

Explaining Ukraine. History, Nationhood and the New World Order

By [Ivan Daraktchiev](#)

Global Research, April 30, 2014

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [History](#)

Numerous papers in the alternative, dissident public sphere have recently discussed the plight of Ukraine.

I will address one after the other all the answers: some to questions never asked, some to complement what others – typically the propaganda machine – have left out, consciously or not, while airing just the preferred part of the truth.

However, before anything else we must clarify a key definition that has been (i) a source of confusion even in civilized discussions between well-mannered people, and (ii) convenient tool for the brainwashing products manufacturers. If I fail to convince you in my point you will be unable to see how the difference in terminology has become a tiny but powerful part of the problem, at least as far as the war of words, and why this is the darling of the propaganda-war designers.

Definition of “nation”

In the US Philosophy “nation” (nationhood) is synonymous with “statehood;” “nationality” has the meaning of “citizenship.” In the Old world, and certainly in Europe, “nation” derives from the root in Latin for “being born” and thereby implies the bond by birth from the same ancestors, of a large and homogeneous group of people living on the same territory for a long period of time – typically millennia – and speaking the same language, sharing the same moral values, history, traditions and culture; some would add here religion although we believe this is contentious, being relatively recent and often just pragmatically useful an argument. Certainly the unbiased members of the oldest nations’ intellectual communities would agree religion is – and should be – no consideration, i.e. adding it as a consideration is a politically motivated move by the architects of the modern ethnic divisions (and has thus become a part of the control tool-set).

Hence when speaking about “nation” the US political class does not mean the nation as such but rather a state that may or may not be the formation administrating a given ethnos. No wonder, then, that the American leaders still can not comprehend that they – or any other occupying force, for that matter – have no chance to win a long-drawn war against a nation that is determined to reject submission to the invaders’ will. USA lost miserably against the Vietnamese people (as did the French before), in Iraq, in Afghanistan (as did the Soviets before), and probably have learned that lesson so that of late its Administration resorts to proxy warfare.

Still, the rhetoric – and all the propaganda pitches – indicate that their thinking has not

changed, i.e. that they haven't realized yet that the nation-state is the most resilient and the only vigorous socio-political formation and that it is bound to outlive any artificial supranational creature; and also, that nationalism does NOT always deserve a negative connotation: over here, when stripped of xenophobic, racist and/or chauvinistic tendencies we call it simply patriotism. Typically, in their current mind-frame the US leaders proclaim themselves patriots while everyone who fights them are nationalists (i.e. "bloody bad guys"): as this typically happens on the soil of the "bloody bad guys" it is hilarious to see the reports coming out. Nonetheless, the results have been consistently the same: mistrust of the mainstream media (MSM) and universally growing unpopularity of American leadership.

It is not clear whether this lack of feel for the importance of nationality stems from the fact that today US itself does not qualify for a nation. Even if we accept that until half a century back it would be admissible to talk about American nation, today that does not fit: within a population of 300 million there are at least 30 million that have been born with a foreign nationality (and respective culture, language, traditions, etc.), and at least 30 more millions of descendants of theirs who would feel as foreigners - and be brought up and educated as such - or at least as half-Americans. And these would be only the legal new "nationals" - so we have to add here anywhere between 10 and 20 million illegal immigrants. Would you call such mixture a nation? I don't.

A nation has cohesive forces that are built-in due to the features listed in the definition given above. In the US these cohesive forces are greatly diluted - if we assume that they were built up strong enough in order to consider it a nation, by the beginning of this century, or perhaps by the end of WWII - and to date it is doubtful it would qualify. In my own perception, and per independent confirmation by respectful Americans, the US that we have grown to admire had its peak as a nation in the period around WWI. Gradually - starting perhaps with the creation of the Fed in 1913 - its Nomenklatura was built up and grown to infiltrate and control all aspects of life.

The events in the last couple of decades have convinced most of the independent-minded people worldwide that it indeed does have everything firmly in its grip. In any case, a growing number of Americans - general public and intellectuals alike - is repeatedly and uncompromisingly stating it clear that during the last decennia they see steep degradation of their moral values system, family image and statute disintegration, activities abroad that bring about hatred to replace the veneration of the US by the rest of the world (something along the lines of "America worst" to replace "America first")... all due to a number of successive US governments succumbing to the coercion by the "knights of the Round Table¹".

