarathustra.
- ²¹³⁻²¹⁷ I. Franko - My Izmaraagd, From the Days of Sorrow, Mother Nature, Faded Leaves, The Masons.
- ²¹⁸ P. Kulish, "Zemlyatstvo", The Bell, Geneva, 1893.
- ²¹⁹ Case, 15. II. 1924, (article by O. Salikowski).
- ²²⁰ O. Fedkovych - Works.
- ²²¹ Nasha Zorya, 1923, pp. 31-33, P. Tagore - Sunset at the End of the Century (in Bengali), translated from German Mykola Shapoval, Kalish.
- ²²²⁻²²⁴ O. Turinsky - Berkut; To the Light.
- ²²⁵⁻²²⁶ I. Franko - Berkut; To the Light.
- ²²⁷ Rab. Tagore - Lebensweisheit; Nacyonalizm.
- ²²⁸⁻²³⁵ Rab. Tagore.
- ²³⁶ A. France - La vie littéraire, Paris, 1899, 3. série.
- ²³⁷ H. Taine - Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire.
- ²³⁸ J. Lahor - Histoire de la littérature hindoue, P. 1888.
- ²³⁹ Current History 1925.

AND SOME OTHER

- ¹ Samoilenko - Humanity; Franko - Moses; Oles - Works.
- ² P. Tychyna.
- ³⁻⁵ Nash Holos. 350, 39, 40.
- ⁶ V. Polishchuk - The Adygean singer, June. Shliakh, 1923, I.
- ⁷ Y. Bachynskyi - Irredentist Ukraine.
- ⁸ "Independent Ukraine".
- ⁹ N. Gogol - Arabesques, On the Middle Ages, On the Movement of Peoples, How to create this drama.
- ¹⁰ P. Kulish, History of the Reunification of Russia, vol. II, 771.
- ¹¹ T. Shevchenko. - 3 letters. (Works by T. Shevchenko, vol. II, ed. by V. Yakovenko, 1911).
- ¹² Kulish - Fall of Little Russia from Poland, I, 11.
- ¹³⁻¹⁵ Schopenhauer, op. cit. I. s. 421, 191, 101, 171, 191, 200, 411, 11, 969.
- ¹⁶ Guyot - Morality without duty and sanctions.
- ¹⁷ Die literarischen Wegbereiter d. neuen Frankreich, R. E. von Curtius, Potsdam s. 174.

- ¹⁸ Nietzsche - La gaya scienza.
- ¹⁹ Schopenhauer. - Üb. d. Willen in d. Natur, op cit, II, 1120; III, 242.
- ²⁰ L. Ward - The psychic factors of civilisation.
- ²¹ E. Durkheim, Die Methode der Soziologie.
- ²² L. Ward - The psychic. factors etc.
- ²³ Hegel, Aesthetik. Philosophie d. Geschichte.
- ²⁴ von Curtius, op. cit.
- ²⁵ Negel - Vorles. üb. die Aesthetik, I, Abt. 123, 124.
- ²⁶⁻²⁷ Jules de Gaultier: La Logique de l'Héroïsme, Mercure de France No. 532, 1920.
- ²⁸ Schopenhauer, op. cit. I. B, 339-434, 440; II, 333; Hegel, Vorlesungen. etc. X. W., Abt.; L. Ward. - Outlines of sociology.
- ²⁹ L. Ward, Dynamic Sociology, I. 174; Hegel, Vorles. ub. die Aesthetik.
- ³⁰ Th. Hobbes - Traite de la Nature.
- ³¹ Güyo, . cit.
- ³² Nietzsche - La gaya scienza.
- ³³ L. Ward - Dynamic Sociology, I. 174.
- ³⁴ Quelch. - The Socialists, 1913.
- ³⁵ Quelch. - The Socialists, 1913.
- ³⁷ O. Spengler - Untergang d. Abendlandes.
- ³⁸ Nietzsche, Wille zur Macht, 99.
- ³⁹ J. London.
- ^{40, 41} Nietzsche. - Also sprach Zaratustra, Wille zur Macht.
- ⁴² Guyot, . cit.
- ⁴³ Hegel, op. cit.
- ⁴⁴ Schopenhauer, op. cit.
- ⁴⁵⁻⁴⁸ Nietzsche, Geburt der Tragödie, Wille.
- ⁴⁹ Gr. Kayserling (from the adn reading), N. Fr. Presse 23. II. 1923.
- ⁵⁰ Mgr. R. H. Benson - Paradoxes du catholicisme.
- ⁵¹ Ad. Harnack. - Das Wesen des Christentums. Leipzig, 1902.
- ⁵² F. Mainecke - Weltbürgertum u. Nationalstaat, Berlin, 1919.
- ⁵³ E. Corradini - L'Unità et la potenza delle nazioni, Firenze.
- ⁵⁴ Fichte, Reden an die deutsche Nation; Hegel, op. cit.
- ⁵⁵ Nouvelles Littéraires, No. 136, p. 25; Lettres à Mélisande.
- ⁵⁶ Fichte. op. cit; G. Simmel - Comment les formes sociales se maintiennent, L'année sociologique, Paris, 1898.
- ⁵⁷ Schopenhauer, op. cit.
- ⁵⁸ E. Renan. - La réforme intellectuelle et morale.