In my opinion, in concurrence with above view, the cohesive forces that once have made America strong and admirable, especially when fighting for the right cause, have been systematically and deliberately annihilated by the architects of the NWO, in synchron with their effort abroad, in the same direction.

Above implies that the key parameter upon which the policy towards a foreign nation should be based is the national psyche of the recipient. Yes, but which "nation:" the state or the people? During the last century or so - and certainly after WWII - a huge number of "new nations" was born simply due to the rule divide et impera.

The proponents of that rule, conveniently disguised behind the myth called “export of democracy,” marshaled the rest of the world to “agree” with so favorable to them a status quo, just to violate the “international law” of their own making every time the opportunity arose to create yet another “new nation” out of a region with a “national” psyche dominated by splintering tendencies. Hence to those in the business of governments manipulation and control juggling with the terminology could bring problems. Not that they do care that much since mostly each is after short-term effects. However, in the long run it eventually ends up as aggregate problem with the bully’s (read America’s) image.

In any case the distinct difference in definitions typically makes the dialog dissonant: certainly Westerners and Easterners are not on the same page. How, then, are we supposed to arrive at harmonious conclusions and resolve whatever the issue has been?

To summarize, in broader sense (*grosso modo*) the people of Ukraine – as well as the people of Belarus’ – are part of the larger Russian nation. Factors like political bias, propaganda, etc. may have influenced some to identify with different nationality; nonetheless most if not all of them inherently know they are all close relatives. For the Westerner to comprehend, I’d offer here the following parallel: Scots and Welsh are infinitely more distant to the English than Ukrainians and Belorussians to the Russians.

What kind of nation is Ukraine exactly?

Juggling with parts of the truth, the smooth operators of Nomen’s propaganda machine have managed to portray Ukrainians as some sort of martyrs at the hands of the Russians. Residuals of that picture transpire in the writings of even the most objective writers today hence no wonder the mass reader is easy to be brainwashed. But even the well read intellectuals rarely display understanding of the single most important feature of Western propaganda: equate “Soviet” with “Russian.” Which, in our view, gives out the sole purpose of said propaganda machine, its *raison d’être*.

One of the key arguments is the famine in the 1930s, dubbed *Golodomor* (pronounced “*holodomor*”) and meaning “forced starvation.” And never will you be told that during those famine years people died *en masse* not just in Ukraine but as well in Russia, Kazakhstan etc.; i.e. everywhere in the Soviet Union where at the time rich landowners – the so called “*kulaks*” – were ordered to give up all their harvest to the state, and were promised to receive food rations in exchange.

The regions we call Ukraine happened to have most such *kulaks* who were regarded as their own Soviet *kulaks* much as those in the regions along Don and Volga that we denote today as Russia proper and much the same as those in Kazakhstan – the Soviet Kazakhi *kulaks* – and elsewhere.

Hence the first distinct Ukrainian feature of the famine is the extensive use of the tragedy for propaganda purposes, and specifically for creating antagonism and animosity among the population, leading to distancing and estrangement of once rather homogeneous group, and possibly separation. The other distinction, the larger scale, is merely a consequence of the fact that Ukraine featured (i) larger areas of fertile arable land – and, respectively, higher per capita rate of “*kulaks*” – and (ii) more zealous local Ukrainian Bolsheviks waging a holy war on their “class enemy.”

And then the writers about *Golodomor* will not mention that at the time of the famine the

top men in charge of Soviet Ukraine were Ukrainian Communists. Most significantly, the top man entrusted specifically with the collectivization policy enforcement was the Soviet Ukrainian Commissar Lazar Kaganovich, and that comrade Kaganovich, one of the few Central Committee's Secretaries, was Ukrainian even without the "Soviet" degree in front of it.

More important even, you will never hear from the Ukrainian "nationalists" - who would pretend to be Ukrainian patriots, I guess - that several Ukrainian leaders played crucial role for the very survival of Lenin's Revolution. The fact is, without the participation by the Ukrainian Anarchists the Russian civil war (1918-1924) would have ended with victory by the White (Czarist) Army.

Lenin struck a deal with the Ukrainians and the so called Black Army led by the most prominent Ukrainian Anarchist (some call him Anarcho-Communist), Nestor Mahno, fought on the side of the Red Army. It is my assessment that this tipped the balance. Needless to mention, the Bolsheviks saw to it that after the anti-Czarist military campaign was over their comrades the Anarchists - who wouldn't care at all about nationality in any sense of the terminology - were either expelled or exterminated (Mahno himself died from tuberculosis in Paris, years later).

The architects of the so much cherished Ukraino-Russian rift would never mention either that several supreme leaders of USSR are from Ukrainian provenance - besides Kaganovich, Khrushchev and Brezhnev come from the region as well... Hence neither the claim that Ukraine has nothing to do with the Soviet adventure - and was therefore a mere victim, as some would love to see it - nor the blame for Golodomor would stick, in my court. If anything, a nationalistic outcry - and call for revenge, maybe? - should be directed to Georgia. Given the Soviets' big shot of the time was born in the neighborhood of Tbilisi (Tiflis), bad names calling in the direction of Moscow is utterly misplaced - if Kaganovich is found "not guilty."

Genesis of Ukraine and Ukrainians

Ukraina - meaning "fringes," "border land," "land at the edge," and similar, in Russian - is the south-western geographical part of Russia on which the contemporary state called in English Ukraine is situated. Here are the essential facts about its history, language, ethnicity and culture:

History and language: In the first centuries AC the lands north, north-east and north-west of Black Sea were inhabited by a mixture of tribes - Thracians, Slavs and proto-Bulgars. The latter had established a long-lasting tradition in administrating and thus the oldest resulting legal entity in the region is known in recorded history as the Old Great Bulgaria. In the 7th century it has expanded in the true tradition of all great empires thus eventually generating two newer states known as Danubian Bulgaria and Volga Bulgaria while fading away itself later on.

In mid 9th century two key events happened in Danubian Bulgaria (which the 19th century "Great Powers" reduced to the contemporary tiny state of Bulgaria) that changed the fate of Europe and the world. First, the Cyrillic alphabet was invented, and then Christianity was adopted as state religion. King (Knyaz) Boris must have realized he needed the tools for homogenizing his conglomerate of tribes into one nation - and he's found them in the forms of one religion, one dominating language, one script (domestic, not foreign!).

The most important result of these developments was that the Old Bulgarian language – or the Church Slavonic as it is also known – was the one for which the Cyrillic alphabet was created, and as a consequence all holy books have been translated into it. Moreover, any new writings that began appearing by then – first the ecclesiastic and afterwards the secular literature – were written in that language, spelling the death sentence to all other tribal languages.

In the period 8-9th centuries several Russian city-states have been established (Novgorod, Kiev, Moscow). By the 9th century Kiev's one was the most prominent among them. It was known as Kievan Rus' (Kiev's Russia). It soon overshadowed the rest and started to expand absorbing them all, thus laying the foundation of the modern Russian state. At the time the population was a Russian-based amalgam (includes Slavs; Bulgars – later known also as Cossacks; some Asians) and the nobility is known for their Slavic (Russian) names.

By the 10th century zealous Bulgarian Church missionaries flooded the lands of their ancestors: the Old Great Bulgaria was overrun by short-lived waves of various Asian nomads but the locals, their relatives, still lived there in typically agricultural communities. Hence preaching the Gospel in intelligible dialects was uninhibited and very efficient.

By the 10th century (11th, by other accounts) the Knyaz of Kievan Rus' reenacted Knyaz Boris' revolution: in a symbolic ceremony the Russian nation of Kievan Rus', personified by himself, was baptized into Christianity, by the Bulgarian Patriarch baptizing the Russian King². In the ensuing centuries several of the highest ranking Bulgarian clerics have filled in the uppermost clerical positions of the Russian Orthodox Church, including the function of Patriarch, in Kiev as well as later on in Moscow.

This was the most important language export of all times, certainly for the Slavic peoples: the Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) has gradually become the basis of the Russian language. It did undergo a relatively minor evolution before being fixed, by the time secular literature appeared and no more major changes were possible or needed (in contrast, in Bulgaria the mother tongue evolved much further, for historical reasons; however it's a long story, unrelated to the subject matter here).