- ⁵⁹ L'Humanité (June 1919); F. Gutrel - Matérialisme, Idéalisme, Théologie.
- ⁶⁰ Nietzsche. - Also sprach etc.
- ⁶¹ R. W. Emerson - Nature and thought.
- ⁶² G. Sorel. - Réflexions sur la violence.
- ⁶³ Spencer, Introduction à la science sociale, p. 171.
- ⁶⁴ LNV, VI, 24.
- ⁶⁵ Luke 14, 26.
- ⁶⁶ Le Bon - Psychology of the Masses, La psychologie politique.
- ⁶⁷ Vilfredo Pareto - Trattato di sociologia generale, Firenze, 1916
- ^{68, 69} Le Bon.- Psych. d. Masse, 47; La psych. politique, 21
- ⁷⁰ Guy-Grand, La philosophie nationaliste.
- ⁷¹ Le Bon - Psych. der Masse, 44, 45; La Psych, polit. 61.
- ⁷² Guyot. - Irreligion de l'avenir.
- ⁷³ Baudelaire - Le voyage (Les Fleurs du mal).
- ⁷⁴ Le Bon - La psych. politique, 126.
- ^{75, 76} Sorel, Réflexions sur la violence.
- ⁷⁷ Stendhal - Vie de Napoléon, 132, 88.
- ⁷⁸ Plato - Staat (Diderichs, Jena. 1909).
- ⁷⁹ Sorel, op. cit.
- ⁸⁰ Hegel - op cit
- ⁸¹ Spencer, op cit.
- ⁸² Grom. Golos, 1925, p. 6.
- ⁸³ Hegel, op. cit.
- ⁸⁴ Le Bon. - Psychologie d. Masse, 48.
- ^{85, 86} H. T. Buckl, History of civilisation in England, II, pp. 12, 40; Carlyle, Die Helden u. das Heldentum in der Geschichte.
- ⁸⁷ Hegel, op. cit.
- ⁸⁸ Nietzsche. - Also sprach etc.
- ⁸⁹ Ward. - Dynamic Sociology.
- ⁹⁰ Lesya Ukrainka - Obsessed.
- ⁹¹ Dostoevsky - The Brothers Karamazov.
- ⁹² Lesya Ukrainka - Reviews.
- ⁹³ Byron.
- ⁹⁴ Lesya Ukrainka - Utopia in fiction.
- ⁹⁵ Nietzsche; Lesya Ukrainka - Utopia in fiction.
- ⁹⁶ Buckle, op. cit.
- ⁹⁷ L. Ward - Outlines of sociology.
- ^{98, 99} Guyot, op. cit.; Schopenhauer, op. cit.