The Russian state expanded, its center of weight shifted to Moscow, turning Kiev into faraway province... The Russian language has – because of the vast territory of the country – the potential to have zillions of dialects. Yet for this giant scale it sports relatively few major dialects. Except for Ukrainian, which is natural, for the fringes of any country. But Ukrainian dialect (language) itself differs as well, depending on which border we are close to.

In Galicia it displays clear influence by Polish, easy to explain in view of the history and the proximity. But even that I view as a dialect and not a separate language. However, my view – not of a philologue – is a generalized one, perhaps from a somewhat higher, philosophical ground. Think of it that way: France is the second largest country in Europe, in terms of territory, after Ukraine, when we set Russia aside. Take now the number of French dialects – many vie for the statute of separate languages as well – and compare first to Ukraine and its own acknowledged dialects. Then translate that to Russia... and I bet you will find larger differences between French and Occitan or Provençal than between Russian and Ukrainian.

The fact is, **Ukraine is a geographical term, denoting part of the historic Russian territory**. The fact is, the population of the geographical territory named Ukraine has been

and is part of the larger Russian nation: the self-identification of the individuals as having Ukrainian or Russian “nationality” – as defined by their association with the respective citizenship – typically results from relatively recent influences.

In the more distant past these have been the typical exploits by the local Intelligentsia in the peripheral territories of any absolute monarchy; in the last century or so they could be described as resulting from propaganda wars between different ideologies seeking separation of states for the benefit of Nomenklaturchiks eager to rule the masses. Add to that picture the propaganda of bystanders with appetite for neocolonialist exploits and the story is complete.

The fact is, there has never been a truly independent state of Ukraine – given its natural (geographically spoken) and traditional (historically seen) statute of southern fringes of Russia, and therefore no natural urge for that – until the coup d’état in 1991 by the three infamous Nomenklaturchiks: Eltsin, Kravchuk and Shushkevich. Those three national criminals whom I am sure one day the Russian nation will try posthumously and condemn to rotting in hell, did break up their great state just because each wanted very much to be a president – the dream of all idiots.

So Ukraine was born as a “new nation,” “independent” (of the other part of itself), in the geographic region known for centuries as “Malaya Rus’” (Little Russia), and the historical “Belaya Rus’” (White Russia) became another “new nation” under the name Belarus’, while the mother of them all, the one that used to be known as “Chernaya Rus’” (Black Russia – how appropriately it sounds, for the mourning Mother of them all) remains as the center of gravity of Russian Federation.

So the Ukrainian Nomenklatura, keen on consolidating its grip on this piece of Russia started to work on indoctrinating lines of distinction and separation: in language (driving the distancing of the dialect away from its mother tongue), by rewriting history (as if the Communists – their own Ukrainian Commissars – have not damaged it enough), and everything else sufficiently useful in order to make the separation irreversible. Yet they did not succeed to push the total population to assume Ukrainian self-identity. The result is seen in the ensuing crisis.

The events on the ground are teaching the lessons of practical reality. The national psyche of the people inhabiting this geographic region – whatever their current self-identification – has formed during centuries under the same conditions as in the rest of Russia, ergo its roots are as deep and as broad as their brethren’s in Russia proper. The intensive brainwashing during the last 23 years may have somewhat more pronounced effect among the younger generation yet the rest can not be deceived as much as to forget their roots or to misjudge where their better future lies. And that especially now when the striking example of their impoverished cousins of the other ex-Soviet and now current-EU allies is plain to see.

Significantly, many declare publicly with pride that they still feel Soviet nationals, citing better overall economic conditions, education, etc., in the past. Internationally that pride derives from the defeat their country wrought onto Nazi Germany (the Western nationals typically ignore the fact that the backbone of Hitler’s Wehrmacht was broken during the colossal battle at Kursk, in the summer of 1943, after which its total annihilation was just a matter of time, with or without the break-out of a Western Front). So, how can we expect these people to accept a bunch of violent neo-Nazi putschists to impose on them a

government picked by the US State Dept? Or to grant anything but mockery to a brave US President who is lecturing them - utilizing funny jargon - that they should not ask their brethren across the artificial eastern border for help?

Culture: Ukrainian cultural drive has produced many famous names, considered top of the line in the then czarist Russia: Skovoroda, Gogol', Shevchenko... Interestingly, most Ukrainian Kulturträger displayed multifaceted talents: Shevchenko is acknowledged as both accomplished artist and poet while Skovoroda was known as philosopher, poet and composer. And then, as if to demonstrate the degree to which the nations under consideration here are intertwined, Gogol', a brilliant playwright, novelist and short story writer, is considered the father of the classical Russian literature...

Religion: The majority of Ukrainians are followers of the Orthodox Church. A smaller part of worshipers, mostly in the westernmost provinces, belong to the Uniate rites. This is frequently misinterpreted as being the Catholic faith. The Uniate Church is in fact identical to the Orthodox except for acknowledging the primacy of the Pope instead of the Ecumenical Patriarch. This phenomenon has originated a few centuries back, politically driven and for purely pragmatic reasons, and is not unique for Ukraine: several Christian nations on the Balkans featured such movements while under Ottoman yoke.

Nomenklaturchik's Psychology

It is important to clarify the key features of homo nomenklaturensis' psychological characteristics: those that distinguish him from the normal homo sapiens sapiens, and moreover those that make his behavior thoroughly predictable. We have discussed it at length before³ and therefore here only a brief mentioning will suffice, just to correlate it to the events in Ukraine and their better understanding.

The typical Nomenklaturchik exhibits no integrity, no spiritual sophistication, no creativity. His/her goals are strictly pragmatic, loaded with egocentrism, greed and total disregard of moral values. His/her credo is limited to "political correctness" and his/her goals in life are trivial: money, career and power (that generates more money... and so the cycles go). The subspecies from within the former Soviet Block countries distinguish themselves by one peculiar feature: the same pace of urgency, to enrich themselves by plundering the national assets. The EU Nomenklatura is noted for its mediocrity, hypocrisy and greed. The US Nomenklaturchiks excel in their ill-concealed servility to the people behind the scenes who are pulling the strings (as already alluded to). The peculiarities of other subspecies are irrelevant to the ongoing Ukrainian Revolution⁴.

Some simple math for the simple minded

The math genius of 20th century, Benoit Mandelbrot, has invented the visual way of solving practical problems that conventional mathematics could not offer satisfactory solutions to tackle, let alone solve, by employing digits only. I'd like to borrow here his theory about "fractals" in order to better exemplify the method of modern propaganda warfare. Presumably just a sketchy approach could do the job, so consider the following:

The tricky "Soviet = Russian" equation is implicitly employed any time some numbers are offered as proof of how bad the Soviet system was. No distinction has ever been made between the ideological sphere, social sphere, economics, etc.

Amazingly, this psychological warfare has worked for more than two decades, with all the gullible sucked into believing – and retranslating – above postulate. Only of recently is there some awakening to the realities; luckily, the process is spreading fast, and it proceeds worldwide. After all, Russia is attested as established multi-party democracy, there's no compulsory ideology, and no repressions for ideological reasons: even the Communist Party is operating freely and is part of the opposition in Parliament. And nobody amongst the conductors of propaganda choirs cares to mention that the very existence of Russian oligarchs – an undeniable fact of life – is incompatible with Soviet ideas, theory and practice alike. Yet I just saw a TV statement by Yatsenyuk along the lines of “Russia is trying to grab back the Ukrainians and impose the Soviet system on them”...

The trickier “Putin = Stalin” equation has been devised the moment it became clear that Eltsin's erratic policies would not be continued by his successor and, moreover, that after consolidating his grip on power and containing the damage the latter has initiated a successful albeit slow process of reversing the chaos into order. The ubiquitous anti-Russian propaganda started picking on any move that could be portrayed as crackdown on critics of Putin while most cases have been actions against undermining national symbols, priorities, traditions or just moral values.

Most publicized are the cases of pursuit of some oligarchs who are presented in the West as – more or less – victims of Putin's personal vendetta (and they love them, in London, when spending 7- to 9-digit amounts in sterling from the plundered accumulated wealth of the Soviet people, for anything between luxurious apartments and fancy football clubs). That they are being prosecuted for embezzlement, tax evasion, etc. are minor details.