- ¹⁰⁰ Nietzsche - La gaya scienza.
- ¹⁰¹ Radek - Foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Rossii. Kharkov, 1924, p. 25.
- ^{102, 103} Ward - Outlines etc.
- ¹⁰⁴ Lesya Ukrainka - Utopia in fiction.
- ¹⁰⁵ Durkheim - Die Methode d. Sociologie.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ward, Dynamic Sociology, II, 140.
- ¹⁰⁷ Nietzsche - Wille zur Macht.
- ¹⁰⁸ H. Sudermann. - Es war.
- ¹⁰⁹ L. George - N. Fr. Pr., 11 II. 1925.
- ^{110, 111} L. Ward - Dyn. Soziologie, I, 17.
- ¹¹² Le Bon - Psych. d. Masse, Psychologische Grundgesetze in der Völkerentwicklung, Leipzig; F. Jodl, Geschichte der Ethik.
- ¹¹³ G. Simmel. - Philosophie d. Geldes.
- ¹¹⁴ L. Ward - Static and Dynamic Sociology.
- ¹¹⁵ Sorel, op. cit.
- ¹¹⁶ Ward, op. cit.
- ¹¹⁷ Schopenhauer, op. citII, 1332; IV, 44.
- ^{118, 119} E Ludwik - "Neue Rundschau", 1925.
- ¹²⁰ Atlantic Monthly, Febr 1925.
- ¹²¹ Spencer, op. cit, 165.
- ¹²² Atlantic Monthly, idem.
- ¹²³⁻¹²⁵ D. Dontsov - Engels, Marx and Lassalle on Non-Historical Nations.
- ¹²⁶ E. Renan - op. cit.
- ¹²⁷ D. Dontsov.
- ¹²⁸ Sorel, op. cit.
- ¹²⁹ V. Pareto. op. cit.
- ¹³⁰ Nietzsche - La gaya scienza.
- ¹³¹ Spengler, op. cit.
- ¹³² Le Bon. op. cit.
- ¹³³ L. Ward - Dynamic Sociology I.
- ¹³⁴ G. Simmel, L'année sociologique, 1898.
- ¹³⁵ Montesquieu - Betrachtungen über die Ursachen der Grosse d. Romer u. deren Verfall.
- ^{136, 137} Myśl. Naród. 41, 1924; J.R.Seeley - The Expansion of England London, 1883.
- ¹³⁸ Sorel, op. cit.
- ¹³⁹ Ford - My Life.
- ¹⁴⁰ Zagrava, 1924.

¹⁴¹ Sorel, op. cit.

¹⁴² Spengler, op. cit.

¹⁴³ Guillot.

^{144, 145} H. Taine. - Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire.

¹⁴⁶ Renan, op. cit.

¹⁴⁷ G. Le Bon. - Psychologische Grundgesetze in d. Völkerentwicklung.

¹⁴⁸ Spengler, op. cit.

AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

¹ R. Kjellen - Die politischen Probleme des Weltkrieges.

² B. Vynnychenko, The Revival of the Nation.

³ A. Holovko - "I can", "Chervon. Shlyakh", 1923.

⁴ V. Vinnichenko.

⁵ 3 speeches by Zhytetskyi in 1877 (D. Doroshenko - Review of Ukrainian Historiography, p. 176).

^{6, 7} Vinnichenko.

⁸ Thunder. Golos, no. 6, p. 25.

⁹ V. Vinnichenko.

¹⁰ LNV, I 1926 (Faraway - Conversation).

¹¹ G. Le Bon. - La Révolution française et la Psychologie des Révolutions.

¹² N. Fr. Presse. - 13. V. 1924 i 12. IV. 1925 (from the letters of Dastaevskii).

¹³ "3rd freedom", 23. X. 1924.

¹⁴ .

^{15, 16} Lenin. - One step forward, two steps back, 1904. - What to do, 1902.

¹⁷ 3 of the same article. - "Słowo Polskie".

¹⁸ Zhytetskyi (D. Doroshenko, op. cit.).

¹⁹ G. Ferrero. - Discours aux sourds.

²⁰ J. Baczynski, The Bolshevik Revolution and the Ukrainians, Berlin, 1925.

²¹ Carlyle - op cit.

²² Carlyle, op. cit.; Chronicle of the Revolution, H. Rakovsky, Ilyich and Ukraine, 1925.

²³ Staszic. - Dzieła, Warszawa, 1815-1821. Uwagi nad życiem J. Zamoyskiego.

²⁴ P. Kulish - The fall of Little Russia from Poland, vol.

²⁵ Mercure de France, No. 588, 1922.

²⁶ M. Barrès - Scènes et Doctrines du Nationalisme.

²⁷ C. Pryhara - From Romanticism to Realism, K. 1913.

²⁸ Ch. Péguy. - Œuvres choisies.

²⁹ Durkheim. op. cit.; B. Mussolini - Discorsi politici, Milano, 1921.

³⁰ Paul Valéry - Variété, Paris.

BERSERKER

BOOKS