Hence Putin's claim of high ground by upholding national values, traditions, moral, unity... has made him comparable to Stalin, according to Russia's professed enemies. And so even his career in KGB is being invoked as a sort of sin. Otherwise we are asked to admire the CIA agents (not to mention the all time favorite 007) and made to believe they work hard to secure our peace and our well-being. To use the vocabulary of famous heroes of the recent past, in KGB they were serving the Evil Empire while in CIA they worked for the Angel Empire. Sure thing!

The unsolvable triple differential equation. I'd offer here a brief outline of the basics in numerical math, in order to complete the description of Western propaganda's logic intended for the brainwashed – and preferably zombied – consumers.

Good Guys (GG), Bad Guys (BG)

GG —□ Win = Victors (V)

BG —□ Loose = Losers (L)

GG = us

BG = them

GG + BG = 0 (it's either them or us)

GG = - BG (we're just the same, wanting the opposite)

If so, it's simply a matter of who would strike first. Let's do it! We have invested enough in

logistics and other preparatory works, we have more (paper) money, so let's go for it!...

Hence the primitive brains are getting the world closer and closer to nuclear self-annihilation. As if it's not enough that statistically we are bound to have a major nuclear disaster through accidents at least once every thirty years or so (statistics from the two data points to date: please let's have all our fingers crossed, for the next 30 years!). Even if we assume tomorrow all nuclear power stations would be closed, there is enough other points where the disaster could start off at: weapon depots, research reactors, nuclear waste depots, unauthorized acquisitions...

The simple truth is, any confrontation could lead to nuclear annihilation of all life on the planet. No cause justifies such confrontation, certainly not the interference in the desire of the people of Ukraine (the people, not the Nomenklaturchicks or their violence-prone mercenaries!) to resolve their problems.

Short rerun of the script for Ukraine

The title of that script - should someone decide to run it in a drama theater - would be "Double hijacked revolution, accelerated by Washington's money." Indeed, from point of view of the Nomenklaturocracy concept things are clear. Look at the narrative (starting point = 10 years after the first abuse of popular discontent in 2004, a.k.a. "orange revolution"):

- despite high expectations, 20+ years of "democracy" yields sinking in poverty for the majority of the population, rampant corruption by the ruling "elite," debilitating-reform of once near-perfect education system, a whole generation brainwashed into consumerism... all very similar to the situation in the neighboring countries, including those already pranking EU membership (Romania, Bulgaria...)
- popular discontent with the Nomenklaturchicks of all colors is grown to the level of start-off of a revolution that is brewing against ALL Nomenklatura, in order to bring in People Power
- foreign investment (US\$ 5B courtesy of Victoria F.E.U. Nulland + Unknown number from German "donors" + ??? from ??? "friends") buys a bunch of power-hungry Nomenklaturchicks who call themselves "opposition" (opposition to what?) to stir up (and pay for) protests against the legitimate president (one of the top Nomenklaturchicks; still democratically elected and empowered) who is desperately trying to save the country from bankruptcy
- protests look impressive; however, in a country of 46 million a few protests of a couple of hundred thousands - make it a million - is some 2% of the nation; and many wouldn't bother to come were they not paid for it plus transported to the venue; protests proceed peaceful and orderly
- in order to achieve its purpose, the protest management (the "opposition" that hijacked the revolution in order to use the popular unrest for the sole purpose to become Ministers and Presidents themselves) brings the thugs in
- the armed bandits take over, start violence - for the incitement of which the "opposition leaders" should be held accountable as well - and a true riot breaks out

- US and EU cheer in support of the neo-Nazi bandits!!! Some of the – hitherto blind for the realities – people wake up and withdraw from the streets
- Takeover of the Parliament results in installment, at gun point, of “new government” and “new parliament” – all illegitimate, yet quickly recognized as the new “leaders” of Ukraine by the US President himself, while the democratically elected President who has been the negotiating partner with the EU just a few weeks ago, and who has not resigned or died was discounted simply because he went in hiding
- In another part of town the new “leaders” claim they need to be given the funds that should save Ukraine – i.e. we are back to the starting point. And delivery is not in sight because there was no money to start with: promises for money ain’t the same thing as cash! And the people of this world started to ask “How come we (US, EU) always support the nasties while trying to portray them as goodies?” For it’s not easy to talk about popular revolt when you show on TV neo-Nazis with guns and Molotov cocktails in violent attacks against the forces of law and order of a legitimate government which in fact has been way too lenient versus illegal actions against the public order. Despite all the bias that “the investing party” and its subordinates from MSM et. al. emanate, people at large still use their brains, especially those associated with the alternative media
- Autonomous Crimea votes for secession and requests ascendance to Russia
- Those who (mistakenly) believe they have the right to give orders to the people (of Crimea) go to the drawer with math equations and pick up Putin = BG. With that plaque in hand, smart looking and sounding speeches follow
- All servile media applauds
- Russia (Putin) is unimpressed
- After some air fisses out of the hot air balloon, the chapter is closed
- In the rest of Ukraine – certainly the whole Eastern half – people realize they are stuck with the foreign stooges relying on neo-Nazi bandits, imported “advisors,” mercenaries and snipers, who have in essence hijacked their revolution... and they decide to seize the momentum: the true Ukrainian revolution (Part 2) unravels
- With a little help from our friends, we shall overcome: that is the Leitmotif of the revolutionaries, I believe. And “friends” does not limit itself to Russia – all honest, dignified, independent-minded people of this world should lend support to the cause of Ukrainian people who do not want to become slaves of IMF, EC, EU, US and their subcontractors
- to be continued...

Conclusion

The campaign in Ukraine is simply part of the ongoing US proxy war for the vast resources of Russia – nothing more, nothing less. Of that very same proxy war, stages of which have been so many places and nations – real ones! – that happened to be a barrier, one way or another: Syria, Libya, Yugoslavia and its derivatives, Bulgaria, Romania, Georgia, Chechnya,

Afghanistan, Iraq, the Baltic republics... you could name at least as many more. This aggressive policy of the US and NATO is accompanied by empty rhetoric without any relevance to the facts of the matter; NATO itself has lost the justification and the purpose of its existence and should have been dissolved by the time its adversary, the Warsaw Pact, has self-dissolved. The US Nomenklatura and its accomplices of the EU Nomenklatura plus the responsible ones on the part of the official media should one day be held accountable for all their crimes against humanity.

The fight against NWO is picking up momentum but attaining victory will require united effort by all dissident groups internationally. Ukrainians' fight today is simply a part of the world-wide opposition against NWO.

They may not necessarily realize this but they intuitively know where their better future resides. In fact we are all into it, whether we like it or not, and each must take a stand.

Appendix

Perhaps I should offer here the answer to the FAQ #1 of late: **“Why is Putin so increasingly popular?”** On the surface this contradicts my own doctrine about Nomenklaturocracy, for, after all, Putin is just another Nomenklaturchik. Well, “Yes” and “No:” he is one among a small percentage who join during revolutionary periods and stay in the system to work for the good of their country and its people, not just for plundering. Such individuals are typically professionals and after brief service during transitional periods leave (usually disgusted by their “colleagues”); those who stay inevitably make a mark – think about Vaclav Havel!

So, Putin's star shines brighter than any other leader's today, and for a single good reason: impeccable leadership. But what does this mean? What do the generic words “work for the good of the country and its people” actually mean? In order to give you my best answer I will subcontract one of my best advisors. Some 2500 years ago he wrote: “The population of Thrace is greater than that of any country in the world except India. If the Thracians could be united under a single ruler, or combine their purpose, they would be the most powerful nation on earth, and no one could cope with them – that, at any rate, is my opinion; but in point of fact such a thing is impossible – there is no way of its ever being realized, and the result is that they are weak.”⁵ There you are: a truly successful – and admired for it – leader is uniting his compatriots and inspiring them to work for combined purpose, aligning his with theirs.

Notes

¹ Jon Rappoport, Who really runs things in America?, www.infowars.com, October 11, 2013

² The official legend sponsored by Czarist Russia claims the baptizing was performed in person by the Patriarch of Constantinople – thus the faith came in straight from the highest level on Earth.

³ Ivan Daraktchiev, Nomenklaturocracy, or what exactly was Orwell right about, <https://www.academia.edu/4439386>

⁴ Ivan Daraktchiev, The Revolution within Democracy, <https://www.academia.edu/5804006>

⁵Herodotus, History, 2008, London: The Folio Society

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Ivan Daraktchiev](#), Global Research, 2014

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Ivan
Daraktchiev](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca